

4082-9
3

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

JUNE 1953

PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING — 1953

ADDRESS OF FATHER ASSISTANT

HIGH SCHOOL SODALITY

FUND RAISING

IMPROVEMENT OF READING

Vol. XVI, No. 1

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Contributors

FATHER JOHN J. DIVINE, teacher of English at St. Louis University High School, gives some realistic suggestions on increasing students' appreciation of good reading.

FATHER EDWARD G. JACKLIN, President of St. Joseph's College, summarizes the rise and progress of cooperative financial contributing on the part of industry.

FATHER VINCENT A. McCORMICK, American Assistant offers suggestions to Jesuit educators in the name of Very Reverend Father General, Janssens.

FATHER JOHN J. McMAHON, Provincial of the New York Province, makes timely observations on Jesuits in their role of teacher trainers.

FATHER WILLIAM J. MEHOK, Assistant to the Executive Director of the J.E.A. summarizes the proceedings of the 1953 annual meeting.

FATHER FRANCIS D. RABAUT, Moderator of the Sodality at Loyola Academy, enlightens administrators on their role in making the Sodality a success.

FATHER PAUL C. REINERT, President of St. Louis University, outlines practical procedures in soliciting individual contributions from industry.

FATHER EDWARD B. ROONEY, Executive Director of the Jesuit Educational Association, pinpoints the two major concerns of secular educators, religion and philosophy.

FATHER PATRICK H. YANCEY, Professor of Biology at Spring Hill College and member of the National Science Board, drawing upon his wide knowledge of Jesuit scholarly effort, offers some sobering facts which point to future improvement.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

June 1953

CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS	2
ADDRESS OF FATHER ASSISTANT <i>Vincent A. McCormick, S.J.</i>	5
FUNCTION OF JESUIT UNIVERSITIES IN TRAINING TEACHERS <i>John J. McMabon, S.J.</i>	11
AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION DISCOVERS FUNDAMENTALS <i>Edward B. Rooney, S.J.</i>	14
INDIVIDUAL GIVING BY INDUSTRY TO PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION <i>Paul C. Reinert, S.J.</i>	19
INDUSTRY COOPERATIVE GIVING TO PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION <i>Edward G. Jacklin, S.J.</i>	33
CATHOLIC SCIENTISTS AND SCIENCE PROGRAMS <i>Patrick H. Yancey, S.J.</i>	43
PLACE AND FUNCTION OF SODALITY IN JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS <i>Francis D. Rabaut, S.J.</i>	53
PROMOTION OF GOOD READING IN OUR HIGH SCHOOLS <i>John J. Divine, S.J.</i>	61
JESUIT EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING—1953 <i>William J. Mebok, S.J.</i>	69
PROGRAM OF ANNUAL MEETING <i>Jesuit Educational Association</i>	77
NEWS FROM THE FIELD	80

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:

JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
DAVID R. DRUHAN, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>
HUGH M. DUCE, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
EUGENE F. GALLAGHER, S.J.	<i>Missouri 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>
STEPHEN F. MCNAMEE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
ARTHUR J. SHEEHAN, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
WILLIAM E. WELLER, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 EAST 84TH STREET

NEW YORK 28, N. Y.

COPYRIGHT, JUNE 1953

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

Address of Father Assistant

VINCENT A. McCORMICK, S.J.¹

This is the first time I have been present at a meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association—one of the penalties of living in exile—but my position over there has helped to keep alive and alert my interest in the life of your association. As I stand here tonight my memory goes back to a summer day in Rome nineteen years ago. I drove out from the City to Frascati where Father General's Curia was in residence at Villa Rufinella. Our revered Father Mattern was celebrating his golden jubilee in the Society. Going upstairs I unexpectedly ran into Father General. He took me aside at once, evidently anxious to give me some news. "Oh, we have just finished the document, a very important document," he said with that buoyant enthusiasm he always showed when some big venture was to be undertaken or after long labor was brought to an end. "It will organize and give new life to all the studies and the schools in the Assistancy and will do much for the Society there." As I left him and continued down the corridor to Father Mattern's room I confess the word that came nearest to my lips was: "Videbimus," "we shall see."

Well, we have seen. It is now a matter of record which we are happy to acknowledge, that proud progress has been made during the last decades in our educational work at all levels from high school through to university, in schools for externs as well as in houses of study for Ours. And that progress stems in great part from the spirit engendered by the *Instructio* and from the sincere and generous and persevering efforts of Superiors and their able assistants to carry out its prescriptions. It is then a distinct *privilege* for me, one I accept with deep feelings of reverence and gratitude, to be able to evoke here tonight the memory of Father Ledóchowski who so confidently expected great things from our Assistancy, and of our late lamented Father John Hynes who assisted his Paternity in the final drafting of the *Instructio*.

Some may at times have got the impression that Roman Superiors are for putting a brake on this progress we are making in the field of education. The word expansion has become taboo, so much so that any addition proposed or solicited either to the material setup of our schools, or to the schedule of courses, is now first of all described and established

¹Address of the Very Reverend Father American Assistant delivered at the Dinner Meeting of All Delegates, Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Fordham University, New York, N. Y., April 5, 1953.

to be not an expansion of our work but a necessary consolidation or a necessary rounding off of a present status. Now I am going to make bold to say a few words tonight about expansion, hoping to express the mind of Reverend Father General on this point. I think it can be done simply enough.

To expand has a divine warrant. "Go forth and make disciples of all peoples." "You shall be witnesses to me in Jerusalem, in Judea, in Samaria, and even to the remotest parts of the earth." And when St. Ignatius in the spirit of his Lord and God blazed the way for his sons with a call to defend and spread the faith whether among the infidels or those of Christian countries, with a masterly stroke he erased every limit of place or person to our apostolic zeal.

And yet limit there must be and always has been. Some forty years ago when doing university studies abroad I was much in contact with Father Timothy Corcoran, well-known humanist scholar and the man who, from his chair of education in the National University, Dublin, quite dominated secondary teaching in Ireland. One day the conversation turned to the matter of recognition over there of our American universities, and he mentioned the objection he found common enough among his colleagues. You have so many universities in the United States that it stands to reason most of them must be mediocre; for there are not enough real scholars among you to staff so many first rate centers of learning. Many changes have taken place during those forty years, yet even today that argument has not lost all its force. And there we meet the first limit put to expansion, a limit which St. Ignatius himself had to face; our restricted forces.

Not only those forces but the peculiar character of our man-power must be a determining factor in any of our plans. Where conditions require our men to carry an administrative or a teaching and extracurricular load that renders it practically impossible for them to fulfill the spiritual obligations of their rule of life, we have overexpanded. Father General cannot in conscience approve such conditions. We have expanded unreasonably when after hard years of advanced and specialized study, men as a rule must be denied the leisure necessary for scholarly productivity. Opportunity does not of itself create responsibility. Our responsibility to the religious Institute we have embraced and its ideals is beyond question; no one would suggest that we are responsible for the education of all Catholics in any one country or district. That responsibility rests foursquare on those whom the Holy Spirit has appointed to govern the Church. Ours is the privilege to assist them to the limit of our forces.

Moreover those restricted forces cannot today be simply committed to the educational field in the United States. There are other commitments awaiting them, demanding them. Perhaps you do not know, there are more scholastic novices in each one of the American provinces than there are in the four provinces of France together; more in several American provinces than there are in the five provinces of Italy put together. Novices are increasing in Germany, but there have been gaps of several years recently when there were simply no students of theology in the Society in Germany. Now some of those provinces were the mainstay of the Church in not a few mission lands, and of the Society in ministries dependent directly on Father General. Is it then surprising that the Church and the Society turn their eyes to our American provinces, especially as new harvests rich and ripe await the reapers in Japan, and India, and Africa? I say nothing of the tragic needs increasing in South America well known to you. It is more often an intellectual apostolate in those countries that makes its voice heard in appeal for help to form a native clergy and a laity thoroughly instructed in the Faith and zealous to expound and defend the Church's religious and moral teachings.

Father General will yield to none in extolling the golden opportunities offered to the Society by our colleges to pursue the end set before it by St. Ignatius: and those opportunities he knows are greater in this country than anywhere else. "Today even as of old our work of education in high school, college, and university, is to be considered one of the chief apostolates of the Society." So he wrote just five years ago in answer to a proposal that our priests leave their places in the schools to lay professors and dedicate themselves to so-called more priestly activity. "From these schools," he continued, "the future life of the Church depends because from them especially will depend her influence on public life. Surely if public life, that is, the world of industry, commerce, finance, wherein is molded the life of any society and the State itself, excludes the teachings of our faith and is even hostile to them, who does not recognize the incalculable harm that will come to souls?" (AR XI, 451-2) Thus far, Father General. But the comment leaps to one's lips: it is precisely the realization of the danger that is behind our American desire to expand, horizontally and vertically, while the way is yet open to us. Quite so; but Father General dwells in the center of Christendom; from the vantage point of his high office he takes in the whole world. To him through the Holy See come demands from the four corners of the earth and from the center too. It is for him to weigh the relative importance of all these varied appeals in the scale of God's greater glory, in serving the Church universal; and in his dire need of well trained and

specially equipped men, he cannot with equanimity contemplate his forces being committed to undertakings which are less pressing, when all circumstances are considered, or which might be assumed and carried through by others. The pressure brought to bear on him by the urgent needs of the Church forces him to demand that we be particularly careful, and exacting, in exercising a strict economy in the use of our personnel.

High schools are a vital and precious source of vocations to the priesthood and religious life and Father General has been willing at times to yield to the request of a Bishop, with the concurrence of the Provincial, for a new school. But for several years he has been particularly anxious, as many of you know, about the multiplication of graduate courses in our universities. He is not alone in his anxiety. Some of your number too have expressed to him a similar anxiety. Reading a few days ago the obituary notice of our venerated Father Phillips I was struck by this sentence: "As Provincial he had always insisted that our graduate schools should not attempt to emulate the complete graduate departments of the opulent state and private universities. He believed that each graduate department should specialize and concentrate along certain lines without unnecessary duplication, so that taken together the different schools would offer reasonably complete graduate courses." That expresses the thought and desire of his Paternity. From another angle, important also for us, the twelve-man commission set up by the Association of American Universities presents a picture of the very critical financial situation of Colleges and Universities in the United States: (*Time*, Dec. 1, 1952)

"The commission offers no neatly packaged plan for paying this staggering bill, but it does make a few suggestions. For one thing, U. S. higher education must economize. . . . Instead of trying to be all things to all men, campuses should divide their specialties, cooperate with one another in exchanging students, and teachers, and in using common facilities."

The practical problem will always have to be faced in determining how necessary a certain duplication may be, but neither can this be determined merely in the light of local circumstances. Hence in each case Father General's permission is required and he may in conscience feel obliged to give priority to the needs of some other section of the world. However, you may rest assured that our Reverend Father General will never be precipitous to impose his wish in such a matter as coordination and limitation of graduate courses. He is always ready and desirous first to hear all parties to such a step. Four years have passed since he pro-

posed the question to the Reverend Fathers Provincial, who then appointed a committee for this study. The committee's report, I have been informed, will be in the hands of the Provincials at their meeting next month and so His Paternity will receive it very soon. It were improper for me to anticipate its conclusions; but I may be permitted in passing to observe that the fraternal cooperation of the provinces in seeking a solution to a common problem, of which this report is one more splendid manifestation, is one of the many beneficial results of the *Instructio* which brought your Association into being.

My message to you, Reverend Fathers, would not be complete if I did not add the expression of Father General's high admiration of the vast good being accomplished through our schools of the Assistancy. The unflagging vitality of your Association, the devoted labors of the executive committee and its tireless chairman, your clear grasp of the problems present and promised in the educational fields of the States, and your resolute, enlightened and united efforts to meet them as far as possible for us—all give his Paternity a reassurance and a confidence for which he is always grateful. This confidence is confirmed by your recognized success in carrying forward the effectiveness of our schools to promote the life of the Church in America and the genuine good of our Country. Let me pay special tribute here to the magnificent and fruitful work of the student counsellors.

Father General has asked sacrifices from us. Four Ph.D.'s cannot be taken from a province in one day without causing a wrench in the whole body. Yet they were given cheerfully to establish the first constituent Catholic colleges of the National University in New Delhi. Scholasticates and universities give up specially prepared and well-seasoned professors to Roman institutes of international character. He will continue to ask sacrifices. Rather let us say he will give us, the young Assistancy, four-score years ago a missionary field, nurtured and strengthened by foreign blood, he will give us, now prosperous and powerful, the welcome chance to share more fully in helping him to support the burdens that rest often very heavy on his shoulders.

In the 8th part of the Constitutions, St. Ignatius stresses the all important need of union in an organization whose members are to be commissioned in all parts of the world. "The chief bond that is to unite them, he says, is the love of God and our Lord Jesus Christ. If closely bound to Him, superiors and subjects will be very easily bound to each other." It is this love of the Head that inspires our love of His Body, which is the Church, and sustains us in our work of education as in all our ministries. For it is eminently characteristic of the education

we offer, that it has its roots and its fruitage in Eternity. The link forged by this unity of motive and purpose firmly fixed in the spirit of each of us makes us into a single phalanx, led by Father General, at the service of the Vicar of Christ. There is the secret of the Jesuits, there is the promise of a constantly increasing effectiveness for the greater glory of God. That link we must keep strong and stronger in our Assistancy.

With these words I conclude, by offering a fervent prayer that your hearts be filled with the joys and peace of the Risen Saviour.

Function of Jesuit Universities In Training Teachers

JOHN J. McMAHON, S.J.*

It is a great joy for me to extend a word of sincere welcome to our Jesuit Educational Association. Our Province, in fact the whole Assistancy, owes a great debt of gratitude to the J.E.A. To mention but a few of its more recent achievements, I single out the Institute of Jesuit High School Principles held at Denver in 1952, The Institute of College Religion Teachers held at Holy Cross in 1951, The Institute of Guidance held at Fordham in 1949, The Institute of College Deans held at Denver in 1948. These cooperative ventures, which have produced lasting benefits for our educational apostolate, are a tribute to our Executive Director, Father Edward B. Rooney, and to our Executive Committee, without whose direction and counsel these splendid works would not have been accomplished.

Our Executive Director has done wonders with the organization which he has built from the ground up. Jesuit education on a national scale is much more effective now than it was when the first text of the *Instructio* appeared in August 1934. During 16 years Father Rooney has amassed such a fund of specialized knowledge on education and acquired so many personal and intimate contacts with the leaders of education that he is in a position now to render increasingly valuable service to the cause which all of us have so much at heart. Our Province is very proud of him.

The New York Times this morning (April 5, 1953) in the headlines over an article by Benjamin Fine states: "Teachers' Colleges are urged to devote more attention to Liberal Arts Courses." It is interesting to note that four hundred years ago the founder of many liberal arts Colleges and Universities wished that the outcome of education in these institutions would be the recruitment of well trained teachers. This founder is St. Ignatius. He wrote in the fourth part of the *Constitution* of our Society the reason why the Society may undertake the care of universities, namely, that the graduates of our universities "may be able to teach in

*Address of Very Reverend Father Provincial of the New York Province delivered at the General Meeting of All Delegates, Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Fordham University, New York, N. Y., April 5, 1953 under the title, "The Function of Jesuit Universities to Train Teachers."

other places with professional competence what they have mastered in our universities, to the glory of God."¹

I should take his words to mean today that the masters and doctors of our universities should be so competent that they may be able to teach as authorities in the universities, colleges and other schools of the United States and, in fact, of the entire world.

Two of his phrases are important:

"Bene didicerint"—what they have well learned—what they have mastered. The implication is clear that the faculties of our universities should be of superior excellence.

"Cum auctoritate"—The graduates of our universities should be able to teach as authorities in their profession. Again the implication is clear. If our graduates are to be authorities in their field of teaching, what should not be the calibre of our own faculties? "Proper quod unumquodque tale et illud magis." Again what a high ideal of scholarship is held up to our students—they are to aim at being authorities in their teaching profession. What labor, what diligence, what patience are here hidden by the words "cum auctoritate"?

The thoughts of St Ignatius on teacher training are especially significant today. There is a dearth of teachers. Last Tuesday (March 31st) in *The New York Times*, a report of a recent survey stated that next September 160,000 additional teachers are needed in elementary schools. Next year overcrowding will reach the high school level and in a few years the college level. The high schools, colleges and universities of this Province are finding it difficult *now* to acquire teachers, especially in the sciences. Within the next few years the difficulty will not decrease. Hence, would it not be well for our deans, guidance officers and student counsellors and all our teachers to take means to interest promising students to enter the teaching profession?

Should we not point out to these students that the teaching profession offers rewards and advantages which, while definitely not financial, are satisfying and apostolic? A few years ago in the *JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY*, Father Poetker wrote an interesting article on "The Place Of The Layman In Jesuit Schools." He wrote: "We must locate, while they are still undergraduates, some students who give promise of becoming scholarly and effective teachers and must propose such a career as a life vocation."²

¹"Ut aliis in locis cum auctoritate docere possint quod in his bene ad Dei gloriam didicerint." (*Societatis Iesu Constitutiones et Epitome Instituti*, Romae, 1949, Pars. IV., Cap. XI, No. 440).

²Albert H. Poetker, S.J., "The Place Of The Layman In Jesuit Schools." (*JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY*, Vol. 9, 1946-47, p. 16).

They may follow this vocation in our own schools or in the many secular Universities and Colleges in which Catholic Professors are only too few. What apostolic opportunities await competent Catholic Professors in these Institutions! Professor Hugh Taylor in an article in *Thought* made a plea for more Catholic scholars in secular colleges and universities.³

Should we not point out these opportunities for Catholic Action so that the Church in this Country may be *present* through her devoted and scholarly laymen in the influential secular institutions?

In his letter, *de Ministeris*, our present Father General wrote in 1947: "The training we give . . . should be such that those who are educated in our colleges are not inferior to those in other schools, but rather surpass them. For the objective of our college is to form Catholic men who by example and influence can be guides to others in any art or any office. This must be so in order that unbelievers may not have the whole field to themselves; for in that event their influence would be tremendous for the harm to souls."

