

4082-9
3

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

JUNE 1955

MAJOR TRENDS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

ST. IGNATIUS AND JESUIT EDUCATION

SOCIAL RELATIONS OF ADOLESCENT STUDENTS

SURVEY 1954 JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

Vol. XVIII, No. 1

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Contributors

The Commission on Secondary Schools of the Jesuit Educational Association follows up a previous study of inquiring into the higher education pursued by 1954 Jesuit high school graduates. Under the chairmanship of FATHER ROMAN A. BERNERT, Principal of Marquette University High School, the Commission consists of FATHERS JOHN A. CONVERY, JOHN J. FOLEY, and J. VINCENT WATSON, Principals of Scranton Preparatory School, Boston College High School and Brooklyn Preparatory School respectively and FATHER MICHAEL F. KENNELLY, Rector of Jesuit High School, Tampa.

FATHER THURSTON N. DAVIS as former college dean and currently associate editor of *America* is in a strategic position of interest and access to weigh current trends in American non-Jesuit higher education.

FATHER GEORGE E. GANSS follows up the publication of his book *St. Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University* with comments on reviews and research conclusions more properly restricted to a Jesuit audience.

FATHER VINCENT MCCORRY, author and spiritual director, suggests a forceful practical approach to guide student counsellors in their dealing with a current social phenomenon.

FATHER EDWARD J. MESSMER, speaking in behalf of the Le Moyne Plan for teaching theology to lay students, takes exceptions to certain impressions conveyed in an article in the *Quarterly* of last January and is answered by its author, FATHER GERALD VAN ACKEREN.

FATHER ROBERT H. SRINGER, professor of moral theology at Woodstock College, presents a much disputed and practical case, that of high school students' "going steady."

277499

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

June 1955

CONTENTS

MAJOR TRENDS IN AMERICAN NON-JESUIT HIGHER EDUCATION

Thurston N. Davis, S.J. 5

ST. IGNATIUS AND JESUIT EDUCATION

George E. Ganss, S.J. 17

SOCIAL RELATIONS OF ADOLESCENT STUDENTS

THEORY

Robert H. Springer, S.J. 33

PRACTICE

Vincent P. McCorry, S.J. 41

COLLEGES ATTENDED BY 1954 JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

Commission on Secondary Schools 47

PROGRAM OF ANNUAL MEETING

Jesuit Educational Association 53

LETTERS ON COLLEGE THEOLOGY

Edward J. Messmer, S.J. and Gerald Van Ackeren, S.J. . . . 56

NEWS FROM THE FIELD 59

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>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland 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>
JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
THOMAS A. REED, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
ARTHUR J. SHEEHAN, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
WILLIAM M. WELLER, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 East 84th Street, New York 28, N.Y.

COPYRIGHT, JUNE 1955

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

Major Trends in American Non-Jesuit Higher Education

THURSTON N. DAVIS, S.J.*

Tonight, if we can take a leaf out of Father Kleutgen's *Rhetoric*, it ought to be the one on *praeteritio*. I am going to use that device a number of times in the next few minutes, and I hope you will, too. Before passing over in silence some major trend in non-Jesuit higher education which each of you considers particularly noteworthy, I would like to ask you yourselves to gloss graciously over the fact that a copyreader from an ivory tower in Manhattan is up here trying to report on the educational weather to brethren who are out in it all the time.

His praeteritionibus peractis, let us go back fifty years to the office of one of your remote predecessors. If he was a dean, he probably kept all the students' grades in a ruled copybook. The chances are he did not have a secretary. He had certainly never heard of I B M or public relations. When he locked up his office at 5:30 P.M., he was not going to a fundraising dinner. His incumbency was in what are now called the good old days.

Today it is all different. You are no longer simply rectors or prefects of studies. In the constantly expanding educational universe of today, you are known as "educational statesmen." And rightly. There are no autarkic little colleges any more. These days colleges spawn relationships faster than they can buy new desks behind which to put new administrators. Newly discovered publics are forever looming up on the college horizon: students on several levels, their parents, our alumni, business and industry, our campus neighbors, the high schools which "feed" us, the cities we serve, our potential benefactors, government officials, the accrediting agencies and the big and small foundations. Today's colleges have obligations which go even beyond our own shores. Through our foreign students, our Fulbright grantees, a Junior Year in Heidelberg and a team of faculty-members in Turkey, colleges get used to living in a kind of educational U N.