In the *Princeton Alumni Weekly* for October 10, 1952, the career preferences of the senior class are stated and compared with the preferences of the same class in junior and sophomore years. It is worthy of note that, whereas in sophomore only one student had elected teaching, in senior year 21 had decided to follow the profession of teaching. The editor feels justified in boasting: "The increased interest in teaching manifested between sophomore and senior years suggests that the experience of a Princeton education conspicuously heightens respect for that profession." (p. 10) It is incumbent upon us to see to it that the experience of a Jesuit education "conspicuously heightens respect" for the teaching profession.

³Hugh S. Taylor, "Catholic Scholars In Secular Universities." (*Thought*, Vol. 24, March 1949, p. 31-35).

American Higher Education Discovers Fundamentals

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.¹

A number of papers that I heard at recent educational meetings have expressed considerable discontent with certain phases of American education. Because some of these expressions of discontent may help to sharpen the focus on problems that I have in mind, I shall take the liberty of quoting generously from them. One such paper was the presidential address entitled, "Some Crucial Issues in Higher Education" given by Dr. M. E. Sadler, president of Texas Christian University, at the 1953 annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges; another was a paper entitled "Major Strengths and Weaknesses in American Higher Education" by Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching delivered at the 1953 Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the Association for Higher Education.

For Dr. Sadler, one of the crucial issues in American education today is that of restoring religion to a position of centrality in education. He shows that, whereas religion was the dominant factor in all colleges during the early days of American education, the creation or maintenance of a basically Christian institution of higher learning today is beset with a myriad of difficulties arising from the secularism of American life, from the cult of scientism, and from what he calls "the stupid" interpretation given to the principle of religious freedom that was bequeathed to us by our forefathers.

But Dr. Sadler is an optimist. He thinks we can restore religion to a position of centrality in education. And here is how:

As I see it, the full solution of this problem involves a complete conversion, a new direction, a return to vital religion as the focal center of all sound education. It will not suffice to have religion merely as one stone in the total educational building. It must be the overreaching beam, the focalizing center, the permeating spirit, the uniting force which gives meaning and significance to *all* subjects and *all* courses. If God is the ultimate and controlling

¹Delivered at the General Meeting of All Delegates, Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Fordham University, New York, N. Y., as part of the "Report of the Executive Director," headed "Discontent with American Education."

reality of life, learning is obviously inadequate unless it does confess Him as its Foundation. John Henry Newman, in his "On the Scope and Nature of University Education" is speaking with deep insight when he says, "Religious truth is not only a portion, but a condition of general knowledge".

Dr. Sadler's main thesis is that "All Schools Could and Should Re-emphasize Pure Religion". He claims that tax-supported schools can do it, but privately controlled schools should lead the way in making religion a "constructive and dominant force in educational life."²

To my mind, Dr. Sadler, a Protestant, succeeded in constructing one of the most powerful appeals for the place of religion in education that I have heard in a long while.

In his paper, "Major Strengths and Weaknesses of American Higher Education", Dr. Carmichael gave as some of the strengths of American education: "the social and economic welfare of America, and the democratic spirit are due in great measure to the unique growth and size of American education; that it has raised standards of living through technological advances; and that by its development of a program of research and professional education it has raised professional standards and leadership, and has created a marvelous respect for research and scholarship."

The chief weaknesses of American education Dr. Carmichael thinks, concern liberal education and the lack of adequate provision for discussion of basic educational philosophy. He feels that in the colleges today, the division of humanities has become but a skeleton of its former self; philosophy (logic, ethics, metaphysics) has become a museum piece; "moral philosophy has now become anthropology, sociology, economics, and political science, under the title of the social sciences. Here is a telling paragraph from Dr. Carmichael's paper:

"The shift from philosophy to science suggests a series of issues in liberal arts program that warrant examination. Philosophy represents a search for truth, whereas science is a search for facts. A curriculum built around the former focuses attention on meaning, while one dominated by science is likely to over-emphasize the importance of facts. Perhaps all would agree that current undergraduate instruction exhibits just this weakness. For example, in history which traces the course of events too frequently the *where*, the *when*, and the *how* are stressed while the *why* is passed over lightly since that is in the realm of speculation. Or, again,

²Association of American Colleges Bulletin, Vol. XXXIX, No. 1, March 1953, p. 15.

in economics, sociology, and political science facts are gathered and classified, observations are recorded and analyzed, value systems are described and explained, but the question as to what constitutes the *good society* is scarcely raised. While facts must be mastered as a part of the educational process, when they become the *end* as well as the *beginning* of that process, higher learning, defined as the pursuit of truth, has lost its meaning."

Putting the matter in another way Dr. Carmichael says:

". . . the emphasis on scientific analysis which characterizes undergraduate instruction in practically all fields, and the failure to devote adequate attention to synthesis, to putting the pieces together to form a meaningful design, frequently leaves the student adrift and without motivation."

And what is the result?

"Failure to make a conscious attempt to help the student construct a logical philosophy of life frequently leaves him bewildered, without chart or compass."

But cannot administrators do something about this situation? Says Dr. Carmichael: "the presidents and deans are too absorbed in organization, administration, and promotion"; "the professors concerned chiefly with scholarly pursuits or departmental development, give little thought to the overall objectives of the colleges as a social enterprise." Who participate in state, regional, and national meetings—the deans and presidents. When the professors meet, they meet by themselves as specialists. "Thus it is," concludes Dr. Carmichael, "that the matter of direction of educational change has fallen between two stools with the result that it has been determined largely by pressure rather than planning, by outside influences rather than by statesmanship. The need is for educators to become masters in their own household with a view to reversing the process."

So much for the discontent of two American educators with American education. I am sure you could all give other quotations to swell the chorus.

But what of the Jesuits? Surely we are satisfied that religion, the Catholic religion and its center, Christ, is central to our whole philosophy of education. Surely we still give philosophy a place of highest honor. Surely we still hold out for the advantages of a liberal education; we try to liberalize our professional and pre-professional courses; surely we try to be selective in our admissions and try to gather about us a group of students who can take what we have to offer and profit by it.

While all of this is undoubtedly fundamentally true of Jesuit educa-

tion that these are our ideals and our principles, there is not a little dissatisfaction and discontent in the ranks of the Jesuits in regard to the execution of these ideals. You and I have heard serious complaints that our teaching of religion is often uninspired, that Catholicism does not pervade the atmosphere of our schools. While you and I hold to the place of preeminence that philosophy should hold in our curriculum, have we not also heard that scholastic philosophy has become a dead, formalized thing, that too often it becomes a mere memory exercise. Have we not heard complaints of the need of revitalizing our classics curriculum. From letters that I have received I could give quotations that would make Dr. Carmichael sound very much like Dr. Milqtoast.

Making all due allowance for exaggeration that springs from enthusiasm, I claim all this expression of discontent is healthy. It is healthy for Sadler and Carmichael to complain of American education. It is healthy for us to complain of Jesuit education. It is a healthy ferment that will undoubtedly give rise, first of all, to a humble admission of how short we fall of our own ideals; secondly, to a critical analysis of our own deficiencies; and, thirdly, to a firm determination to correct what is faulty, to improve what is right.

More and more I, myself, am coming to the conclusion that what is wrong with Jesuit education in the United States—and I can speak only for the United States—is that it just is not Jesuit enough; that we have been losing sight of our own great tradition, perhaps, especially our own great tradition of teaching. On the other hand there is evidence of a desire on the part of many of Ours for a “back to the *Ratio*” movement. I hear too of the desire for, and the organization of self-studies on the part of our institutions to see how they can come closer to the ideal of Jesuit education on how best to restore, in the measure possible, our own great traditions. This perhaps is the healthiest sign of all; for in the last analysis, improvement can come only on an institutional basis.

While we may be led by the speeches of secular educators to ponder more thoughtfully our own ideals and the efficacy and the intrinsic value of the educational facilities and instruments that are truly our own birth-right—surely we need not look to them for the inspiration to know our own traditions, to realize our shortcomings in living up to them, to return to them where a return is indicated. If we would have the execution of our educational ideals come up to what it should be, we have all the backing of authority and the inspiration that we can possibly need in the authoritative inspiring words of our own highest superior.

I refer to Very Reverend Father General Janssens and especially to the letter he addressed to the Society on the occasion of the canonization of

Saint John De Britto and Saint Bernadine Realino. Read section five of the letter where he speaks of the apostolate of scientific research, and publication in the field of the secular and sacred sciences. To this he gives first place in the choice of our ministries. And read section six where he speaks of the work of teaching in colleges and universities and high schools. "How valuable", he says, "for our own times is the traditional pedagogy of the Society, based as it is upon the principles which we, ourselves, have drawn from the *Exercises* and our rules, can be seen from this that it fortifies youth especially against the evils of the present time." Go on and read what he has to say about the liberal arts, and about training in religion. In his words you will find inspiration and wisdom and courage.

I would not have you think that I underestimate in any way the wonderful good that our high schools and colleges and universities are accomplishing in the field of American Catholic education. But by the same token neither would I have you think that I underestimate the ideals of the Society and of every Jesuit. It is not sufficient for the Society to do good, to achieve God's glory. The ideal of the Society in all things, in all its ministries, and for us especially, in education, is *Major Dei Gloria*. As long as there is the least room for improvement in our schools, by our profession as Jesuits and as educators, we *must* be dissatisfied. In education, as in all other works our aim must ever be—*Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*.

Individual Giving By Industry To Private Higher Education

PAUL C. REINERT, S.J.*

My assignment as I understand it is to abstain as much as possible from theoretical considerations in this field of fund-raising from firms and corporations and to present concrete practical methods of going about a task for which most Jesuits feel themselves inadequately prepared. It should be emphasized that these suggestions are not presented as coming from an expert. They merely reflect one man's experience in contacting a rather long list of companies in one urban area. Obviously, different Jesuits will find other methods more successful, and every technique outlined here should be trimmed to fit individual personalities and local circumstances.

WHY MUST WE TURN TO INDUSTRY?

If Jesuit colleges and universities are to continue their normal development, in fact, if they are to survive, every source of increased income must be explored. Dr. Urban Fleege, Staff Associate of the National Catholic Educational Association, has estimated that the total enrollment in Catholic colleges and universities in 1960 will be twenty-six percent higher than at present. On the basis of current figures, this would mean that these institutions will need sixty-four million dollars more than they are spending currently for operating costs, exclusive of any capital expenditures for building, etc. Where will these huge additional resources be found? Tuition income will increase with enrollment, but this source alone will always be insufficient and limited. Endowments, pitifully small in most of our institutions, are yielding lower investment returns. Gifts from families and individuals are not so frequent as in earlier years, although, as Arnaud C. Marts has pointed out, it would be a major error for us to assume that the day of all large individual giving is gone.¹ Most

*Delivered at the Meeting of College and University Delegates, Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Fordham University, New York, N. Y., April 6, 1952 under the title, "Individual Giving to Private Higher Education by Industry".

¹"Trends in Giving and Fund-Raising for Colleges & Universities", Arnaud C. Marts, Association of American Colleges Bulletin, October, 1950. Reprinted in THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, January, 1953, pp. 163-174.

institutions are convinced that annual giving by alumni can be more effectively cultivated. But added to all these sources, alert administrators must look to industry for substantially more support than it is now giving. Currently business organizations are giving less than 1% of their income before taxes to charitable and educational causes (about 1/6 of this total going to education). If they gave even 3% of the possible 5%, higher education might receive about \$325,000,000 annually (1/4 of the total \$1,300,000,000) and this added subsidy would at least close the gap between current educational income and expenditure.

The first two sections deal with the tasks which should be accomplished *before* actual fund-raising from industry is initiated.

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

A danger to which more than one educational fund-raiser has succumbed is that of rushing into business executives with only one idea in mind—to get money. Without a plan which gives meaning and direction to fund-raising one can make the mistake of accepting so-called “gifts” which may easily hurt rather than help his school’s financial condition. For example, it may be comparatively easy to secure money on a research contract basis. But unless such proposals are carefully thought through in advance, every hidden cost included, contracts for research, especially in an applied rather than a basic science, can easily develop into a serious burden. Again, one of ten meets the type of business executive who is most eager to support some odd, esoteric program which is in no way related to the institution’s current curricula. The costs of implementing such a completely new program will inevitably go far beyond the subsidies that such a person may offer. In other words, one should not set out to seek gifts from industry until those persons responsible for the academic administration and development of the institution have completely analyzed its specific objectives, have determined what departments, what educational programs are to be emphasized and supported and to what level, which projects are to be discontinued or never to be initiated. Too many put the cart before the horse, creating educational programs because the money is available rather than planning a defensible educational blueprint and then seeking the money to support it.

A LONG-RANGE FUND-RAISING PLAN

Nothing substantial will be gained by a temporary fund-raising spurt on a one-man basis. The crisis which our Jesuit institutions of higher

education will continue to face demands an organized, continuing attack. For most of us this means the establishment of a development office, staffed by one or more people trained in the field of public relations and fund raising, under the direction of the president himself, or a vice president in charge of development. Every member of this development office must become thoroughly familiar with a clearly defined outline of the plans for the educational development of his institution—the fundamental thing his college or university stands for and is trying to accomplish. With this academic blueprint thoroughly understood, the president and the development office staff must work out a cooperative project aimed at long range results. The organization drawn up by the development office should aim at the securing of outside volunteer help—alumni and friends of the university who will in turn interest others in the needs of the institution.

Since we are concerned here with a long-range continuous approach to industry rather than a one-time high-powered drive, it is very doubtful that the on-campus services of professional fund raisers, such as the American City Bureau, should be engaged. It has been found very helpful however, to employ an outside counsel—some person who has an impressive record of successful fund raising for other educational institutions. But the secret of success in this type of program is an ever enlarging corps of volunteers whose interest in and loyalty to the institution make them eager to assist in every way possible. At the same time, the necessity of consulting and reporting to such a fund-raising counsel periodically, forces the president and his development office staff to move along in their plans without allowing other more immediate duties to distract them. Begging is so distasteful to most of us that some "gadfly" device is essential for success.

WHO SHOULD SOLICIT FUNDS FROM INDUSTRY?

No matter how completely the educational blueprint has been drawn up by academic administrators, no matter how well organized the staff and the development office, it is difficult to see how the president of a Jesuit college or university can divest himself of his role as the number one fund raiser. The chief executive of a firm or a business or a corporation of any size naturally wants to deal with the top executive of an educational institution. Before he commits his company to any obligation he wants the answers to certain questions which only the one responsible for policy making can give. Nor should we ignore the fact that most executives will be impressed, in fact, flattered if visited by the college or uni-

versity president. The best technique is for the president to take with him a business man who is a friend of the company executive or one with whom he does business. For example, in visiting the owner of a large steel company, the president could do no better than to be accompanied by the executive of a railroad which buys thousands of dollars worth of steel annually from this company.

The difficulty of placing the entire obligation of visiting companies on the president is obvious. Arranging suitable appointments and carrying out these calls is extremely time consuming and exhausting. If it is to be successful on a large scale the development office in conjunction with a group of volunteer workers, for example, a firms and corporations council of the president's general advisory board, must be responsible for the details of gathering preliminary information about each company, setting up a card system with a history of giving, important persons in the company, business contacts, etc. The development office also determines the best person to accompany the president, and arranges for the appointment to be made so that the president is involved only in the actual visit itself. But eventually the idea that the president alone is responsible for fundraising must be dispelled. As the program develops there will be many cases when it will be advisable for someone other than the president to make the call, for example, the dean of the Graduate school or of the Engineering school, especially if a gift for research is in question. But as other solicitors become involved every precaution must be taken to insist on clearance and on keeping open the channels of communication. Just as an individual resents being approached by two different persons for the same cause, so a company is irked by requests for money from several different administrators or faculty members in the same institution. Briefly, therefore, experience seems to indicate that the president himself must assume the major role in seeking funds from industry though the time-consuming details connected with such efforts should be delegated to others.

WHAT OFFICIALS IN INDUSTRY SHOULD BE VISITED?

Careful inquiry should be made ahead of time to determine the person who really controls the company's policies regarding gifts to charitable and educational institutions. Be aware of the fact that most companies have a committee responsible for the handling of annual routine requests such as the March of Dimes, Cancer, Red Cross, etc. With rare exceptions be sure to see either the president of the company or the chairman of the board; avoid being shunted off to a minor official or the chairman of a

committee for routine giving. This points up the danger of unprepared "blind" phone calls for appointments. Secretaries are trained to protect busy executives from constant requests for a hearing. Postpone the visit rather than agree to see anyone who is not in a position to speak for the company with authority.

WHEN IS THE BEST TIME TO SOLICIT FUNDS?

As has been wisely said, there is really no good time for asking people for money. Obviously, of course, the summer months are the least useful since many business men are either out of town or in a less receptive mood, because of the hot weather. One of the most promising periods is from September to December. Experience shows that it is rarely possible to secure an annual gift from a large company immediately. The money available for continuing gifts has been budgeted rather accurately and hence, a new recipient must be added to the following year's budget. Since most companies are preparing budgets during the Fall months, an approach at this time may result in inclusion in the budget for the fiscal year beginning in January with a fairly rapid disbursement of the gift. January and February are also good months because if a company's operations have resulted in a net income larger than anticipated, particularly, if excess profits have been realized, their executives may be willing to make a gift immediately before filing their income tax reports. In spite of the fact that some periods of the year are better for this activity than others, since it is impossible to contact a large number of companies in a short period, one must be resigned to keeping at this task all year long. The general rule therefore, is: contact companies when you can, knowing that results will materialize much more quickly in some cases than in others.

After the initial gift has been received, the follow-up should be timed very carefully. If a company's check is dated in December, the follow-up for the next year should begin not later than October. Even though companies may expect to make an annual gift, few of them will actually include it in the budget for succeeding years unless explicitly requested to do so at least by letter.

WHERE SHOULD CONTACTS WITH BUSINESS EXECUTIVES TAKE PLACE

In general it seems better to go to the offices of the executives themselves. Such a meeting provides the setting for a business-like conference. It is preferable to a luncheon meeting where it is usually difficult to carry

on a continuous, orderly conversation. In any case, the sales technique of taking people to lunch is badly overworked. Moreover, as has been mentioned before, it is flattering to a business executive to be visited in his office by the president of a college or university. The mountain comes to Mohammed. Such a conference offers him an opportunity to put his distinguished visitors on display before his junior executives and office personnel. He usually relishes the added opportunity to show off his plant to the type of visitor who would rarely have any occasion for coming there. The necessity of tramping over acres of industrial plants adds to the difficulty of this fund-raising work but it pays huge dividends, not only in the form of gifts received but in public and community relations values.

HOW SHOULD THE CONFERENCE BE CONDUCTED?

We begin with the supposition that the normal purpose of the conference is to convince the executive that his company should give an annual unrestricted subsidy to your institution. With this in mind, start with the companies which are certain to make the largest gifts. This has several obvious advantages. It is easier and more encouraging for the fund raiser, particularly if he is inexperienced. Moreover, these larger gifts will set a pattern which can be used to encourage those who frequently enough ask what other companies are giving.

It may help to group companies into three classes, e.g., those expected to give \$5000 annually or more, those expected to give between \$2500 and \$5000, and those between \$1000 and \$2500. Some schools set a base below which there can be no participation, at least in the specific program being carried on at the time. In any case, some arrangement must be made to make it possible to bring in even those who say they can afford only \$300 to \$500.

It is usually better if the person whom you are approaching knows in advance the general purpose of your visit. Most men resent being caught unawares, as it were; therefore it is often better if the business man who is accompanying the president sets up the appointment. The company executive will feel free to ask his friend what the purpose of the visit is and this "breaking of the ice" makes the subsequent meeting much less embarrassing and uncomfortable.

Have a prepared, concise, clear presentation. This should highlight the type of gift which you are seeking and the purpose for which the money will be used. An oral presentation can be greatly improved in its efficacy by use of a flip chart containing a graphic "visual aid" picture

of salient points as you proceed with your presentation. The exhibits in this flip chart can be changed to suit varying occasions.

The following are ten important points which should be woven into the presentation. They comprise your strongest sales arguments:

1. You are not begging; in fact, you are not even *asking* for anything. If you are apologetic, your prospect will sense it quickly and his reaction will be unfavorable. Rather you are presenting him with an unusual opportunity for an excellent investment.

2. Call attention to opinions expressed by industrial leaders such as Irving Olds, and either during the interview or in a follow-up letter present reprints of such articles as Alfred Sloan's in *Collier's*, June 2, 1951.

3. Do not use the argument of securing funds for deficit spending. The "fear" argument applied to the financial crisis in private education will result in only short term benefits. Rather, the money that is given is to be used for something tremendously and positively important, for example, for teachers' salaries, in order that we may make teaching so attractive that the best qualified instructors will remain happy and contented in their vocation.

4. Point out industry's need of trained competent managers. Intellectually disciplined personnel usually can be found only among graduates of colleges and universities. It is estimated that 80% of the top leadership in American business and industry consists of graduates of liberal arts colleges.

5. Emphasize the essential importance of higher education in our whole economic, political, cultural and spiritual life as a nation. "Our whole future as a people depends in a large measure upon our qualities of mind, character and spirit, and our colleges and universities are making an incomparable contribution to those qualities."²

6. Insist on the special contributions and importance of *private higher* education. We have always had a dual system in this country which provides healthy competition and a safeguard against political interference in both tax-supported and private institutions.

7. It can truly be said that private colleges and universities are part of private enterprise in this country; certainly they are not government sponsored and controlled. But this argument should be used with the greatest care lest we seem to identify the interests of private education with those of "big business" and "capitalism" in the questionable sense. More will be said about this later.

²Ibid., pp. 163-174.

8. Point out the unique contributions of *church-related* schools: their emphasis on morality and the relationship of ethics to family life, business, and society in general; their strong stand against Communism (without implying that other institutions are "tainted").

9. Dwell on the special contributions of *this* school: the number and record of graduates; the community services performed by professional men and women, whether graduates or staff, in clinics, hospitals, etc.; the absence of discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color or economic status.

10. Use the argument for giving because of tax advantages, but don't over-emphasize it. Nearly all executives are thoroughly acquainted with the facts; very few are in the excess profits brackets; and some resent the implication that they cannot be interested in giving for other worthier motives. Hence, it may only rarely be necessary to point out that a company can give tax-free up to 5% of its net income over and above gifts listed as business expense; that a company in the excess profits tax bracket can actually give 18 cent-dollars, for example, a gift of \$5500.00 at a net cost to itself of only \$1000.00.

ANSWERS TO ANTICIPATED OBJECTIONS

Many of the eleven following points seem obvious or unimportant to us, but they cannot be taken for granted in dealing with businessmen.

1. Try to know ahead of time what the company's giving policies are. Do they give at all to education? Is the president of the company on the board of some other institution? What are they giving to neighboring institutions? To institutions comparable to your own?

2. Be conversant with your own institution's business relations with the company. Do you buy their products or those of their competitors? If not, why not?

3. Most companies will indicate that they cannot promise a gift on a continuing basis. Business fortunes fluctuate and there will undoubtedly be bad years ahead. Suggest a solution adopted by many companies—setting up a foundation for charitable and educational purposes. A certain percentage of annual income is allocated to the foundation but less than this annual total is assigned for various gifts. In this way a reserve is built up which can be used in less favorable years to support the annual giving program.

4. The argument that stockholders may object to the use of company profits for this type of philanthropy has less and less cogency. The legitimacy of such giving will undoubtedly soon be settled by test cases which

are being held in several parts of the country. One must also realize that the majority of court decisions, cited to show that charitable contributions are within corporate powers only when they tend directly to advance corporate interest, are 25 to 30 years old. The social and economic climate has changed. As Professor Harry J. Rudick points out:

The very absence of litigation on the point in recent years in the face of common knowledge that corporations regularly make contributions to charity is strong evidence that stockholders rarely object where the objects are worthy and the amounts given are not excessive. There is no doubt that public sentiment concerning the place of the corporation in the community and its obligations to the community as well as to its employes has advanced enormously in the last generation.³

5. Many business men will be interested in the efforts made to secure financial assistance from other sources, especially the alumni. They argue correctly that the graduates are our product and their satisfaction with the school, manifested through giving, is clear evidence of the quality of the institution. This attitude emphasizes the importance of correlating alumni and industry giving as closely as possible. It also points up the importance of *participation* rather than the actual amount of the gift in the case of the alumni fund. The *percentage* of alumni participation is the critical point in the minds of business executives.

6. Firms, particularly with non-Catholic executives, will often question why a Catholic institution should need additional support since it is undoubtedly receiving regular subsidies either from the diocese or possibly from Rome, and certainly is being supported by the religious order whose members operate the school. It is usually taken for granted that Jesuit institutions, as older, better-established, and larger than other Catholic schools are well-off financially.

7. In the eyes of many non-Catholics, our colleges and universities are chiefly seminaries, teaching philosophy and theology to men and women who either are or intend to be priests or nuns. They have no concept of the number or variety of the educational programs on the undergraduate, graduate and professional levels.

8. Some imagine that our financial problems should be at least partially solved by reason of the fact that we enjoy the contributed services of religious teachers. The number of lay teachers in our institutions usually astounds them.

9. Some, particularly those with a religious bias, may suppose that

³*The Manual of Corporate Giving*, edited by Beardsley Ruml. The National Planning Association, 1925, Washington, D. C.

our students and faculty are practically all Catholics, that non-Catholics must take courses in Religion, that the institution is too narrow and denominational to merit and justify general community non-sectarian support.

10. Many simply take it for granted that Catholic institutions are inferior to secular schools in size, quality of faculty, variety of programs, libraries, equipment, etc.

11. Some think with Beardsley Ruml that all educational institutions waste money because of poor management. This, they suspect, is particularly characteristic of Catholic institutions in which the change of president every few years results in drastic policy reversals: in which outside professional advice, particularly in business matters, is rarely sought; and in which presumed "friends" of the institution monopolize its business and take advantage of its gullible administrative officers.

Two comments might be in order in connection with this rather common criticism: in fairness to higher education it should be pointed out that some of this criticism is based on a lack of understanding of educational processes and values. For example, Ruml suggests that if you have a student body of 1000 and a faculty of 100 you have a student-faculty ratio of only 1 to 10. Therefore, reduce your faculty to 50, and without spending more money, you can double the salary of each faculty member retained. The impossibility of such simplification must be explained to our business critics.

On the other hand, however, we must admit there is some justification for the suspicion that some of our institutions are operated inefficiently. Most of us waxed fat in faculty and equipment during the G.I. enrollment bulge and, in contrast to the flexibility of business, we were very slow to adjust conditions as enrollment decreased. Moreover, we educators are much more hesitant to take a decisive step when economy demands it. Witness the retention of obviously inefficient personnel out of a misguided sense of charity or loyalty. If higher education is to justify and perpetuate industrial support, we will have to guarantee to these business men that with the minimum of waste and extravagance we are putting first things first and discharging only those duties to society which each institution's resources in personnel and finances indicate it can do best, relegating the rest either to other educational institutions or to other agencies in society. Part of this guarantee that our house is in order can arise from evidence that we employ competent business management personnel, publish annual financial reports, and have lay advisory committees on investment, building, and other policy matters.

MUTUAL OBLIGATIONS AND RELATIONSHIPS CREATED
BY INDUSTRIAL GIVING

On the part of Industry: Industry must recognize that contributing to higher education must not result in identification of interests. In the desperate search for funds, institutions of higher learning must not be expected to sell their souls to the economically privileged and tie themselves to the *status quo* in a period of social change. Business donations cannot be thought of as payments for the perpetuation of certain economic doctrines or at least for the exclusion of consideration of their opposites from the classroom.

Still less should firms and corporations which contribute to higher education attempt actually to dominate or interfere with the educational policies and freedom of any college or university. Actually, experience thus far has given no reason for concern in this matter but just as in the case of federal aid such a danger will undoubtedly always be at least a remote possibility. The preventative to possible identification with or domination by industry is to make it abundantly clear that financial assistance from industry is only one phase of the institution's total *coordinated* fund-raising program which includes the cultivation and support of all its 'publics': alumni, parents, friends, foundations, various community groups, including corporations both large and small, labor unions, etc. In connection with labor unions the fact should not be overlooked that their total annual income exceeds 500 million dollars. Many of them have shown great interest in higher education particularly from the viewpoint of providing opportunities for the children of laborers, but to insure their interest and support they will first insist on representation in the institution's advisory councils and committees.

On the part of Higher Education: It is obvious that colleges and universities receiving an annual subsidy from industries and firms should adopt appropriate means to express their appreciation. One of the simplest and most common methods is to form the contributors into a group called for example, the Associates. As a select group of benefactors of the institution they might be invited to a dinner at least once a year at which time the general status of the university or some aspects of its program are explained. Business men are genuinely appreciative of the recognition which comes to them through some such identification with an educational institution.

As a beneficiary of industrial giving, colleges and universities must make it clear that they understand and appreciate the problems faced by industry in this type of philanthropy. Industry knows that there are

many weak colleges which probably should not be allowed to continue to exist, so the problem is to determine methods of support which will neither discriminate against worthy institutions nor on the other hand perpetuate unworthy ones. Moreover, the problem of equitable distribution of support in the case of corporations whose activities are nationwide in scope is still to be solved. Let us hope that the establishment recently of the Council for Financial Aid to Education composed of the following outstanding corporation leaders: former Chairman Irving Olds of U. S. Steel, Chairman Alfred P. Sloan, Jr. of General Motors, Chairman Walter Paepcke of the Container Corporation, Chairman Henning W. Prentis, Jr. of Armstrong Cork, and Frank Abrams, Chairman of the Board, Standard Oil of New Jersey, may discover a workable answer to this problem..

Institutions of higher education should also realize that although businesses which contribute to their support cannot expect them to return the favor by guaranteeing to buy their products, nevertheless, certain definite principles should be applied in this regard. First, companies which have never had any commercial dealings with an institution, should if lending support, be given an opportunity for at least some business. Secondly, in the case of several contributing companies with similar products it becomes necessary to transact purchasing on a bid basis, opening up the opportunity for new bids every three to six months, especially in the case of such commodities as dairy products, etc. Thirdly, a fair principle and one that all businesses will accept is: everything else being equal, preference will be shown for those firms and corporations which support the institution by annual subsidies.

Institutions should realize that the contributing of funds from the operation of business enterprises imposes serious obligations on the part of the officers entrusted with the administration of the stockholders' money. Therefore, we should respect the standards which have been compiled to govern corporation giving. These have been formulated by the National Information Bureau and appear as follows in an excellent study by the Russell Sage Foundation.⁴

BASIC STANDARDS IN PHILANTHROPY

Philanthropic operations entail a high degree of responsibility because of the element of public trusteeship involved. Compliance with the following standards is considered essential for approval by the Bureau:

⁴"Revised Basic Standards in Philanthropy" by the National Information Bureau, *Corporation Giving*, F. Emerson Andrews.

1. *Board.* An active and responsible governing body, serving without compensation, holding regular meetings, and with effective administrative control.
2. *Purpose.* A legitimate purpose with no avoidable duplication of the work of other sound organizations.
3. *Program.* Reasonable efficiency in program management, and reasonable adequacy of resources, both material and personnel.
4. *Cooperation.* Evidence of consultation and cooperation with established agencies in the same or related fields.
5. *Ethical Promotion.* Ethical methods of publicity, promotion and solicitation of funds.
6. *Fund-Raising Practice.* In fund-raising: (a) No payment of commissions for fund-raising. (b) No mailing of unordered tickets or merchandise with a request for money in return. (c) No general telephone solicitation of the public.
7. *Audit.* Annual audit, prepared by an independent certified public accountant or trust company, showing all income and disbursements in reasonable detail. New organizations should provide a certified public accountant's statement that a proper financial system has been installed.
8. *Budget.* Detailed annual budget, translating program plans into financial terms.⁵

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

"Nature and Needs of Higher Education", *Commission on Financing Higher Education*, New York, 1952, Columbia University Press.

"Financing Higher Education in the United States", John D. Millett, New York, 1952, Columbia University Press, *Commission on Financing Higher Education*.

"Corporation Giving", F. Emerson Andrews, New York, 1952, Russell Sage Foundation.

"Common Sense about Fund Raising", Robert Keith Leavitt, American Book-Stratford Press, Incorporated, New York, 1949.

"Financing Higher Education in the Future", William McPeak, *Ninth Annual Institute of Higher Education*, July 1952.

"The Manual of Corporate Giving", edited by Beardsley Ruml. *The National Planning Association*, 1925, Washington, D. C.

⁵*Corporation Giving*, F. Emerson Andrews, p. 142, Russell Sage Foundation.

"Industry Cooperation with Education", New York: *National Industrial Conference Board*, Studies in Business Policy No. 34, 1949.

"Higher Education and American Business", New York: *Commission on Financing Higher Education*, 1952.

"Business Financial Cooperation with the Liberal Colleges", Beardsley Ruml, New York, 1951.

"The Five Per Cent" Beardsley Ruml and Theodore Geiger, *National Planning Association*, Washington, D. C., August 1951.

"American Business and the Independent Colleges", Louis B. Lundborg, *Oregon Colleges Foundation*, Portland, Oregon, November 1952.

"The Donor's Tax Dollar", Kersting, Brown and Company, Inc., New York, February 1952.

"Company Foundations for Philanthropic Purposes", Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, New York, November 1951.

ARTICLES

"Corporation Support of Higher Education", John A. Pollard, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 30, no. 5, September-October 1952, pp. 111-126.

"The Stockholder and Corporate Giving", T. E. Blackwell, *College and University Business*, Vol. 13, no. 4, October 1952, p. 43.

"If Corporations Will Give", Laird Bell, *Atlantic Monthly*, May 1948.

"How Can American Business Help American Education?", Frank W. Abrams, *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*, March 1949.

"Big Business Must Help Our Colleges", Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., *Collier's*, June 2, 1951.

"The Romance and Technique of Raising Money", James King Quay, *College and University Business*, Vol. 13, no. 4, October 1952, p. 19.

"Will Corporate Giving Solve College Deficits?", F. Emerson Andrews, *College and University Business*, vol. 13, No. 4, October 1952, p. 17.

"Corporate Profits and Campus Budgets", *Fortune*, December 1952.

Industry Cooperative Giving To Private Higher Education

EDWARD G. JACKLIN, S.J.¹

FINANCIAL CRISIS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In an article in *The New York Times* of June 1st, 1952, Benjamin Fine states that educators generally agree that colleges and universities today are faced with the worst financial crisis in a hundred years. Approximately half the independent colleges are operating in the red with an average deficit of \$55,000.00. In some of the larger institutions, the deficit ranges from \$100,000.00 to \$500,000.00. Although not as seriously affected as the private institutions, church-affiliated colleges nevertheless were running into hard times.

Financial problems of private higher education are nothing new, of course. Back in 1947, an exploratory committee began analyzing them. As a result, the Commission on Financing Higher Education came into being in 1949. Recently the findings of the Commission were reported in a book entitled: *The Nature and Needs of Higher Education*².

The Commission found that five factors were chiefly responsible for spreading red ink on the budgets of educational institutions. These were fluctuating enrollments, uncertain sources of income, expansion of educational services—some ill advised, need for enlarged and modernized plants, and inflation.

The Commission singled out the medical schools and the independent liberal arts colleges as the two types of higher educational institutions suffering the most from financial anemia, despite the fact that the colleges on the average had raised their fees anywhere from 50% to 75% in the past ten years.

The Commission's Report boils down to the fact that if higher education is to meet the needs of our society, where 20% of our youth attend college, it needs more money. Basing its estimates on the year 1950 alone, the Commission came to the conclusion that the 1500 colleges, junior colleges, universities and professional schools required at least \$200,000,-

¹Delivered at the Meeting of College and University Delegates, Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, April 6, 1953, Fordham University, New York, N. Y., under the title "Cooperative Giving to Private Higher Education by Industry."

²191p. Columbia University Press, 1952, \$2.50.

000.00 more in current income if they were to operate efficiently; or 15% more than the \$1,350,000,000.00 received for educational services in the same year. Dr. Miller, Executive Director of the Commission, claimed that in 1952, the needed amount had jumped another \$50,000,000.00.