This increasing complexity of present-day higher education is one of the hard facts of life. We can no longer shut our front gates and tell the rest of the world to keep off our academic grass. In a hundred ways we are laced in with persons and institutions which themselves are tied into

* Address delivered at the Dinner Meeting of All Delegates, Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, April 10, 1955, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

us. Is this a trend? Is it simply a drift? Whatever it is, it is a fact which comes popping across your desks a dozen times a morning.

If these new relationships do not shape up into a trend, they do comprise a set of techniques for the success and survival of a college in 1955. These techniques make quite a litany. It is a litany of secular methods by which we tell the world our needs (*Ego vero egenus et pauper sum*) and fend off people and events likely to cause trouble (*Nihil proficiat inimicus in nobis*).

We say it all when we say "public relations." P R means fund-raising and its heartaches; it means the new partnership of the colleges with business and industry; it means getting into cordial relations with the foundations. Public relations imply faculty and student and alumni relations, placement, public information, publicity, printing, publishing, purchasing and recruiting. It means serving our local, national and international communities through adult education programs, guidance and testing services, T V panels and radio stations and a foreign student adviser. As of September 15, 1954, public relations for 35 American educational institutions meant they had signed 43 Foreign Operations Administration contracts committing their faculty personnel to teach in 24 foreign countries.

To the man in the street who reads the headlines some colleges seem fairly successful in their attempt to juggle all these hoops. Among non-Jesuit institutions, Notre Dame impresses people as an alert, "heads-up," thoroughly American college.

At Notre Dame, evidently, "public relations" is not just a sign on an office door. It works. Today, when people say "Notre Dame," they are not thinking only of the golden dome or the germ-free backfield. The Ford Foundation thought of her Center for Soviet and East European Studies last September, and wrote a check for \$57,500. Could this be connected with the fact that the Notre Dame Foundation, Greater New York Division, has offices at 441 Lexington Avenue, or that during 1954 the university's public information bureau sent out about 250 well-written and appealing news stories?

On February 5 Father John J. Cavanaugh announced that Notre Dame's gifts and grants for 1954 totalled \$2,289,113.94, which is 55 per cent or \$1,470,851.13 better than the 1953 total. There may be a relation between these figures and the fact that the average alumnus gave \$49.54 in 1954; each year Notre Dame Clubs all over the world hold a local Communion breakfast on the Sunday nearest to December 8; April 18 each year is Universal Notre Dame Night; everywhere on the globe South Bend alumni express their freemasonry by getting together that night.

Every Thursday night for the past five years in New York about 20 Notre Dame alumni have been giving their time, money and services to running a Career-Planning Clinic. In 1954 the Clinic placed 199 men and women, graduates of 47 colleges. Only 36 of the 199 were from South Bend. The man in the street is more likely to have heard of the Clinic than of the 45 distinguished professors who are now being publicized as visiting lecturers at Notre Dame, or of the early-March Conference for Deans on Liberal Arts and Christian Culture, or of the address January 11 at Notre Dame by Abba Eban, Israeli Ambassador to the United States. But the American public will certainly see the movie which Columbia Pictures has agreed to film on the Notre Dame story, with John Ford directing. All this adds up to the kind of public relations or educational diplomacy we admire and might imitate.

II

While the educational statesmen are busy plying their diplomatic works of Martha, Mary the teacher stays behind in the college classroom. What is happening there?

Philosophy. American philosophy has been for some time in the doldrums of logical positivism. A book written in 1936 by Prof. A. J. Ayer of Oxford—*Language, Truth and Logic*¹—won Ayer disciples by the hundreds, not only in Great Britain, but throughout the English-speaking world. At the August, 1953 World Congress of Philosophy in Brussels the gulf of misunderstanding yawned deep and wide between Continental philosophers on the one hand, and British and American pragmatists and logical positivists on the other. It appeared to shock many of the outnumbered British and Americans that respectable European philosophers actually took metaphysics seriously. Dr. Max Rieser, writing in the Feb. 4, 1954 *Journal of Philosophy*, said the two groups were “intellectually not on speaking terms” and lived in “two different universes of discourse.”

Perhaps the tide is beginning to turn. John Dewey is not the untouchable he was five years ago. In the British journal, *Encounter*, Philip Toynbee dealt the logical positivists a deadly blow recently with an article called “Sense and Nonsense.”² Over here the Metaphysical Society of America, founded in 1949 to meet the need felt by philosophers who had supped full of the programs of the American Philosophical Association, numbers about 350 members from all over the country. Roughly 25 per cent of the membership is Catholic. It is worth noting that about 55 per

¹ 2nd rev. ed., New York: Dover, 1951.

² *Encounter*, Nov. 1954, pp. 7-14.

cent of M S A's members come from the larger, Eastern universities. They are predominantly the older members of the faculty since younger men rarely want to get tarred with the metaphysical brush before their reputations are established. At any rate, there are heartening signs.

Languages. Last week, April 5-7, the College English Association for Liberal Education and the Executive held its seventh national conference in Schenectady. You have the whole story when you know that Union College and General Electric were the co-hosts this year. The C E A, realizing that the liberal arts are being threatened in today's higher education, has invited business and industry to share their concern. It is a marriage of convenience, intended—as a recent brochure reads—"to help shape that popular culture of adequate quality which is the goal of enlightened academic and executive leadership."

Worried over the decline of modern foreign language study in high schools and colleges, the Modern Language Association is doing something about it. Last Christmas week, at the MLA convention in New York, Kenneth Mildenberger, assistant director of the M L A Foreign Language Program, made an encouraging report on the progress of foreign language study in the public elementary schools of the nation.

What is the background of this problem? In 1915 40.6 per cent of public high school students were studying a foreign language, but by 1949 this percentage had skidded down to 13.7. In 1913 89 per cent of the nation's colleges listed foreign language as an entrance requirement. Only 70 per cent demanded it in 1922. Today 70 per cent do *not* demand it.

At least we can report good news from today's grade schools. In 1953 there were 145,000 pupils taking foreign language courses in our public elementary schools alone, and in 1954 there was a known total of almost 330,000. Of these, 209,549 were getting their instruction from a teacher in the classroom, while 119,522 were receiving it through radio lessons broadcast regularly into the school. In 1954 more than 1,350 public grade schools in about 280 cities and towns were providing instruction in Spanish, French and German, in that order of frequency.

A recent survey of 550 member institutions of the Association of American Colleges, conducted by Randolph-Macon Woman's College, showed that only 50 of the 550 colleges had 50 or more students enrolled in the study of Greek, and that only 11 had 200 or more enrolled in Latin. Since 1929, Latin enrolments have dropped 53 per cent, Greek (already low) only 20 per cent. Here, unlike what we find in the case of modern foreign languages, there is little or no pump-priming going on at the pre-college level. Last Dec. 4 I attended a meeting of the public school Latin teachers of Greater New York, who met to discuss "the rapidly worsening language situation in the public high schools of the city." The minutes of that meeting might conservatively be summarized as two hours of almost

unrelieved weeping and gnashing of dentures. Their most serious problem: few if any young teachers are being recruited for Latin.

Mathematics. Something worth noting has been happening in mathematics. Mathematics departments used to feel themselves too much the servants of the "practical" people in physics and chemistry, who insisted that mathematics be long on problems and short on theory. But today mathematicians are emphasizing the wholeness and independence of their discipline. Following Edna St. Vincent Millay's principle, "Euclid alone has looked on beauty bare," they are now stressing the study of mathematical principles for their own sakes.

Today, by a kind of paradox, mathematics departments find that they can turn their abstract speculations to all kinds of hitherto unthought-of practical uses. They are making practical suggestions to economists, psychologists, physicists, engineers and social scientists. Thus, students in a wide field of studies must today school themselves in what are called mathematical models, in the theory of games of strategy and in statistics viewed as research into inductive rules of human behavior. Today's mathematician asserts that he can adapt the ancient skills of the gambler to what he conceives as games played against Nature. In public health, city planning, traffic control, the study of group tensions, as well as in military, naval and air science, "game theory" has a thousand new uses. Mathematical laymen will find Leonid Hurwicz's article, "Game Theory and Decisions," in the Feb. 1955 *Scientific American*, a real help.