As the need for supplementary revenue for the colleges and universities has been more and more publicized, business leaders have not been slow to advance the proposition that it is the responsibility and obligation of industries and corporations to help the schools in carrying their deficit. On December 20, 1951, the National Association of Manufacturers unanimously adopted the resolution: "Business enterprise must find a way to support the whole educational program—effectively, regularly and now." The resolution called on the NAM's seventeen thousand companies, producing 85% of the nation's manufactured goods, to exert every effort to make available to higher education supplementary private financial support essential to meet the educational needs of youth, American industry and the nation.

Among the voices raised in behalf of the colleges are those of Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., Board Chairman of General Motors; Frank W. Abrams, Chairman of the Board of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey; Irving S. Olds, former Chairman of United States Steel Corporation; Mr. Laird Bell, Chairman of the Board of Weyer-Hauser Lumber Company; (Chicago) Clarence P. Randall, President of Inland Steel Corporation; Henry Ford, II, President of Ford Motor Company; Walter Paepcke, Chairman of the Container Corporation of America; Mr. Lundborg, Vice President of the Bank of America; Harry A. Bullis of General Mills.

In an address at Yale's two hundred and fiftieth anniversary, Mr. Olds declared:

Every American business has a direct obligation to support the free, independent, privately endowed colleges and universities of this country to the limit of its financial ability and legal authority.

Mr. Laird Bell addressing the members of the Association of American Colleges stated:

The liberal arts colleges are to me the bulwark of our philosophy of the individual man and woman. I look with concern on each new step that brings them nearer to dependence on government. If businessmen really believe in our free enterprise system that is based on that philosophy, it behooves them to keep the colleges independent. Industry as the custodian of most of the wealth of today is increasingly the prime source of the support for the liberal arts colleges.

Before big business opens its till to the colleges and universities, however, there are a few problems requiring solution.

One is the question whether corporations have the legal power under the Federal Tax Law of 1936, to appropriate 5% of their gross income to charitable and educational enterprises, regardless of their stockholders' wishes in the matter. In 29 States, laws already are on the statute books authorizing corporations to make such grants. In other States, the legality of such action on the part of a corporation will soon be decided in the courts. At the present time, the New Jersey Superior Court is hearing a stockholder's suit that challenges the legal right of A. P. Smith Company, hydraulic manufacturers, to make a gift of \$1500.00 to Princeton University. This is considered a test case that will have profound influence on the entire question of corporation giving.

Another major obstacle to corporate giving has been the question of the method of distribution. An unidentified executive of one of America's largest corporations has been quoted as saying:

Yes we're heartily in favor of contributions to colleges. But we're not giving one penny. Why? There are some 1200 private colleges. We have employes and distribution centers in all forty-eight states. How can we know which colleges are good and which should be let die? . . . If we help one, the other 1199 will be at my desk next week, mad as hornets.

This problem has been attacked with a certain measure of success. For instance, the National Fund for Medical Education, headed by S. Sloan Colt, President of the Bankers Trust Company, has since 1949, gathered more than \$2,800,000.00 for the nation's 79 medical schools. It is now engaged in raising \$10,000,000.00 more.

In addition, the United Negro College Fund has been successfully practicing the technique of centralized fund raising in support of its 32 members. Chartered under the laws of New York State on April 12th, 1944, it now conducts an organized campaign in 58 cities and communities. The formula of distribution of funds which has operated successfully for the past seven years is as follows: 45% of net income divided equally; 45% is divided on the basis of endowment income or its equivalent consisting of annual appropriations made by church bodies; 10% on the basis of enrollment.

In nine years of effort, income in the amount of \$10,010,928.33 has been raised for current purposes and another \$10,444,000.00 has been raised on a capital funds program as a special and limited effort. Income for all purposes in the nine years amounted to \$20,454,928.33. In the five year span from 1947 to 1951 inclusive, the amount received for

current expenses has slowly and steadily increased from \$1,032,571.12 in 1947 to \$1,320,431.34 in 1951.

ORGANIZATION

As of November 24th, 1952, Foundations in at least 28 States were using the cooperative approach to industry. In all 325 institutions, chiefly liberal arts colleges, are affiliated with various state-wide organizations or regional groups such as the New England College Fund, Inc., covering Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont. There have been reports that organizations are being formed in California, Georgia, Nebraska and Massachusetts. Five colleges in Maryland have begun the process of organizing. While the movement is still in swaddling clothes, certain general observations can be made.

Eighteen groups are either incorporated or in the process of becoming so. Eleven either employ a full-time executive officer or are planning to do so. H. E. Hastings, Jr., Executive Secretary of the Associated Colleges of Indiana, recently emphasized the importance of having a full-time professional staff man at work.

EXPENSE

The initial expense involved in forming such State organizations and in carrying out the initial campaign has been met in various ways. In some cases, the members of the organization have been assessed anywhere from a few hundred to one thousand dollars. In other cases, a stipulated entrance fee has been charged the members. In still others, the presidents of the various colleges have paid their own campaign expenses. Up to date, only one group, the Associated Colleges of Indiana, has been fortunate enough to obtain a grant of \$75,000.00 from Lilly Endowment, Inc. to cover administrative expenses.

SOLICITATION

Much has been done, of course, to prepare the way for actual solicitation. Speeches and articles by educators and industrial leaders; an analysis of the problems of private higher education and the reasons why the private colleges and universities are vital to a system of private enterprise have already been well publicized. In addition, attractive and informative brochures have been issued by the various cooperative associations.

Other techniques employed are luncheon meetings and formal dinners

sponsored by prominent businessmen or the associations themselves, alumni magazine features, newspaper stories and so forth.

Save for Michigan which relies on businessmen to carry the case to their fellows, in other corporations, all the associations assign the task of solicitation to the college presidents. Presidents may sally forth singly or in pairs, or may team up with a prominent trustee from another institution. The method of working in teams seems favored.

In general, it can be reported that a friendly reception and keen interest is the normal rather than the exceptional experience presidents meet with when calling on corporation executives. It can be stated too that the bigger the company, the higher the executive, who is interviewed, the more pleasant the reception. One discovers too that businessmen are quite well informed on the movement and very favorably disposed to the liberal arts colleges as the source of their most promising manpower.

Some organizations have taken steps to apportion the task of soliciting the presidents. In Indiana, each president obligates himself to devote twenty days annually to the association in order to do his part in meeting the over-all goal of reaching 600 corporations. In Iowa, South Dakota and Texas, each president has pledged himself to devote at least six full days a year to soliciting. As might be expected in the State of Virginia, presidents work under a gentleman's agreement obliging them to give as much time as possible to solicitation and to the Foundation duties.

FORMULA FOR DISTRIBUTION

Various formulae have been worked out for dividing the money collected. Eleven Foundations have settled on a formula for the distribution of undesignated gifts that allocates 60% equally and the remaining 40% on the basis of full-time enrollment. Of the group following this method of distributing the spoils, Missouri, Oregon and Texas specifically rule that designated gifts following joint solicitation are to be subtracted from the 40% amount awarded under the formula to the designated institution. The New York Association and the Illinois Foundation rule otherwise. Most of the others divide 50% equally among participants on the basis of enrollment and/or distribute the gifts on a basis of absolute equality.

Michigan and Pennsylvania have adopted a unique formula. In the case of Michigan, 25% of the proceeds is distributed equally; another 25% on the basis of enrollment, and 50% on the basis of needs, programs, approach to the problem of education and the efforts of each institution in raising money on its own behalf. In Pennsylvania, the following plan for distribution has been hit upon. One third of the net income will be

apportioned equally. Another third will be awarded on the basis of enrollment. The final third will be divided up according to a special factor: "Based upon the preceding five years, the average amount contributed to the institution in individual and corporation gifts and bequests, divided by the regular full-time undergraduate enrollment", a bow in the direction of private enterprise.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

A certain pattern can be found running through the qualifications for membership. In general, institutions entering cooperative groups must be private, independent, unsupported by taxes, devoted to the liberal arts and accredited—whether this be by a state association of colleges, the state department of education, or the regional association. In a number of States, church association is required. Missouri, for instance, specifies: "Such accredited liberal arts colleges . . . as are related to some regular Christian Church denomination".

The New England Colleges Fund, Inc. demands that its members be of a certain size by requiring that members must have awarded a minimum of one hundred liberal arts degrees in 1952.

The Empire State Foundation of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges has adopted the most rigid set of qualifications so far. Over and above the standard requirements of accreditation and financial independence, membership is open only to those institutions with primary emphasis on an undergraduate program in the liberal arts and sciences, and an essential concern with non-technical preparations; a four-year program of undergraduate instruction; a resident student body as an integral part of the nature and philosophy of the institution; and an autonomous college not essentially a part of a unified and complex university.

RESULTS

Except for a few of the well established organizations, the various state and regional associations have little to report as yet in the way of actual contributions received from business and industries within their borders. This is neither surprising nor discouraging if it is borne in mind that most of these movements are of recent origin and that any change of policy in the matter of corporate contributions must meet with the approval of a board of directors. What is important is that the groundwork is being laid for more productive solicitation in the future. In view of what has already been accomplished, leaders of the various movements are

quietly confident that the cooperative program represents a significant and encouraging step in the direction of solving the financial problems of higher education.

Five States had reported the total number of gifts received as of November, 1952, and the amount distributed to member institutions.

In the State of Indiana, \$15,000.00 was received in 1948; \$65,000.00 in 1949; \$100,000.00 in 1950; and in 1951, \$141,000.00. I have no information on the results in 1952.

In 1951-52, Minnesota raised \$80,000.00 at a promotion cost of \$3,000.00. From November, 1951, to December, 1952, the Ohio group collected \$223,865.00 from 103 donors, only \$7600.00 of which was designated. Out of this amount \$190,000.00 was distributed, \$7000.00 being the smallest check received by any college, \$17,000.00 the largest.

\$26,000.00 was raised in 1950-51 by the Oregon Foundation which counts 10 members. An additional \$100,000.00 was received from business and industry, although this was not due to the solicitation campaign.

In 1951-52, the five colleges comprising the West Virginia Foundation received the sum of \$3000.00 and much encouragement.

The latest results of the campaign in Pennsylvania which was hurriedly launched in November, 1952 are \$53,000.00 from 57 contributors. Where we had tentatively set a rule of thumb of \$5.00 per employee as a standard for contributions; the average so far in actual gifts is \$1.90 per employee. In the minds of the membership, the results of this campaign are encouraging. It was recognized that initiating a campaign in the last months of the fiscal year with companies whose budgets were fixed a year ago were scarcely conducive to obtaining lucrative results. It was decided to enter on the campaign without delay, however, in order to have the request of the colleges given due consideration by the budget makers for the ensuing year.

We encountered the usual problems. Changes in philanthropic policy and actual contributions required action by the board of directors. Large corporations with ramifications throughout the country pointed out that the repercussions of such a change in policy must be carefully studied in the several states. We learned too that some of the industries located in Pennsylvania, where the law permits corporate donations to charitable and educational enterprises, were incorporated in other states where the legality of such action was in doubt. Much will hinge on the decision to be handed down in the New Jersey case. Though the results to date would scarcely put to rout the wolf at the door, we feel that the cooperative approach to industry for an annual contribution to the independent colleges will promote substantial contributions in the years to come.

Several points argue to better success in the future. The process of building up sponsoring committees, composed of leading industrialists and businessmen has been of necessity slow. Such a committee has been composed for central Pennsylvania. Only the groundwork has been laid for such a group in western and eastern Pennsylvania. We are now engaged in planning area luncheons or dinners for small groups of business leaders; the first of which has been set for the third week in April at Philadelphia. Another is planned for Pittsburgh.

We have discovered that boards of directors of many Pennsylvania corporations are intricately interlocked. As a result of this discovery, we are beginning to aim our promotional material at directors as well as presidents of corporations. While it is believed that the president of a company is the man to convince of the necessity of coming to the financial aid of the colleges, the importance of enlisting the sympathy of men who serve as directors of several corporations is obvious.

THE NATIONAL BOARD

In attempting to estimate the possibilities of the cooperative approach to industry, it is well to keep in mind the type of men who have already declared their support of the independent college and the responsibility of business to see to its survival. They are gentlemen accustomed to getting things done and whose influence upon their counterparts can scarcely be over-estimated. Another straw in the wind auguring the success of the cooperative movement is the recent formation by these men of the Council for Financial Aid to Education which expects to open for business in the near future, in New York City.

The leading spirit in establishing the Council has been Frank W. Abrams, Chairman of the Board of Standard Oil Company of New Jersey. It will include in its membership such citizens as Irving S. Olds, United States Steel, Alfred P. Sloan Jr., of General Motors, Walter Paepcke of Container Corporation, and Henning W. Prentis, Jr. of Armstrong Cork Company. The Council plans to operate on a three-year basis with a tentative budget of \$150,000.00 per year which it expects to obtain from various foundations.

According to Mr. Abrams, the main objective of the Council is:

To promote a better understanding by the managers and owners of American business, and by the members of the public, of the substantial contribution which higher education has made and is making to the effectiveness, the skill, the growth and the success of American business and to the development of this country.

. . . Corporations pay the colleges little or nothing for training the personnel which they now eagerly recruit each June.

. . . I am convinced that American business neither needs nor wants a free ride, least of all from our private educational institutions, which we know to be hard pressed financially. In my opinion, it is not good business to withhold from these institutions the support which they need.

(The New York Times, February 12, 1953.)

Meanwhile the Association of American Colleges through its Commission on Colleges and Industry has been the only agency of communication among the various State groups. At the annual meeting last January in Los Angeles, the session of the Commission recommended a larger and more fully organized meeting. As a result, a three-day workshop was held in Indianapolis, April 12th to the 15th.

THE POTENTIAL

At first sight, the fact that under the 1936 federal corporation tax law, five percent of net income is deductible for contributions to charitable and educational causes promises a potential source of revenue that is exciting. Despite the provisions of the law, however, most estimates agree corporations have, in fact, given less than seven-tenths of one percent, about \$250,000,000.00 to philanthropic causes. The best available data on the distribution of corporate gifts suggests that of this amount, some 44% has gone to welfare agencies, principally community chests, nearly 27% to health agencies including hospitals and some 12% to miscellaneous purposes including agencies supporting the "American Way". There remains about 17% that has been distributed to education of all types in various ways. The Commission estimated that in 1950, higher education received between \$40,000,000.00 and \$50,000,000.00.

President Griswold of Yale in his annual report to the Yale alumni, however, estimated that in 1950, one percent of total corporate contributions went to education and that of this amount the private colleges and universities received only \$10,000,000.00 which he compared to a drop in the bucket as contrasted with current expenditures.

The Commission on Financing Higher Education figures that if the corporations were to increase their philanthropic contributions up to 3% of net income, the total gifts would be about \$1,300,000,000.00. One-fourth of this sum might well be allocated to the colleges and universities. Were such to be the fact, corporate giving would approach \$325,000,-

000.00 a year and would close the gap in the current financing of higher education.

In the matter of corporation support for colleges and universities, Dr. Griswold said:

Notwithstanding the legal barriers to more substantial corporate giving, which are now under study and in test litigation, three things seem clear:

One is that our corporations have it within their power to bring about a dramatic improvement in the financial fortunes of our colleges and universities, particularly our private colleges and universities.

The second is that there is a disposition on the part of both corporation executives and stockholders to do exactly this.

The third is that this disposition must be galvanized by intellectual conviction before it becomes policy and practice.

CONCLUSION

The whole undertaking of the cooperative approach to industry is a gamble, of course, or if one prefers, a prudential risk. The stakes seem reasonable: time against what may be substantial financial rewards. There are other indirect benefits to be considered, such as closer personal associations among college presidents and business executives. Each institution taking into consideration its own local circumstances, must decide for itself whether it chooses to take the gamble.

For the smaller liberal arts colleges overshadowed by great universities, located in an industrial area, and lacking strong financial backing, it would seem that the cooperative approach is well worthwhile.

Catholic Scientists and Science Programs

PATRICK H. YANCEY, S.J.¹

Back in January I addressed the Mobile Catholic Men's Breakfast Club on "American Catholics and Science". I sent Father Edward B. Rooney a copy of the talk asking him whether he thought it would do any good to publish it. At first he replied that he would publish it in the January issue of the *JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY*. Then he wrote asking me if I would incorporate it into the present subject, and give it at your meeting. I accepted. Later he sent me the galley proofs of two papers in the same issue of the *Quarterly*, one by Father Timothy J. O'Leary on "The Role of Science in Jesuit Colleges", and the other by Father Joseph F. Mulligan on "Preparation in Natural Sciences in Jesuit Colleges" and I saw that they had already covered much the same ground. However, since you may not have had time to read these papers, I propose to summarize them briefly and then give you my ideas about why the conditions they describe exist and make some suggestions as to how they may be remedied.

Father O'Leary's paper is more general and reminds us that it is according to our vocation to teach and that, from the beginning of the Society, it has been our practice to make our schools second to none in those subjects which are, if you wish, the fad of the day. He also criticizes the idea held by some that Ours should not teach sciences at all but leave these to laymen, even in our own colleges.

Father Mulligan goes farther and shows that our colleges have not only not held a place of pre-eminence in the sciences, as they did in the classics during the Counter Reformation, but have not even kept pace with non-Catholic institutions or even with some Catholic institutions in this country. In proof of his assertions he adduces: 1) a 1948 study by the National Research Council on "Baccalaureate Origins of Science Doctorates" (1936-1945), which showed that "in those ten years 187 alumni of Jesuit colleges obtained their Ph.D. degrees in some field of natural science. . . . This is an average of less than one graduate per Jesuit college per year." The same study showed that Notre Dame, during that same time, produced almost as many Ph.D's as any Jesuit school. 2) The 1951 study by Goodrich, Knapp and Boehm on "Origins of U. S. Scientists," (1924-1934) in which they found such a low index (2.8) for Catholic institutions that they had to treat them separately. Thus, among the fifty

¹Given at the meeting of College and University Delegates, annual meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Fordham University, New York, N. Y., April 6, 1953.

institutions most prolific in producing future Ph.D's not a single Catholic college is listed. And the strange part of it is that thirty nine of those fifty institutions are small, liberal arts colleges, usually with Protestant church affiliation.