Social Sciences. With the slackening off of Latin, Jesuit colleges have had a boom in the social sciences. We are not singular. The Harvard presidential report for 1953-1954 contains a graph showing that in 1930 Harvard students concentrating in the humanities numbered 1,200 and students in the social sciences only 1,100. In 1954, however, though the Harvard College student body had increased by more than a thousand in the meantime, the humanities attracted less than 900, the social sciences more than 2,100.

The "look" of contemporary American higher education is to some extent determined by the directions taken by the social sciences. Some say that as these sciences mature they are developing a methodology which rigorously excludes values, and that the old battle between religion and science is today being waged in the fields of sociology, social psychology and political science. Everett S. Graham, pseudonym of a Catholic professor of political science in a large secular university, recently propounded this thesis in an article which some thought exaggerated in certain of its claims.³ The 943 pages of Part One of the hearings before

³ Graham, E. S., "Value-free methodology: a sectarian weapon," *America*, Oct. 9, 1954, pp. 37-39.

the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations⁴ throw some light on the questions raised by Dr. Graham. Unfortunately, the so-called Reece Committee, by overstating the case against the foundations, has made it almost impossible for objective critics to highlight what may have been the genuine excesses of some of the foundations in supporting a value-free methodology for the social sciences.

Graham claims that the "great effort of the secularized elite is not, as they profess, to respect everyone's search for truth and to keep wide open the doors of the search. It is nothing less than first to destroy the Catholic Church, and then all other systems of theology." Father Gordon George, S.J., while admitting such a trend, comments: "Almost as futile as retreat would be an opposition based on mere invective and recrimination. . . . Catholic sociologists can best serve the cause of religion by being outstanding sociologists. . . . If truth is to triumph, it must be from within."⁵

Physical Sciences. Enrolments may be sky-high in the social sciences, but industry, technology and defense are focusing much of the nation's attention—and a sizeable amount of her budget—on our physical science laboratories. The architect, Frank Lloyd Wright, speaking Mar. 16 at Princeton, said this country is "under the heel of science." Today the physical scientist is a candidate for the office of philosopher-king. Einstein, Bush, Urey and Oppenheimer make headlines with casual statements on ethics or society.

In a sense there is a new relationship between man and Nature. The scientist appears to have mastered Nature. As Charles Morgan writes in his preface to *The Burning Glass*, no one dreamt until yesterday that Nature, "the mighty, the powerful, the enduring, the stubborn, would ever abdicate in favor of (man's) pygmy self."⁶ This, of course, is in large measure rhetoric, but it catches the mood of much popular sentiment about our scientists. Robert Jungk's book *Tomorrow Is Already Here*, seems almost to prove it true, with chapter and verse.⁷

These confused, lonely and dedicated men of science, symbolized by J. Robert Oppenheimer, seem tragic figures when looked at up close. Oppenheimer's letter of self-defense, published April 13, 1954, says that as a young professor, "I never read a newspaper or a current magazine like

⁴ House of Representatives, Eighty-Third Congress, Second Session on H. Res. 217. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1954.

⁵ George, S.J., Gordon, "Some sociologists out of bounds," *America*, Jan. 15, 1955, pp. 397-398.

⁶ Morgan, Charles, *The Burning Glass*, with a preface, "Power over Nature." London: Macmillan, 1954. Cf. *New York Times*, Feb. 28, 1954.

⁷ Jungk, Robert, *Tomorrow Is Already Here*, tr. by Marguerite Waldman. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954.

Time or *Harper's*; I had no radio, no telephone; I learned of the stock-market crash of 1929 only long after the event." Was Dr. Lawrence S. Kubie, psychiatrist at the Yale School of Medicine, thinking of men like Oppenheimer when he wrote of the "psychologically unhygienic conditions" of the scientific life?⁸

In his Columbia University Bicentenary radio broadcast last Dec. 26, Dr. Oppenheimer spoke with poignancy of the scientist's lot—his loss of a "sense of community" with other men, and of how the scientist, "knowing his limitations, knowing the evils of superficiality and the terrors of fatigue, will have to cling to what is close to him, to what he knows, to what he can do, to his friends and his tradition and his love, lest he be dissolved in a universal confusion and know nothing and love nothing."⁹

The findings of Robert H. Knapp and H. B. Goodrich in *Origins of American Scientists*¹⁰ would lead us to think that these problems, though real, are not especially relevant to Catholic colleges. Their research led Knapp and Goodrich to underscore, and then to attempt to explain, the "conspicuously inferior position of virtually all Catholic institutions in the production of scientists."¹¹ Catholic colleges, they write, differ but little from the general run of American colleges in "financial resources, student-faculty ratio, cost of attendance, and quality of students, so far as could be ascertained."¹²