Father Mulligan admits that these studies are not completely fair to our colleges since they go back several years when our colleges were not as well organized as they are today. However, his third piece of evidence indicates that our colleges are still not as active in the sciences as they should be. Here are last year's National Science Foundation Fellowship awards. Of the 569 fellowships granted, only eight went to students in Catholic colleges; three to students at Notre Dame, and one each to students at Boston College, Detroit, Fordham, St. Louis, and San Francisco. He says this represents "only one per cent of the total awards, though in 1950-51 our colleges enrolled six per cent of the country's male undergraduates".

I would like to add to Father Mulligan's comments that, as far as I know, none of the eight winners were Jesuits though there must have been at least several dozen of Ours engaged in graduate work in the sciences and I know that Father Rooney called the attention of the Province Prefects of Studies to the availability of these fellowships. I cannot say whether any of Ours tried for the fellowships, though some of our graduate students told me that they did not know about them.

Of course, allowances can be made for the first year since this was something new. However, the second round of fellowships does not show us in any better light. I have just come from the meeting of the National Science Board where we awarded the second lot of fellowships for next year. Out of 3,298 applications 557 fellowships were given. Of these, 7 went to students in Catholic colleges (1.2%); 2 at Fordham; 1 at St. Peters; 1 at Catholic University; 1 at Seton Hill; 1 at Notre Dame. All were pre-doctoral; no student at a Catholic institution received a post-doctoral fellowship. This year "Honorable Mention" was given to all those who were considered worthy of fellowships but who, because of lack of money, could not be given them. The number of these was 1277, of whom 48 (3.7%) were in Catholic colleges, 16 of which are Jesuit colleges (1.2%).

Father Mulligan also calls attention to the fact that the National Research Council and the National Academy of Sciences, which are the dominant factors in American science today, "are now represented by less than one-tenth the number which would be consistent with the fraction of the population which is Catholic." As far as I know, Father Macelwane of St. Louis University is the only Jesuit who is a member of the National

Academy. Yet it is from the Academy and the National Research Council that the screening panels for the National Science Foundation fellowships and research grants are drawn. Up to now only one Catholic institution, Notre Dame has been represented on any of these panels.

Finally Father Mulligan refers to "the paucity of articles in scientific journals from Catholic institutions and the small use made by our colleges of the vast facilities for research open to our faculties and students at national laboratories like Brookhaven and Oak Ridge".

I might also add to this that our institutions have also shown up poorly in getting research grants from the National Science Foundation. During the first year of its operation the Foundation gave grants in the amount of \$1,073,975. Of these only three were obtained by scientists in two Catholic institutions, namely, two at St Louis University and one at the Catholic University. I know of only three other requests having been made from Catholic institutions. These were not granted possibly because the Foundation has not been given its full appropriation and is short of funds, but I know the appraisers have made an effort to distribute these widely. Therefore, if one of Ours has a worthwhile project, he should not hesitate to seek support for it from the Foundation. However, he should not expect to be granted a large sum of money at once before he has shown his ability to do good research by previous publication. This means that in the beginning administrators will have to support some research out of institutional funds. Once this gets going they will find that their difficulty will be just the opposite, namely, they will have to curtail acceptance of research grants because of lack of facilities, personnel, etc.

So much for the facts and I believe any honest person will admit that they are facts. More important, though perhaps less easily proved, is the explanation of these facts. I have given a good deal of thought to this matter for over thirty years and have not been able to arrive at any really satisfactory answer.

In the first place, let us rid ourselves of certain easy and, in a way, comforting explanations. The first of these is prejudice. Now I have been associated with scientists on both state and national levels for over thirty years and while it is true that some, especially the older ones, are prejudiced against our theology and philosophy and against our declared purpose of using science to bolster them; yet most of them are not only not prejudiced against Catholics as persons but are positively desirous of our cooperation. This has certainly been true in my own case. I have been elected not only to membership in several scientific organizations but also to office in some of them, including the Presidency of our State Academy

of Science (which has very few Catholics in it) and membership on the Council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. I am sure that most of our scientists will tell you the same thing. Hence, failure to obtain recognition in scientific organizations is usually due to the lack of initiative on our own part. Sometimes this comes from timidity and sometimes from lack of interest on the part of individuals. At other times it has come from the hesitancy of some superiors, for reason either of economy or failure to appreciate its value, to allow Ours to join such organizations, or at least to go to their meetings.

In this connection it might be well to point out that we should not expect to be elected forthwith to membership in the National Academy or to the presidency of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. We have to walk before we can fly. Ours can accomplish a great deal more in their small local organizations at first and then extend their influence gradually in national and international groups.

To failure on our part I also attribute some of the blame for the poor showing in the studies referred to above. For instance, both Lehman and Witty's, and Goodrich, Knapp, and Boehm's statistics were based on inclusion in the well known publication *American Men of Science*. Now I have not made a thorough canvass of the number of Ours listed in that book, but I did look up the names of ten Jesuit biologists in my acquaintance and found only seven listed. Yet the three not included are heads of departments in large Jesuit colleges. They could and should be listed there and failure to be included has pulled down our average.

To go back to the charge of prejudice, even though scientists might be prejudiced against Catholics to the extent of refusing them power in their scientific organizations, they certainly are not so when it comes to recognition of scientific research. They are glad to have research papers by priests and nuns. The success of Father Basile Luyet (not a Jesuit) at St. Louis University is shown not only by his write-up in *Time* magazine and other publications, and his editorship of the journal *Biodynamica* but also by the symposium on frozen tissues at the St. Louis meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science which attracted internationally known biologists. Father Luyet's success is an example of what can be done with comparatively little money, provided one is really interested and willing to sacrifice himself to the work.

Similarly Sister Florence Marie of Seton Hill College has had her researches in embryology recognized by election to membership in the Corporation of the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, an honor given only to outstanding biologists. And if I may be allowed to compare small things with great, recently I was invited to give a course in

physiology at the Gulf Coast Research Laboratory at Ocean Springs, Mississippi. I refer to this merely to show the lack of prejudice.

Finally, I believe we can hardly accuse the Holy Father of anti-Catholic prejudice in his choice of members of the Pontifical Academy of Science. Nine scientists in the United States have been named to this body, only three of whom I recognize as Catholics and two of these are Europeans. Only one, Dr. Sperti of the Institutum Divi Thomae, is in a Catholic institution.

The second excuse most commonly alleged is lack of money. This has more validity than the first but it is not the real answer. To begin with, that a lot of money is not necessary to do research is evidenced by Mendel's immortal work in the discovery of the laws of heredity. All he needed was a small plot of ground and a few peas. Yet his experiments did more good for the Church than any number of other achievements. Also, it is well to remember that of the fifty top-ranking institutions in the production of scientists mentioned above, only three might be considered well endowed. Most of them are small colleges depending on churches for their support.

However, if money is needed this should not deter us. It is a well known fact that we can find money for those things in which we are really interested or which we think important. The most striking example of this, of course, (fortunately now a thing of the past in most of our colleges) is the money expended on football. The empty stadia at some of our institutions are mute witnesses to this. Now that we have outgrown that foolishness, can we not arouse in our supporters the same enthusiasm for building research laboratories and endowing professorships? I notice some of you smiling at this suggestion, but is that not how the non-Catholic institutions get the money for their magnificent installations? As a matter of fact, they have obtained some of it from scientifically-minded Catholics (for instance Francis Garvin's contributions to Yale). Why did they not give this money to Catholic institutions for the same purpose? Could it not be that it was not asked for this purpose?

In this connection, read your province publications gotten out for the purpose of interesting the laity in our works and see how much space is allotted to our educational work in general and to our scientific work in particular. How can we blame the laity for lack of interest in scientific things when all they are told about and asked to give to are our foreign missions, our parishes, and such like?

Why, then, are Catholic colleges lagging in the sciences? I believe that most of them are doing a good job of teaching elementary science; at least

they have come a long way from the conditions that existed when, as a first-year regent I was put to teach biology without having had a course in it. This success is reflected in our students of the professions such as medicine, (though our medical deans are not satisfied with their showing in the Medical College Admission Test), dentistry, and engineering. However, this is not enough. We Catholics will never be able to mold public opinion in this country unless we also produce scholars. This is especially true in the sciences. As long as we merely pass on to our students knowledge which has come from the discoveries of others, and expect of them only the memorizing of this knowledge, their minds will be simply passive receptacles, untrained for producing any new ideas. Yet, in order to be intellectual leaders, we must give the world new ideas. We know what happened during the Dark Ages. The former intellectual ferment of the Greek and Roman Golden Age was replaced with intellectual stagnation. The Church has been blamed for this. Of course, we know that the contrary is true. The Church alone was responsible for keeping alive the spark of learning in the monasteries. However, this withdrawal of learning into the cloister left the great mass of the laity in ignorance and it also became itself to a large extent sterile, merely copying and recopying the ancient manuscripts and adding nothing new. What a difference with the coming of St. Thomas and the other Medieval scholastics. They were not satisfied with merely repeating what Aristotle and the other ancients had taught. Instead, they showed the falsity of some of the earlier ideas and, using what was good in them as a foundation, proceeded to build a magnificent edifice of learning. This was also the time when most of the great European Universities were founded. As I pointed out in a paper on "Catholics and Medical Scholarship", what made the Medical School of Salerno famous was the fact that its teachers were not content with handing down what their predecessors had taught but tried to find new methods of treating disease. Even though crude by modern standards, this is research.

Unfortunately, this happy situation did not last long. As we know, in the later Middle Ages Scholasticism lapsed into a period of sterility. For this, too, the Church has been blamed. Of course, we know that this was not the fault of the Church, but in my opinion, it was the fault of some Churchmen. And when the new revival of learning came, particularly in the field of natural sciences, it was not only led chiefly by laymen, such as Galileo, Newton, and Descartes but also it was opposed to some extent by the clergy. This was unfortunate for several reasons. The most important is that it led to the divorce of philosophy and natural science that has had such baleful effects. It also led to the accusation that the

Church is opposed to science, which, while false, nevertheless has been hard to live down, particularly since the natural sciences have developed much more in Protestant countries like England and Germany than they have in Catholic countries like Spain and Italy.

There are several reasons for this misunderstanding which have nothing to do with religion. However, there is a certain amount of connection with it. Protestantism is essentially a revolt against religious authority. It is not strange then that Protestants should question all authority. On the other hand, the Catholic who is taught from his earliest years to accept the authority of the Church in faith and morals is inclined to extend this to other matters too, particularly when he is taught secular subjects by the same religious teachers who instruct him in religion. I have noticed that our Catholic students rarely ever question what is contained in their textbooks or what we tell them in lectures. Students tend to confuse what is taught as a rational theory with matters of faith. This is especially noticeable with regard to philosophy. Whether it is because of the way it is presented to them or because of the prefix "Catholic" they have very much the same attitude towards, say hylo-morphism, as they have toward the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

Now what can be done to remedy this situation?

In the first place, we have to be convinced of the importance of science, especially of research in science. If we take the high and mighty attitude that science is only a necessary evil or at best an adjunct to philosophy in the curriculum, we are not going to get very far. Yet this seems to have been the attitude of some provincials, rectors, and deans in the past. Both in men and money the sciences were treated as the step-children in our educational house. When, rarely, a man was adequately trained in science he was immediately loaded down with so many teaching or administrative duties that he could not even do a good job of teaching, and any research was out of the question. During my time I have seen several brilliant careers in science in the Society cut short in this way.

It should also be recalled that Mendel's great discoveries were lost for forty years and would have been lost forever if it had not been for the conscientiousness of Correns, Tchermak, and DeVries, because Mendel was made Abbot of his monastery and spent the rest of his life in fruitless and insignificant business transactions instead of continuing his biological researches.

However, we cannot lay the blame entirely on superiors. Many of our science teachers take the attitude that as long as they teach the classes assigned to them they have fulfilled their obligation. I recall in this regard a very successful science teacher who had a noteworthy record for

preparing students for professional school. During the Christmas holidays I went a thousand miles to the convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science which was being held in the city where he was stationed. I took for granted that he would attend the meetings, but he told me that the whole thing was a lot of "poppycock".

How can this lethargy be overcome? In the case of laymen of course there is the spur of financial reward. In most non-Catholic institutions failure to produce published research usually retards promotion while great activity in this field commonly brings higher salaries and better offers from larger institutions. For Ours this motive has no place. They know they will get the same treatment regardless of whether they accomplish anything or not; in fact from the novitiate we are imbued with the idea that it is the intention that counts. Of course, the teaching and example of St. Ignatius and of all the generals of the Society down to our present Father General is to the effect that, while making sure that we have right intention, we ought also to take all the natural means at our disposal to bring about the salvation of souls. In St. Ignatius' day the study of the classics was the paramount intellectual interest and, at his bidding, the Jesuits became the world's foremost classical scholars. Today science is the chief preoccupation of the learned world, and our recent Generals have bidden us to make ourselves second to none in this field. That should be sufficient motive for us. However, human nature being what it is, superiors might well investigate the possibility of using some natural incentives to proficiency in intellectual accomplishments by Ours. For instance, they could be more generous in allocating funds to departments where greater productive activity is shown. They could also more readily give permission to attend meetings to those who take an active part in them. Thus, the presentation of a worthwhile paper ought to be sufficient reason for attending any meeting. Finally, outstanding intellectual accomplishment by Ours could be rewarded by honorary degrees from other Jesuit institutions. Some may object to this on the score that it might be misinterpreted as self glorification. On the contrary, if the honor is really deserved (and that is the only time it should be given), then the college would gain in prestige for recognizing scholarship as being at least as worthy of reward as wealth or political prominence.

The idea that research is unimportant is quite prevalent among Ours in liberal arts colleges without a graduate school. They claim that we are not supposed to be doing any research ourselves and certainly not to be training undergraduates to do it. Where they get this idea I do not know. In the first place, anyone engaged in intellectual pursuits, whether in a university, a college, or even a high school, should, as has already been

pointed out, do more than merely repeat parrot-fashion what he has learned out of books. Secondly, we should recall that the last two years of college in the United States corresponds to the first two years of university in Europe. Therefore, if we teach anything above the elementary level, we are in effect university professors and have an obligation to train our students in university methods. Finally, we cannot expect our undergraduates suddenly to blossom into enthusiastic researchers upon graduation if they have never done any of this kind of work before themselves or even seen it done by their teachers. No, they will have neither the desire to go into graduate work nor even a knowledge of what it means. The ambition of most will be to enter professional school: medicine, dentistry, or engineering. Some chemistry and physics majors may apply for graduate work in order to prepare themselves for industrial positions but rarely with the idea of devoting themselves to teaching or research. Rarer still is the biology major who will do this. Yet this is perhaps the field where we need Catholics more than any other.

At Spring Hill we have found in the biology department that our undergraduates are not only capable of but enthusiastic about doing some research. Of course, this is not world-shaking; though the work on the use of aerosols in the treatment of respiratory diseases carried out by some of our students under the direction of Dr. Joseph B. Miller, research associate in biology, has been acclaimed by the *Journal of the American Medical Association* and Dr. Miller has been receiving requests for reprints from all over the world. The week before last four of our seniors presented research papers at the regional conference of Tri Beta National Biological Society. Yet, all this has been done with the expenditure of very little money and in very cramped quarters.

In conclusion, then, let me say that I agree with Father O'Leary and Mulligan that we are not "pulling our weight" in scientific education. I also believe that there is a definite place for research not only in our universities but also in our colleges. This does not necessarily require great outlays of money (however, money is available to those who show the ability to do research) but it does require the good will of administrators. This can be shown by giving our science teachers some time in their schedule for research and insisting that they use it for this purpose; by allotting a little money for this purpose; and by giving recognition to accomplishments by Ours in the field of productive scholarship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Goodrich, Knapp, and Boehm, 1951. *Origins of American Scientists*. *Sci. Am.* 185 (1):15.
- Lehman and Witty, 1931 *Scientific Eminence and Church Membership*. *Sci. Mon.* 33:549.
- Miller, Joseph B., et al. 1952. *A Non-Toxic Detergent for Aerosol Use In Dissolving Viscid Bronchopulmonary Secretion*. *Jour. Ped.* 40 (6):767.
- Mulligan, Joseph F., S.J. 1953. *Preparation in Natural Sciences and Jesuit Colleges* *JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY*, January 1953, p. 229.
- O'Leary, Timothy J., S.J. 1953. *The Role of Science in Jesuit Colleges*. *Ibid.* p. 223.
- Yancey, P. H., S.J. 1948. *Catholics and Medical Scholarship*. *Laboureaux* 1(2-3).

Place and Function of Sodality In Jesuit High Schools

FRANCIS D. RABAUT, S.J.¹

A paper on "The Place and Function of the Sodality in Jesuit High Schools" is very much in order at a Jesuit Educational Meeting, for the end of the Sodality is to produce a Catholic entirely devoted to Christ and Mary, a Catholic who in every situation thinks, judges, and acts according to the principles of Jesus Christ. Our educational program is geared to produce an educated Catholic conforming to this ideal. Hence, in a Jesuit high school the Sodality in a very special manner is a co-curricular activity.

This topic is in place for another reason. It is of the utmost importance that principals and assistant principals keep abreast of Sodality trends, for in his letter to the provincials on the Sodality Fr. Ledóchowski insists that Sodality directors are not to be left to themselves to manage Sodalities according to their own whims and fancies. Ultimately the rector, the provincial secretary of Sodalities, and the provincial are going to rely in no small measure upon the judgment of the principal and his assistant in appraising the effectiveness of the Sodality program in a Jesuit high school. Therefore, a principal and his assistant need a clear understanding of the true nature, place, and function of the Sodality.

Finally, in no small measure the effectiveness of the Sodality program in a Jesuit high school is determined by the decisions made by those administering the school. Unless the sodality director and the principal are a team pulling together, not only will Mary's Sodality suffer, but in due proportion the educational program in the school will suffer as well.

It is a timely topic because our Father General as recently as Nov. 21, 1952 wrote: "The purpose of this instruction is once again to impress upon all of Ours how necessary it is ever to promote the Sodalities of Our Lady and bring them to a more perfect condition." This letter was to be read in all the houses of the Society.

In this paper the topic is developed under four large headings: First, modern trends in the Sodality movement; second, the place of a Sodality in a Jesuit high school; third, the function of this organization in the

¹A paper read at the meeting of the Secondary School Delegates at the annual meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, April 6, 1953, Fordham University, New York, N. Y.

school; and finally, some of the means that have been used especially by principals and assistant principals to further the Sodality at Loyola Academy. A sincere effort will be made to be realistic and practical, and to meet issues squarely.

What, then, are the modern trends in the Sodality movement? As you know the Sodality is a religious organization founded by the Society of Jesus and approved by the Holy See. Its members strive to achieve a threefold end: personal sanctification, the sanctification of others, and the defense of the Church against the attacks of the wicked. What are the means to be employed to achieve these goals? The answer to this question will indicate one of the modern trends in the Sodality movement. For some of us, at least, it will be a program quite different from that Sodality program which we recall from our high school and college days. Perhaps the Sodality we knew was in the words of His Holiness "a simple union of quiet and inoperative piety." "Such Sodalities," says Father General, "do not deserve a place among the forms of apostolate of our age and day which call for hard work with a definite goal."

These observations are no condemnation of the men who have gone before us and who have done noble service for Christ and Mary. We are harvesting where they sowed. They did not have the clear directives for the conducting of Sodalities that we have today; to judge the manner in which they conducted Sodalities by the directives recently publicized and given to us would be grossly unfair and most uncharitable. At the same time in our day we are being called upon to make a contribution to the glorious growth of Sodalities. If we follow the directives given us by the Holy See and by our Fathers General, we shall not fail in the great work that through the powerful intercession of our Mother Mary is being confided by God to our charge.

What are these directives? What is this modern trend in the Sodality? Briefly, it consists in a return to the faithful observance of the Sodality rules, the "Sodality way of life". When a boy consecrates himself to Mary in her Sodality, he not only becomes a member of an organization, but he freely assumes the obligations of a definite "way of life". This "way of life" is an adaptation for people in the world of the Jesuit "way of life". It may be briefly outlined as follows. A sodalist gives his word of honor (not binding under pain of sin) to cultivate an ardent love for Mary and her divine Son by the faithful performance throughout life of the following *daily* spiritual exercises: 1. Morning prayers, including the Morning Offering, acts of faith, hope, charity, and thanksgiving, and three Hail Marys; 2. Mass, if possible; 3. Holy Communion, frequent—even daily; 4. Fifteen minutes of Mental prayer; 5. Five decades of the

rosary or the recitation of the Little Office; 6. Examination of conscience and an act of perfect contrition. In addition he binds himself to the following apostolic and religious practices: 1. Frequent confession, and if possible, to a regular confessor; 2. An annual retreat, preferably one made at a retreat house; 3. A general confession, once or twice a year; 4. The faithful performance of the duties of his state in life; 5. Apostolic work to further the kingdom of Jesus Christ; 6. Active membership, if possible, in a Sodality.

Undoubtedly the acceptance of this "rule of life" calls for great generosity, and left to our own judgment some of us would perhaps hesitate to make such demands of high school boys. Fortunately for us we are not faced with making this decision. The decision has been made for us by the Holy Father, Pius XII, and by our Father General.

Even provincials themselves according to Father General are not "to relax the severity of the official by-laws (*praescripta*) of Father Wernz" in whose generalate the Sodality rules were last revised. "To wish to form Sodalists," writes Father General, "and to urge them to strive for Christian perfection, without at the same time demanding from them that they lead a life tending to Christian perfection . . . is wishing the end, of course, but without the means, or at least the efficacious means."

Obviously, an organization demanding this measure of generosity from its members is not meant for all our high school students indiscriminately. It is for those who have a sincere desire to live a full Catholic life, who have a capacity for spiritual progress beyond the ordinary, who are prompted by a zeal to further the Kingdom of Christ by apostolic endeavour, and who are determined to observe throughout life "the way of life" proposed in the Sodality rules. The Sodality is, therefore, by rule selective in its membership.

What is new in the Sodality? With one exception, which will be immediately taken up, there is nothing new. We are to return to our former traditions; we are to insist upon the faithful observance of the Sodality rules. The one strictly new factor in the Sodality program is that Sodalities conducted according to the rules constitute Catholic Action. "The structure and peculiar character of the Sodalities of Our Lady," wrote Pope Pius XII, "are no obstacle whatever to their being called with fullest right 'Catholic Action under the auspices and inspiration of the Blessed Virgin Mary'." So much for modern trends in the Sodality movement.

We proceed to the second section of this paper, which deals with the place of this organization in a Jesuit high school. Here we look to the *Epitome* of the Society of Jesus and the letters of our Generals to clarify its status. According to number 673 of the *Epitome* in keeping with the

traditional practice of members of the Society of Jesus, Jesuits are to practice an ardent devotion to the Blessed Virgin; in all our labors we are to rely upon her powerful intercession with God, and everywhere we are to promote her honor and propogate devotion to her. Number 675 treats specifically of Sodalties which are to be founded and fostered. These Sodalties are to be promoted especially among our students. On July 16, 1922 Very Reverend Father Ledochowski in a letter to all the provincials on the promotion of the Sodality wrote: "It would be superfluous to tell you how much I have at heart this progress of the Sodalties and how much this progress will accomplish for the greater glory of God." Our present Father General has written a letter as well as an instruction on the Sodality to the entire Society, and in addition gives considerable space to the subject in his letter on our ministries.

We turn now to the third topic, the function of the Sodality in a Jesuit high school. In the natural order we recognize that some boys have superior gifts and in our educational work we try to provide for the development of those gifts through the honors course. Some boys have superior gifts in the supernatural order and the Sodality of Our Lady is in the loving providence of God the tool in a Jesuit school for the adequate development of those gifts. In a high school conducted by Franciscans or Dominicans the tool would probably be the Third Order peculiar to each or specialized Catholic Action, but in a Jesuit school it is the Sodality. The loving providence of God does not lead all souls along the same path; amid unity in essentials, He wills that there be diversity in accidentals. If we should without good reasons employ some other apostolic tool, e.g., the Legion of Mary, in place of the Sodality in our schools, we would have no right to expect the same outpouring of graces upon our apostolic labors, for we have spurned the tool given to us by Providence, recommended to us by our *Institute*, and time and time again by our Fathers General. The only organization, with the possible exception of the Apostleship of Prayer, that our *Institute* urges us to establish and foster among our students is the Sodality of Our Lady. Other organizations are good and they have their place in a Jesuit school, but without a flourishing Sodality the end of Jesuit education will not be adequately achieved. Moreover, by reason of the Sodality we can rightly expect God through the powerful intercession of His Mother to exercise a more loving providence over the entire student body and faculty. In a very special manner Sodalists belong to Mary; they are her chosen sons.

In every student body there exists or there tends to exist a group of boys who are lazy, opposed to the administration, and who in spiritual matters tend to practice the minimum. This group with the lowest ideals

is frequently the most vocal in the student body, and can have a demoralizing influence upon the large group of students who are trying to do a tolerably good job on their studies and who have moderately high ideals. A flourishing Sodality at the same time that it provides for the students with high ideals serves as an effective check upon this demoralizing force in the school. The entire center block realizes that there is a group of boys in the school who openly profess to strive after the ideals repudiated or belittled by the group at the bottom. Moreover, by reason of the Sodality the boys in the middle group begin to hesitate to profess that they are outstanding Catholics because they receive Holy Communion once a week. They know that many of their fellow students are receiving this Sacrament five, or six, or seven days in the week. And hence, through a flourishing Sodality the entire tone in the student body undergoes quite a radical change for the better.

Since a Sodalist should carry out faithfully the duties of his state in life, and since the vocation of a boy in high school is to be a Catholic student, only those students should be accepted as candidates for the Sodality, and certainly only those should be received who are putting forth a sincere effort to develop the talents God has given to them. Hence, they should be outstanding for their attention in class, and their effort in their studies both at home and at school. Since the school rules are in force to help the students achieve the objectives of Catholic education, a genuine sodalist will be outstanding in his effort to observe them. Moreover, he will observe them more from a desire to imitate the obedient Christ and from a love of God's Handmaid than from a fear of being "jugged". He has a sincere desire to grow in every virtue but especially in obedience, the characteristic virtue of a Jesuit, and therefore the characteristic virtue of a sodalist.

In addition to the influence that the members of the Sodality bring to bear upon the school through their life of prayer, their good example, and their efforts in studies, the genuine Sodality will through apostolic projects contribute to the well-being of the school. These apostolic projects may be conducted by the Sodality itself or the Sodality may channel sodalists into other organizations for the furthering of apostolic work. For example, at Loyola Academy, Chicago, the members of the Sodality clean up the cafeteria at 12:30 each noon. This is a Sodality sponsored project. On the other hand every member of the Sodality is expected to participate in one or other extra-curricular activity and bring his influence to bear in that activity for Christ and Mary. Any officially established extra-curricular activity in the school suffices: the Mass servers' organization, the debating clubs, track, football, managing, etc.

Thus the sodalists bring home to their fellow students that the membership of the Sodality at Loyola is made up of a good cross section of typical American boys. Moreover, in free elections the students themselves choose sodalists to head most of the activities in the school.

We are all keenly aware of the need for religious and priestly vocations to further the work of Catholic education, and the home and foreign missions. The Sodality provides an organization in which these vocations may be fostered. Our Father General in his Instruction of Nov. 21, 1952 advises Sodality directors to keep this general principle in mind that "vocations are best fostered in suitable surroundings or within a select group of the very best companions."

Finally, the high school Sodality is a novitiate and a training ground for the lay apostles of tomorrow. Many of the young men in our high schools today will form the nuclei round which parish Sodalities, alumni Sodalities, and professional Sodalities will form. In this work we cannot rest till we have Sodalities on all levels, so that the high school sodalist upon graduation will pass to a college Sodality, and from college to a parish, alumni, or professional Sodality. Some may think that this is merely a dream. They reckon not the powerful intercession of the Mother of God on behalf of her sodalist sons who in her Sodality have consecrated their entire selves to her for life and for eternity.

What we have said about the function of the Sodality in a Jesuit high school should help us to understand why our Father General desires throughout the entire Society a new order and a new intelligently founded enthusiasm for the Sodality. Over the years an effort has been made at Loyola Academy, a day school with eight hundred students, to bring about this new order. We are still working at the task. Since this paper has been written to assist principals and assistant principals, a brief presentation of this program at Loyola, especially of those phases which are dependent upon the administration, might be of help.

A real effort has been made to assign capable moderators to assist the Sodality director. In addition, administrators have tried not to burden them with other activities so that they may devote their energies to the formation of lay apostles. At present, there are two priests and two scholastics assigned to Sodality work, one for each year.

The Chicago Province directive, which states that other extra-curricular activities including the practices of athletic teams are not to be conducted during the time of Sodality meetings, is in force. Hence, on Monday nights sophomores are not expected to appear for meetings or practices till after the Sodality meeting which begins at 3:00 and closes at 3:45. On Thursday the same is true for the freshmen. What about

the meetings for sodalists in third and fourth years? That brings us to the next point, our schedule arrangement.

The school schedule is so arranged as to favor rather than impede the Sodality. In third and fourth years there is one period in the day which is a split period. In third year the split period is from 10 to 10:50; in fourth year from 11:00 to 11:50. During this period on two days of the week religion is taught. For some students there will be a study period on the other three days of the week at this same hour. The schedule is so arranged that during this split period all third year boys have a study period on the same day of the week, and all boys in fourth year have a study period on the same day of the week. Members of the Sodality, instead of attending this study period, hold their Sodality meeting. The other boys in their year go to their study period. Attendance is taken both at the study period and at the Sodality meeting, and an attendance report is made to the office. If on rare occasion for a serious reason a sodalist wishes to be excused from the Sodality meeting in order to take advantage of the study period, he must report the matter to the assistant principal beforehand.

Who are permitted to attend these sodality meetings? Only the members. All candidates, to prove their serious intentions in regard to the Sodality, must attend after school a weekly candidate meeting for one year. How does the faculty accept this scheduling of meetings during the school day? The faculty is not affected, for the sodalists would be studying if they were not at the Sodality meeting. Of course, in drawing up the schedule the Sodality moderator must be kept free from teaching during the period he conducts the Sodality meeting. This schedule is set up at the beginning of the year. After that the principal's job is over. No announcement about the Sodality meeting is made. The sodalists merely go to their meeting as they would go to another class. Finally, this arrangement has this definite advantage. Our coaches and our moderators of other activities depend more upon students in third and fourth years than upon those in first and second years for the smooth functioning of their activities. With this arrangement the boys in third and fourth years can report every night after school to their activity. Soon you men will be planning your schedules for next year. If you have a split period in the day, you might be able to employ this schedule.

At Loyola, principals have encouraged closed retreats for sodalists in second, third, and fourth years in place of the open retreats on the campus. When necessary sodalists are excused from class to make these retreats.

An effort is made to provide the Sodality with an adequate fund.

Finally, the principal once or twice a year during a class period and

in his office meets with the Sodality officers of third and fourth years. The session might be called a special guidance session for the leaders. The principal explains to the officers that they are the chosen leaders of the most important activity in the school. He informs them that they are welcome to come to his office to discuss any difficulty or to propose any project. He points out some of their opportunities, some of the areas in the student life in which they may bring the influence of the Sodality to bear for the furthering of the Kingdom of Christ.

Very honestly a flourishing Sodality in a high school is the fruit of much sacrifice, thought, planning and toil not merely on the part of the Sodality director, but on the part of administrators and members of the faculty as well. The Sodality belongs to every Jesuit; the director is merely the one from among their number who has been appointed by the provincial to direct this Jesuit corporate work. Here there is a parallel with our educational apostolate in a high school. Every Jesuit makes a contribution to the work being done there; the principal is merely the one appointed by the provincial to direct this fruitful Jesuit corporate work for the salvation of souls. Jesuits are zealous, and if they begin to see results—a real spiritual growth in their students—they quickly become enthusiastic supporters of the Sodality. This is not strange, for all of us are keenly aware of our great personal debt to the Mother of God, and many of us in our youth consecrated ourselves to her in her Sodality. At that time we said, "I firmly propose to serve thee ever more myself and to do what I can that all may render faithful service to thee." Since the Sodality is a gift of one's self for life and for eternity to the Mother of God, it is not surprising to meet a Sodalist now a Jesuit who judges that he should use his special gifts to serve Mary ever more himself and the powers of his office to do what he can that all may render faithful service to his Queen, his Advocate, his Mother. The day is coming when more Jesuits will realize the implications of the Sodality consecration they made to Mary in their youth, and in that day there will be an ever greater flowering of Sodalities in our schools.

In conclusion, may I say that I shall welcome suggestions for improving the Sodality program at Loyola Academy. I wish to thank you, my fellow Jesuits, for your kind attention, the Executive Committee of the Jesuit Educational Association and the Executive Director, Father Edward B. Rooney, for their thoughtful invitation to address you; and finally, but not least I wish publicly to acknowledge my debt of gratitude to our Queen, our Advocate, our Mother for this opportunity to serve her ever more myself and to do what I could that all might render faithful service to her.

Promotion of Good Reading In Our High Schools

JOHN J. DIVINE, S.J.¹

The following anecdote will serve as an introduction to the discussion which has been assigned to us this afternoon. When interrogated by his psychiatrist concerning the nature of his illness, Mr. Smith replied simply: "I have no delusions or illusions; my problem is that I exist day to day with grim reality."

I am sure the Jesuit high school teacher suffers very few delusions about the reading habits of his charges; nor does he entertain any grandiose illusions about converting the average students into voracious and voluminous readers of the "best thoughts of the best minds."

The grim reality is that the average high school student of today reads less, and possesses a more limited vocabulary, than did the student of twenty or ten years ago. The contemporary American scene has presented us with another anomaly: the number of books read by the modern student is in inverse proportion to the multitudinous pages spawned annually by our presses, and the quality of that reading has degenerated in proportion to the rising literacy level of our population.

The villains in the tragedy are too obvious to merit extended discussion. We seem to be fighting a losing battle against the television, the movies, the multiplicity of extracurricular and extra-domicile activities, the American disease of the "jitters," and, if I may be so bold as to utter it aloud, an overemphasis on audio-visual education in our schools. The plain fact is that the average American student is frightened by the solidly printed page. Fed upon a diet of comics and bred in an atmosphere of graphic illustration, modern youth is accustomed to purely passive participation and finds little relish for written language with its challenge to mental activity and the functioning of the creative imagination.

Small wonder it is that our students, like their elders, are great talkers but poor thinkers. They possess an encyclopedic knowledge of miscellaneous and disparate facts but are powerless to correlate or integrate

¹Delivered at the meeting of Secondary School Delegates, Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Fordham University, New York, N. Y., April 6, 1952 under the title "The Fostering and Promotion of Good Reading in our Jesuit High Schools."

them. They are grossly ignorant, according to their age level, of the great traditions of the past, of the literary and cultural heritage which has been bequeathed them, and are impatient with anything that does not smack of modernity.

Certainly not all our Jesuit high school students come under the above indictment; perhaps, not even a good proportion of them. But we would be deluding ourselves to conclude that the average Jesuit boy has a habit of good reading or a love for it. How frequently does the Jesuit high school teacher leave his classroom harried and harassed as a result of his apparently futile struggle against the apathy and indifference of his scholars who have refused to share with him his enthusiasm for "the realms of gold."

However, it is with possible remedies we must treat, not with jeremiads. It will avail us little to fulminate against existing conditions or by wishful thinking to conjure them out of existence. The television, the movie, the comics, and the pictorial approach in education are apparently here to stay. Surely we can and do use them to complement our reading program. We can use their highly skillful technical devices to implement the sale of our product. But we must violently oppose their substitution for the understanding, enjoyment, and discriminating appreciation of that miracle world of artistic expression "where all our mental highways are paved with ink."

No garbled or distorted movie version of *Ivanhoe* can usurp the enriching personal experience of an attentive reading of Scott's novel. Not even the consummate acting of an Olivier in the movie productions of *Hamlet* and *Henry V* can compensate for the intellectual and imaginative activity that must accompany the personal study of Shakespeare's dramas. The most detailed and minutely drawn models of the *Globe* theater is small return for the failure to read *The Tempest*; and a conducted tour of Tom Sawyer's cave at Hannibal, Missouri, is a poor exchange for the vicarious pleasure which an adolescent derives from Twain's American classic.

The function of a reading program in our high schools must coincide with and implement the primary objective of a Jesuit High School education. Our primary objective is not Life Adjustment in its modern educational sense, nor training for Democracy or Citizenship, however valid these objectives may be for other systems of education. We know, as a matter of fact, that adjustment to life, democracy, and citizenship will inevitably follow as corollaries from the successful prosecution of our principal objective. But since our primary purpose is to equip our young men for college and university training, our reading program must in-

clude those books which of their intrinsic nature will assist in the spiritual, mental and emotional maturation of our pupils. A reading program which is not instrumental in progressively introducing our students to the social, cultural, and literary traditions of the past and is incapable of integrating the past with present society or does not intimate the continuity of our Western culture has no valid place in our curriculum. Each book read by our students during the four years of high school should serve as a step in an ascending stairway with the cumulative aim being to develop both critical appreciation and discrimination of what is best of the old and new—a Christian evaluation of literature in its relationship to life, the development of a capacity to think integrally about the relationship of time and eternity, the natural and the supernatural.

Such a program of reading must include not only the best Catholic books of the past and present, but also the great masterpieces of English and American literary tradition. It must include the best writings of contemporary authors whose artistic expression and philosophy of life will exercise a wholesomely maturing and deepening influence upon the adolescent reader.

In formulating our reading program, we must avoid two further heresies of modern America: the cult of the mediocre and the worship of the child. Intellectual Peter Panism which reduces all learning to the child level will never produce mental giants nor mature intellectual adults. The consumption of intellectual emasculated "pot boilers" cannot supply the energy necessary for tough mental fiber. Is it not possible that our modern mania to make education pleasantly easy for the child serves to make us overlook the innate capacity of the student to understand and appreciate what, on the surface, might be above his comprehension? Is it not possible to mistake disinterestedness for inability, and ignorance of what is good for apathy?

Objectively speaking, therefore, good reading is not what necessarily interests the student but that which is best for him, according to his age level and the over-all aim of our reading program. Consequently there must be a fundamental agreement on the part of Jesuit high school educators about three categories of books which I would like to call *must* books, *ought* books and *may* books. That is, those books which must be read by every student before the completion of each year; those books which ought to be read; and those books which may be read. I propose that the forthcoming revised edition of the Jesuit High School Reading List be constructed according to these three categories. It is my opinion that there is too much free lancing on the part of our boys in the choice of their outside reading. It is also my opinion that there is not sufficient

correlation between our literature text books and our supplementary reading. I further suggest that committees of teachers representing each year of high school be appointed to determine what books should be included in the *must* list and the *ought* list.

First, a word about the *must* books. This list would include a minimum of five titles for freshmen, six for sophomores, seven for juniors, and eight for senior students. The reading of these books would be made mandatory if the student is to complete successfully his work for that year. In following such a compulsory reading program throughout the four years of high school, we would attain this end result: the assurance that *everyone* of our graduates will have read twenty-six books whose cultural value has been considered an integral part of a young man's education. Secondly, no longer shall we have to suffer the annual embarrassing discovery that we are graduating some students who have never read a book or, at the most, four or five books during their four years of high school. I believe that if we accomplished nothing more than the fulfillment of our *must* list program, we could be proud of our achievement. Any young man who would leave high school with a moderate enjoyment and appreciation of one or more of the works of Shakespeare, Dickens, Stevenson, Thackeray, London, Cooper, Masefield, Whatron, Cather, Austen, Repplier, Churchill, Conrad, Kipling, Twain, Swift, Bronte, Eliot, Wilder, T. S. Eliot, Chesterton, Belloc, Greene, and Waugh, to mention but a few, has already been initiated into the companionship of the literary giants and has opened wide for him the magic casements of the world of letters.

The *ought* books on our list are those whose content and artistic expression have and do give evidence of lasting value; and, because of their particular subject matter, can be used as core books to correlate a definite unit of study in our literature, religion, history, and social science courses. If we are to assist the student in linking the past with the present, we must acquaint them with good modern authors who have written well of a certain period, author, type, character, or movement of the past. If they are to have an intelligent understanding of the present, we must introduce them to significant books whose authors have correctly interpreted the spirit of our contemporary conflicting society.

The selection of core books for such a program would certainly require a great amount of time and very serious thought. But the expenditure would be eminently worth while. Such a list should not include over thirty titles for each year; perhaps it could be reduced to fifteen or twenty.

Let me illustrate what I have said above by an example from my own

teaching experience. In our senior English class we are studying the Age of Henry VII and Elizabeth. The content of concentrated classroom study includes excerpts from the writings of St. Thomas More, Roper's *Life of More*, Shakespeare's sonnets, *Macbeth*, and some selections from the works of Edmund Campion and Robert Southwell. In the few brief hours which are allotted to the teaching of this unit, I can do little more than briefly touch upon the background and spirit of this stormy age. But at this point I can make use of the supplementary related reading list (the *ought* list) prepared especially for this unit. I assign for book report reading several well-known books by contemporary authors who have used the medium of fiction or biography or historical study to portray some aspect, character, or significant movement of the age. I appoint one student to read and report upon Prescott's excellent chronicle *The Man On A Donkey*; to another, Charles Brady's recent novel *Stage of Fools* portraying the life of St. Thomas More. To other students I assign the reading of Waugh's *Campion*, Belloc's *Cramner* and *Characters of the Reformation*, Sheila Kaye-Smith's *Superstition Corner*, Joseph Q. Adams' *Life of Shakespeare*. Written reports may be made upon these books (they are excellent subjects for composition work); but, of more importance, an oral presentation of these works are given by the students, which may consume two or more class periods. As moderator of such discussions, I shall tell my students of the position these modern authors hold in modern letters, other well-known works of theirs, and what these authors are endeavoring to accomplish through their writings. By this method I am not only saturating the students with the background and spirit of a past age; but I am assisting them to explore some of the best of what has been written by contemporary writers, who have seen the present in the light of the past, who have breathed the vibrant authentic spirit into the age and characters they have portrayed, who have given perspective, depth, and human dimensions to the turbulent ebb and flow of humanity.

Enthusiastic sales talks about the value of these books will prompt other students to read them. Who would deny any teacher his moment of exhilaration or the star dust that fleetingly appears before his eyes when he realizes that one or other of his students is reading an extra book on his own initiative? Such a method as outlined above is the most effective method which I could suggest for fostering and promoting good reading through classroom procedure.

Naturally there will be in our program the *may* books: books of lesser value both in content and expression, which will be read primarily for leisurely personal entertainment. But these again should be selected from

the standpoint of well-known authors and for their inspirational and informational value. The list should be very limited; otherwise both the student and teacher are equally confused. It is my personal opinion that our present reading list contains far too many titles. The average teacher with a limited reading background and the unguided student, when faced with pages of titles from which to choose, can be likened to a young child in a pre-Christmas toy department who can purchase only one toy, but is utterly bewildered as to what toy to choose from the enchanting plethora which confronts him. Our problem is not the multiplicity of books at our disposal. It is their limited and well-directed selection.

We are expressing a truism when we state that our High School Reading Program will be successful only in proportion to the enthusiasm of our teachers in promoting it. Above all else, the teacher of today must be a salesman *par excellence*. He must persuade his sales-resistant students to accept a product for which they may have a natural prejudice. He must convince those who resent being told what to read that reading the best is a form of living. To paraphrase a passage from Fr. Francis Thornton's *How To Improve Your Personality By Reading*, he must assure them that the lawyer who defends him in court, the doctor at the bedside, the priest, the university professor, the journalist and the writer of radio scripts, the Quiz Kids and John Kieran, the Einsteins, the Fulton Sheens, the Eisenhowers, the general and the admiral who defend on land and sea—are all men of books, men made by books.

The teacher must be a lover of books and have much more than a passing acquaintance with the *must* and the *ought* lists. Enthusiasm is infectious; and no student, no matter how apparently apathetic, can long resist the incessant sales talk of a teacher who is himself sold on his own product.

The clever teacher will be ever on the watch for references to important famous literary characters often to be found in sports columns, editorials, and current news magazines—all of which will substantiate what he has been telling his students about the universality of the citizens of Parnassus. Within the measure of his limited time and opportunity, he will keep abreast of the current reviews of the best in modern literature in *America*, *Commonweal*, *Catholic World*, *Book World*, *Time*, the book letters of the Thomas More Book Shop and others. A regular or even an occasional perusal of *The New York Times Literary Supplement* and the *Saturday Review of Literature* will often result in a stimulating article on some author or book listed in the Reading Program. He will not hesitate to digress briefly from his prepared classroom instruction to discuss the merits of a book when that particular work is mentioned spon-

taneously in class. From such personal enthusiasm, his students will be awakened to a desire to imitate and emulate his reading habits and to assimilate in some small measure the cultural background of their professor.

If our reading program is to succeed we must have the fullest cooperation of our librarians. I am afraid that many of our librarians are doing a very conscientious job of displaying the wrong kind of literary products to our students. They are endeavoring to make reading attractive, but too frequently it is the latest cowboy or adventure story. Could we not ask them to spend an equal amount of time and care in the display of attractive posters and jackets advertising the *must* and *ought* books? We have no complaint against the number of books in our libraries—but there are too few copies of the best books and these are oftentimes old editions, with small print and unattractive make-up. A gallery of the authors of the *must* and *ought* books could be enticingly displayed. Perhaps we could be so bold as to test the experiment by which only the books on the reading list would be placed on the open shelves. Necessity is the mother of invention. And the student who has within easy grasp only those books we want him to read may in pure desperation grab one from the shelves. Ignatius of Loyola would not be the Founder of our Society had he been able to secure a love story during his illness. The rule of our librarians should be not how many books we have or how many of them are read—but how many attractive copies of the best books are lodged on our shelves and how effectively they are sold to the student body.

One very excellent extracurricular activity for promoting good reading is the formation of literary clubs, whose membership is limited but whose number in any particular school is contingent upon the interest and salesmanship of the respective teachers. Since such clubs are for the *selecti quidem*, they afford the richest and most fruitful media for the development of a young Catholic intelligentsia who will be prepared to make the most of their college training and, perhaps with the grace of God, become leaders of tomorrow's world.

It has been my good fortune to have "some charge and care" over such a club during the past ten years. It has been the most pleasant experience of my teaching years and, from the viewpoint of the students' reaction, the most satisfying. Many young men have told me on numerous occasions that it was the most valuable and profitable activity of the student days, next to their closed retreat. I have had the equally satisfying experience of knowing that similar clubs are being sponsored in our schools by former members of our club who since have entered the Society.

The literary club has convinced me, above all else, that our young people are both capable and anxious to mature intellectually. A brief recital of what has been read and discussed during the present scholastic year should convince the most sceptical that a fair proportion of our students want to be treated intellectually like adults and deeply resent the popular prevalent opinion that their reading should be diluted and predigested to suit their age level. Certainly any young man who can read and intelligently discuss some of the representative works of Chesterton, Belloc, Broderick, Waugh, Greene, Mauriac, Bazin, Hollis, and Newman hardly worships at the altar of mediocrity.

I would like to make one final suggestion which might be utilized in the promotion and fostering of good reading in our high schools. A public symposium or panel discussion on some of the *must* or *ought* books of an individual year or the entire four years presented by the ablest members of their respective classes should do much to stimulate wider interest among the students themselves. The symposium would likewise serve as the official sanction and public acknowledgment on the part of the school administration of the place of good reading in our educational program.

I shall conclude this discussion with what I might term a happy coincidence. While in the progress of composing this paper, I inquired from the members of my best senior English class what suggestions they might provide for the promoting and fostering of good reading among our boys. Without any intimation of why I was asking such a question, to my utter but delightful astonishment, they had read the image of my own mind and almost without exception suggested what I have written above. Was it another instance of *ex ore infantium loquitur sapientia*? Or is it a further affirmation that there is a basic need in man for the making and reading of books?

Jesuit Educational Association

Annual Meeting - 1953

WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J.

Before one of the largest assemblies yet to gather for an annual meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Father Laurence J. McGinley, Rector-President of Fordham University greeted 186 Jesuits representing 86 colleges, high schools and seminaries, and welcomed them to the hospitality of Fordham's campus Easter Sunday Evening April 5, 1953.

As this was the first meeting held in New York, we were doubly honored in having the President of the J.E.A., Father John J. McMahan, Provincial of the New York Province, address the general meeting, stressing the importance of training Catholic lay teachers in our schools.

In his customary Report of the Executive Director, Father Edward B. Rooney recorded some of the Jesuit educational highlights of the past year. Rather than catalogue the general educational trends, he spotlighted certain legislative measures such as the Korean G.I. Bill, deferment of students, faculty and student housing loans and Fulbright Grants. Other significant events on which he reported were the Union Carbide Educational Fund, National Commission on Accrediting, Inter-American Jesuit Alumni Congress, International Association of Universities, International Association of Catholic Universities, investigations of educational institutions and other timely topics. The major part of his report dealt with discontent with American education on the part of educators generally. Religion and philosophy are more and more being granted their places of preeminence, and Americans are urged by several highly regarded spokesmen to reinstate religion as the focal center of education and to restore philosophy to its rightful role of integrating subject.

This year's Dinner Meeting of all Delegates had the unique privilege of having as its guest of honor, Father Vincent A. McCormick, American Assistant to Very Reverend Father General. Father McCormick conveyed the encomium of Father General for the splendid work done by American Jesuit education and urged the delegates to stress the importance of scholarly and productive work. This is to be carried out but not at the expense of overexpansion and dissipation of our resources.

SECONDARY SCHOOL SECTION

As opening speaker of the Meeting of Secondary school delegates Monday morning, Father Lorenzo K. Reed offered a follow-up report on

the 1952 Denver Institute for Jesuit Principals. The *Manual For Jesuit High School Administrators* was distributed widely, over 360 copies to all parts of the world. It was deemed advisable not to revise but rather supplement it. Accordingly, several new sections will be prepared, primarily on homework, finance and cost accounting, and principles and practices. A record has been kept of the copies of the *Manual* mailed out and the supplement upon completion will be sent to the same addresses. Many excellent papers were prepared by the principals and it is hoped that they can be reprinted in the *Quarterly* or other publications.

The major portion of the Meeting of Secondary School Delegates was devoted to the means of spiritual advancement, the Sodality and the student retreat. In addition to this, several points of unfinished business were taken up.

Father Francis D. Rabaut, spoke on the nature, place and functions of the Sodality. Calling upon the official documents of the Holy See and the Society, he proved his major points and showed by concrete examples how the major objectives could be achieved. His major stress was the key position of the principal in his encouragement and scheduling of Sodality activity so that it truly becomes the central activity of the school.

For several years the Commission on Secondary Schools had been working on an inquiry into the high school curriculum to see if it really does what it purports to do, prepare the majority of the students for college; and secondarily to prepare for life those whose formal education is to cease after graduation. In the past, employers were circularized, alumni were questioned and deans of our schools were invited to offer their comments and constructive criticism. This year a study was made of the success of Jesuit high school graduates as measured by standardized tests and college freshman grades.

Father John F. Sullivan, Chairman of the Commission, reported on the preparation of Jesuit high school graduates as measured by standardized tests. Outlining in some detail the procedure that ought to be followed in such a study, Father Sullivan was quick to realize that a complete survey of a representative sample of our graduates over an extended period of time was unpractical unless a graduate student were to devote his full time to it. He did, however, report on a pilot study made at the University of Detroit comparing the scores of the University of Detroit High School graduates entering the University of Detroit with the scores of graduates from other high schools. In all tests, psychological, mathematics, English and reading, the Jesuit students surpassed the others.

Father Francis P. Sausotte prepared a study of college preparation of Jesuit high school graduates as measured by college freshman marks but,

owing to his inability to attend the meeting, he delegated Father Harry J. Carlin to read the paper. His survey showed that students from Loyola High School, Los Angeles, as a group achieved the same scores in freshman college as they did in high school. *De facto* two-thirds of the group achieved an average of "C" or better.

Father John H. Williams, Chairman of the Jesuit Speech Committee announced that the Committee had completed the speech syllabus for the training of Ours. It is to be divided into two sections, one for novices, juniors and philosophers and another for theologians. The first section, which is to be ready for use in the Fall of 1953, will aim toward training in those skills which make an effective teacher. The latter, which will be published by the Fall of 1954, will give the future priest the theory but above all the practice in the more formal types of public address which he will use in his priestly ministries.

The afternoon session began with a symposium on the school retreat. Father John W. Magan attempted to convey his own convictions that the closed retreat was the only one worthy of the name and that it is a *must* for every student some time during his stay with us. In a most interesting account, he told about the almost miraculous completion of Gonzaga, the first retreat house for youth at Monroe, N. Y. Beginning with little in funds but much in enthusiasm on the part of his volunteer helpers, he was able to convert an old building into the flourishing and self-supporting institution that it is, operating on a year-round basis. He urged others of a similar need elsewhere and the possibility of carrying similar plans to completion.

Regardless of whether the students are to make a closed or a school retreat, there are certain things that can be done to make the students more receptive to the idea and prepare them to enter upon it with the dispositions necessary to reap its full advantages. It was to this task that Father Thomas A. Murphy had devoted a good deal of thought and application at Fairfield College Preparatory School. Selection of a retreat master, experienced in the high school retreat work, is not the least important part of remote preparation. Proper scheduling can help much in getting the best of this much sought after but scarce commodity. Next comes the job of selling the idea of a retreat. Visual aids, placards, the cooperation of the librarian in selecting and displaying an attractive shelf of recent and appropriate spiritual books, discussion at faculty meetings, and the actual scheduling of the program of the retreat should all be considered in the task of selling the idea of the retreat and of holding students' interest once they have embarked upon it.

Second only to the closed retreat, Father John J. Divine is convinced

that an appreciation for good reading is the most noteworthy experience a high school boy can take away with him. Aware of the modern distractions that stand in the way, Father Divine offered two practical suggestions towards encouraging high school students to read the books that are essential for their development. The first is a tripartite listing of books. The *must* books, few in number, should be graded and required of all. The *ought* books are those whose content and artistic expression have lasting value, and, because of their particular subject matter, correlate with a definite unit of other courses. Finally, the *may* books are those read primarily for leisurely personal entertainment. His second suggestion is the formation of extracurricular literary clubs, limited to the few but interested students.

The final portion of the Secondary School Delegates' Meeting was devoted to the question of making Jesuit students more parish minded. Father Christopher O'Donnell offered several suggestions apart from the normal requisites of baptism, Sunday Mass, marriage and last rites by the pastor of the parish church. Boys should be encouraged to serve Mass in their parish; the school program should be accommodated to non-obligatory services such as Holy Week services; have faculty members help at the parishes; encourage boys to contribute to the support of their pastors; train students in reverence; teach the use of the missal and train in the Missa Recitata. There is some debate about the advisability of regular school confession and communion on the grounds that it too closely associates these practices with school life which might later be discontinued. Students should also be encouraged to help in the coaching of parish athletics and dramatics. In general a program of motivation and indoctrination should be instituted whereby habits that are formed should be made general rather than specific.

Monsignor Charles M. Walsh, Director, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine of the New York Archdiocese, addressed the group on what the parish has a right to expect of the school. He pointed out that from experience he knew that zeal and intelligence are not always united in those volunteering for apostolic projects. He encouraged the schools to instil the apostolic spirit in those who are the intellectual leaders of the school.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SECTION

The morning session of the meeting of the College and University delegates was devoted to ROTC problems, Catholic scientists and radio and television, and the afternoon session was given to discussion of fundraising and the report of the Commission on Liberal Arts.

Father Thurston L. Davis followed the trend of ROTC from an extra-

curricular, non-credit program to its present status in many schools of a credit and potentially a cultural program. Currently the average total academic credit in military subjects required for a degree is 16% for ROTC courses. Present thinking is that ROTC is here to stay, that colleges must cooperate in raising the cultural level of the military courses and teachers and, finally, many want military courses to continue to receive credit applicable toward graduation.

For some time criticism has been leveled against Catholic (including Jesuit) institutions of higher learning on the grounds that they are not producing scientists in a measure comparable to other institutions laboring under the same financial and manpower limitations. No more competent person could be found to evaluate these criticisms and offer suggestions than Father Patrick H. Yancey. As member of the National Science Board, Father Yancey is in a position where he can observe from a national viewpoint. The facts show that fewer graduates of Catholic colleges are recognized nationally and that Catholic college and university students are not receiving science scholarships proportionate to their numbers. Admitting several handicaps, he suggests that science teachers be given some time for research; that limited funds be assigned to this purpose, and that Ours be given recognition for work in productive scholarship.

As chairman of the newly founded J.E.A. Committee on Use of Radio and Television in Jesuit Institutions, Father Daniel E. Power read and commented on a carefully phrased report by a 6 man group. Among other things, the committee agreed that we must concern ourselves with television, that each institution assign a man to the work, that it is not feasible to build and operate a non-commercial T.V. station, that we cooperate in principle with state and independent cooperative groups, that we avail ourselves more of existing sustaining time, that courses be offered in radio and T.V., that campus stations are a valuable training field, and that some of Ours be given specialized training in this field. It was observed that television is the mass education medium of the future, but, regardless of our obligation in that field, it is an invaluable medium of community service and good public relations. Students should be guided into the fields of radio and television; a plan for exchange of programs on tape was found impracticable; and F.M. should not be neglected as a quality medium. With a suggestion concerning the structure of the Committee, the report closed.

The afternoon session was devoted primarily to the problem of raising funds. Father Edward Jacklin treated it from the standpoint of a number of schools within a state or geographical region banding together for the

purpose of jointly soliciting help from industrial and other firms within that area. The movement is still young but bears careful watching as industry reaps greater benefits from this type of giving. The practical setup of such a cooperative group was outlined, and typical methods of conducting the interview and distributing the funds were given. The movement is spreading rapidly and holds great promise.

Father Paul Reinert treated the problem from the standpoint of individual solicitation of industry for funds. He pointed out the fallacy of accepting gifts for the purpose of inaugurating new programs. Rather, industry should be sold on what the university already has and convinced of the advisability of supporting that. In short, the entire program should be carefully planned. This means that that proper man on the school faculty should present the proper appeal to the right man in the firm at the most advantageous time. Suggestions regarding time, place and method were carefully outlined. The man making the appeal should be forearmed with likely objections to be raised and have the answers to them. He ended with a statement of basic standards in philanthropy.

In its report read by Chairman Father Paul L. O'Connor, the Commission on Liberal Arts Colleges found that the basic problem was a decline in the enrollment and lack of interest in liberal arts education with an increasing trend toward business administration. With a corresponding trend on the part of business curricula toward liberal subjects, the danger feared by the Commission is that the two will be fused into one, an outcome not favored. That the fight for the cause of our traditional liberal curriculum might not be entirely unrealistic, the Commission suggested a campaign for its retention on the many fronts of press and speech. Cooperative effort was indicted. A need for careful planning of the size and objectives of the liberal arts college was discussed and suggestions were offered that further study be made. Another fundamental problem was a lack of challenge to students which suggested that the methods of the *Ratio* be reexamined. Extra-school work, training of administrators and improvement of the course in religion were also discussed.

MEETING OF GRADUATE SCHOOL DELEGATES

Two problems were treated rather thoroughly in this year's session—the advisability of extension graduate work and criteria for selecting areas in which Jesuit institutions should seek preeminence. This writer is indebted to Father Edward Drummond, secretary of the meeting, for his report from which this summary has been drawn.

One institution is embarking upon a project of extension graduate work for a community of nuns. Fault was found with this on the score that

it may set a precedent and dissipate our resources as well as water down the standards of graduate work. Fordham has what was believed to be the ideal answer to teacher training of Sisters. The Archdiocese in effect considers Fordham as its teacher training institution and pays part of the Sisters' tuition. The nuns pay the remainder. A valuable suggestion was made that benefactors, who may not be interested in graduate work as such, be directed to establish scholarships for Sisters.

Among the criteria proposed upon which Jesuit institutions might select areas of concentration with a view toward achieving preeminence were these: relevance to Catholic culture, danger to the student if courses are not offered under Catholic auspices, importance in forming Catholic leaders and enhancing the prestige of Catholic education, and relation to social and intellectual problems of the day. There was general agreement that in the fields of law and psychiatry all of the criteria applied, but there was a difference of opinion as to whether it was within the scope of Jesuit graduate work to devote greater emphasis to professional fields rather than to strictly academic areas.

BUSINESS SCHOOL SECTION

Delegates of the Commission on Schools and Departments of Business Administration treated three major aspects, the marketing, economics and accounting programs.

Father Michael McPhelin was of the opinion that course content in marketing was of minor importance as it changes so frequently and fundamentally. What was important is to teach students to think what business does, why it does it, is it done best this way, and can it be done better. This places the major emphasis on the liberal subjects which prepare students for any contingencies to which modern trends might take him.

Father W. Seavy Joyce presented the economics curriculum which he introduced in his school. It was generally conceded to be excellent, allowing sufficient electives, but some disagreed with its omitting economic history as a required course.

Father Joseph Butt pointed out that the average accounting student in the country and in Jesuit institutions takes 30 hours of accounting. He offered suggestions based on teaching and placement experience relative to emphasis and timing. It is his conviction that the drudgery courses should all be put in first year, thereby saving the student and the school further grief. He also presented and commented on a survey made of the curricular and personal qualities found most desirable.

ALL-JESUIT ALUMNI DINNER

As a concluding feature of the J.E.A. Annual Meeting, about 900 alumni of Jesuit institutions throughout the country gathered at the Hotel Commodore April 6th for the third annual All-Jesuit Alumni Dinner.

In the presence of the delegate of Cardinal Spellman (who was unavoidably prevented from attending himself), Father Vincent McCormick, American Assistant to Father General, and Father John McMahon, New York Provincial, the alumni were welcomed by Father Laurence McGinley, President of Fordham.

Father Robert I. Gannon was speaker of the occasion and with his usual deft touch rendered his hearers benevolent. Turning to a serious consideration of education problems, he placed the blame for academic ills on the rapid extension of education to those not qualified. America is committed to world leadership without being prepared. Academic freedom had gone rampant and is only now being checked. The major determinant in deciding who is to get the best education is financial. The government can do its part without dictating the course, but the burden will ultimately rest on individuals.

Another year has come and gone with a bigger and, it is hoped, better J.E.A. meeting. Much has been learned; inspiration has been given and administrators have gone back to their respective schools to wrestle with their problems. They have not gone home the wealthier but it is hoped the wiser. As Robert Hutchins said so well, the only problem that money will solve is the financial problem. With God's help they should be better equipped to solve their educational problems.

Program of Annual Meeting Jesuit Educational Association

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, N. Y.

APRIL 5, 6, 1953

+

GENERAL MEETING OF ALL DELEGATES

EASTER SUNDAY, APRIL 5, 4:30 P.M.

Keating Hall, First Floor Lecture Room

Presiding: REV. LAURENCE J. MCGINLEY, S.J.

- Welcome to Fordham REV. LAURENCE J. MCGINLEY, S.J.
Greetings VERY REV. JOHN J. MCMAHON, S.J.
Provincial, New York Province
Report of Executive Director REV. EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

+

DINNER MEETING OF ALL DELEGATES

EASTER SUNDAY, APRIL 5, 6:00 P.M.

Dealy Hall, Students' Dining Room

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

- Address VERY REV. VINCENT A. MCCORMICK, S.J.
American Assistant to Very Rev. Father General

+

MEETING OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DELEGATES

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 10:00 A.M.—12:30 P.M.

Keating Hall, First Floor Lecture Room

Presiding: REV. JAMES J. SHANAHAN, S.J.

- ROTC Problems REV. THURSTON N. DAVIS, S.J.
Catholic Scientists and Science Programs REV. PATRICK H. YANCEY, S.J.
Report of J.E.A. Committee on Use of Radio
and Television in Jesuit Institutions REV. DANIEL E. POWER, S.J.
Chairman

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 2:00—4:00 P.M.

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

- Cooperative Giving to Private
Higher Education by Industry REV. EDWARD G. JACKLIN, S.J.
Individual Giving to Private
Higher Education by Industry REV. PAUL C. REINERT, S.J.
Report of J.E.A. Commission on
Liberal Arts Colleges REV. PAUL L. O'CONNOR, S.J.
Chairman

MEETING OF SECONDARY SCHOOL DELEGATES

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 10:00 A.M.—12:30 P.M.

Keating Hall, Third Floor Lecture Room

Presiding: REV. JAMES R. BARNETT, S.J.

Follow-up Report on 1952 Denver Institute

for Jesuit Principals REV. LORENZO K. REED, S.J.

The Place and Function of the Sodality in

Jesuit High Schools REV. FRANCIS D. RABAUT, S.J.

Report of the J.E.A. Commission on Secondary Schools:

College Preparation of Jesuit High
School Graduates as Measured by:

Standardized Tests REV. JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S.J.

Freshman Marks REV. FRANCIS P. SAUSSOTTE, S.J.

Report of J.E.A. Committee on Speech REV. JOHN H. WILLIAMS, S.J.
Chairman

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 2:00—4:30 P.M.

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

How to Derive More Profit from High School

Retreats—A Symposium:

The Closed Retreat REV. JOHN W. MAGAN, S.J.

Preparation for the Annual Retreat REV. THOMAS A. MURPHY, S.J.

Promotion and Fostering of Good Reading in

Jesuit High Schools REV. JOHN J. DIVINE, S.J.

How to Make Jesuit Students Parish-Minded:

What We Can Do REV. CHRISTOPHER J. McDONNELL, S.J.

What the Parish Has a Right

to Expect VERY REV. MSGR. CHARLES M. WALSH,
*Director, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine,
Archdiocese of New York*

+

MEETING OF GRADUATE SCHOOL DELEGATES

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 10:00 A.M.—12:30 P.M.

Keating Hall, Room 107

Presiding: REV. EDWIN A. QUAIN, S.J.

Panel Discussion: The Apostolic

Function of the Jesuit

Graduate School in America

MEMBERS OF THE J. E. A. COMMISSION

ON GRADUATE SCHOOLS

+

MEETING OF THE JUNIORATE DEANS

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 2:00—4:30 P.M.

Keating Hall, Faculty Lounge

Presiding: REV. EDWIN D. CUFFE, S.J.

MEETING OF SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS OF
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DELEGATES

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 10:00 A.M.—12:30 P.M.

Keating Hall, Room 104

Presiding: REV. JOSEPH A. BUTT, S.J.

Major Programs in the Jesuit Colleges of Business Administration:

- The Marketing Program . . . REV. MICHAEL F. MCPHELIN, S.J.
- The Economics Program . . . REV. W. SEAVEY JOYCE, S.J.
- The Accounting Program . . . REV. JOSEPH A. BUTT, S.J.

+

LUNCHEON FOR ALL DELEGATES

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 12:45 P.M.

Dealy Hall, Students' Dining Room

+

LOCAL COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS

REV. LAURENCE J. MCGINLEY, S.J., *Chairman*

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| REV. EDWIN A. QUAIN, S.J. | REV. WILLIAM J. FARRICKER, S.J. |
| REV. LAWRENCE A. WALSH, S.J. | REV. JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S.J. |
| REV. VINCENT J. HART, S.J. | REV. LORENZO K. REED, S.J. |

(Continued from page 80)

R. Griffin, Assistant Dean; Page 20: Regis College Evening Division, Rev. Harold L. Stansell, S.J., Associate Director; Page 21: Saint Louis University School of Commerce and Finance, Stephen W. Vasquez, Dean; Page 22: Saint Louis University School of Medicine, Rev. Edward T. Foote, S.J., Regent, Dr. James W. Colbert, Dean; Page 23: Seattle University, School of Nursing, Dorothy Walsh, Dean; Page 25: University of San Francisco Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Rev. Alexis I. Mei, S.J., Dean; University of Santa Clara College of Business Administration, O. R. Anderson, Acting Dean. Page 26: University of Scranton College of Arts and Sciences, Rev. John J. Coniff, S.J., Dean; Graduate School, Rev. John J. Coniff, S.J., Dean; Summer Sessions, Rev. John J. Coniff, S.J., Dean. Page 27: Brophy College Preparatory School, delete School; Canisius High School; Rev. Gerald A. Quinn, S.J., Rector; Page 29: insert: McQuaid High School, Rochester, N. Y., Rev. James R. Barnett, S.J., Rector, c/o Catholic Schools Office, 50 Chestnut Street, Rochester 1, N. Y. Page 31: change Xavier Labor School to Xavier Institute of Industrial Relations; Rev. John M. Corridan, S.J., Associate Director. Page 35: delete BC* under St. Joseph's College, Ceylon; delete C* under St. Michael's College, Ceylon. Page 38: San Jose Seminary, Rev. James J. Meany, S.J., Prefect of Studies, Major Seminary.

News From The Field

CENTRAL OFFICE

DIRECTORY CHANGES AND CORRECTIONS: Page 4: *Very Rev. William F. Maloney, S.J., Provincial, Maryland Province*; *Rev. Michael B. Majoli, S.J., Socius to Provincial of the New Orleans Province*; Page 6: Commission on Secondary Schools: delete 1953 *Rev. J. F. Sullivan, S.J., Chairman, Univ. of Detroit High School, Detroit*; add: 1955: *Rev. R. A. Bernert, S.J., Chairman*; 1958: *Rev. M. F. Kennelly, S.J., St. John's High School, Shreveport, La.* Commission on Liberal Arts Colleges: 1953: delete *Rev. A. A. Lemieux, S.J., Seattle University, Seattle, Wash.*; add 1955: *Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass.*; 1958: *Rev. W. F. Kelley, S.J., The Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr.* Commission on Professional Schools: delete *Rev. E. B. Bunn, S.J., Province Prefect of Studies, Maryland Province.* Commission on Seminaries: *Rev. R. O. Dates, S.J., Bellarmine College, Plattsburg, N. Y.*, *Rev. T. J. Wolf, S.J., Chairman*, *Rev. J. M. Moreau, S.J., Jesuit House of Studies, Spring Hill, Ala.* Commission on Graduate Schools: delete 1952: *Rev. S. E. Dollard, S.J., Chairman, Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.* and 1953: *Rev. James L. Burke, S.J., Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.*; change *Rev. Edwin A. Quain, S.J., Chairman*, and 1955: *Rev. G. F. Yates, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.*; add 1958: *Rev. J. H. Martin, S.J., University of San Francisco, San Francisco, Cal.* Commission on Schools and Departments of Business Administration: delete 1953: *Rev. Henry J. Wirtenberger, S.J., University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.*; add 1958: *Rev. Michael F. McPhelin, S.J., Fordham University, New York, N. Y.* Page 7: History: American Jesuit Historical Conference, Chairman: *Rev. John A. Kemp, S.J., Loyola University, Chicago*; Medicine: Conference of Jesuit Medical Schools, Chairman: *Rev. Paul A. McNally, S.J., Georgetown University*; Social Work: Conference of Jesuit Social Work, Chairman: *Rev. Aloysius H. Scheller, S.J., St. Louis University.* Page 13: delete *Rev. William F. Maloney, S.J., Executive Assistant to President, Georgetown University*; change School of Medicine, Telephone Emerson 2-4000. School of Nursing: *Rev. L. C. McHugh, S.J., Regent.* Page 14: Holy Cross College delete S; Page 15: John Carroll University, Summer Session, *Rev. Edward C. McCue, S.J., Dean*, *Rev. Hugh B. Rodman, S.J., Assistant Dean*; Page 17: Loyola University, Los Angeles, College of Engineering, *Rev. L. Clyde Werts, S.J., Regent*, *Daniel E. Whelan, Dean*; Page 19: Marquette University Graduate School, George
(Continued on page 79)