Knapp and Goodrich give four reasons when they come to explain the "inferior position" of Catholic colleges in this particular regard. First, they point out the fact that Catholic colleges are to a great extent located in the industrial East, which has not distinguished itself for the production of scientists. Second, they say that the parent European cultures of most American Catholics have not in recent times been conspicuous for scientific work. A third observation is that Catholicism has rejected the philosophy of physical monism under which science has made many of its advances. Their fourth remark concerns the fact that Catholics and Catholic schools have not succumbed to secularization. They suggest that secularization can be looked upon as an occasion for the production of scientists, because "scientists began to emerge in larger numbers from certain Protestant-affiliated institutions at the very time that these institutions first showed clear signs of secularization in purpose, interests and ethics."¹³

⁸ Kubie, L. S., "Some Unsolved Problems of the Scientific Career," *American Scientist*, Oct. 1953 and Jan. 1954.

⁹ *New York Times*, Dec. 27, 1954.

¹⁰ Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 288.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 288.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 276.

This analysis raises all sorts of important questions about science, scientists and the colleges. We can not go into them tonight. One point, however, I would like to pursue. This is the question of secularism.

III

The educational weather in America, generally speaking, is stormy. The wind may not be blowing so hard on the upper levels, but down below there are storm signals out all the way from nursery school to senior high. A local "twister" like the old Oregon school case, and minor gusts like the ones over buses, lunches and released time, were probably preliminaries to the big hurricanes of the future.

Let's drop the metaphors. Culturally and spiritually, we are in a period of transition. The question for our people and our schools is—a transition to what? More and more frequently these days we hear the British say that modern England is post-Christian. It sounds sort of *avant-garde* to say the same of the United States, and yet, despite our recent religious revival, "post-Christian" is beginning to seem like an accurate designation for certain of our institutions. We certainly need not hedge about applying it to many non-Catholic colleges and to American public education generally. The article, "Conscience and the Undergraduate," by Dartmouth's president, John Sloan Dickey, in the current *Atlantic Monthly*,¹⁴ tells us how a post-Christian college thinks of man's relations to God.

Post-Christian ideas have consequences. One is the booklet, *Public Education and the Future of America*, issued in January by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association. It mirrors the thinking of educational spokesmen like Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer,¹⁵ Ernest O. Melby,¹⁶ R. Freeman Butts,¹⁷ Theodore Brameld,¹⁸ William O. Stanley¹⁹ and others in influential places who promote a philosophy of education which is nativist, "scientific," secular and "democratic" in the totalitarian, Jacobin tradition.

There is no lack of opposition to the educational Jacobins. Some of it is

¹⁴ *The Atlantic Monthly*, April 1955, pp. 31-35.

¹⁵ "The Clerical Challenge to the Schools," in E. O. Melby and M. Puner (eds.), *Freedom and Public Education*. New York: Praeger, 1953, pp. 76-88. Reprinted from *The Atlantic Monthly*, March 1952.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, "Introduction," pp. 1-16. Also *American Education under Fire*. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1951.

¹⁷ *The American Tradition in Religion and Education*. Boston: Beacon, 1950.

¹⁸ *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*. Yonkers, N.Y.: World Book, 1950.

¹⁹ *Education and Social Integration*. New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1953.

intelligent, some not so. Mortimer Smith,²⁰ Arthur E. Bestor,²¹ Gordon K. Chalmers,²² Douglas Bush²³ and a host of journalists, parents and teachers are firing away with everything from books like *The Diminished Mind*²⁴ and *The Nihilism of John Dewey*²⁵ to a movie like "Blackboard Jungle" or an exposé in *Collier's*. William W. Brickman, whose reviews of all this writing on both sides of the question have been so balanced, was recently the object of a letter-writing campaign of protests from the teachers' colleges because he published an article by Prof. Bestor in *School and Society*.²⁶

The controversy is not solely over religion, but an educational philosophy based on religion is the ultimate principle dividing the two camps. Just now a tidal wave of religion or religiosity seems to be sweeping the country. It remains to be seen whether it is sufficiently deep, strong and sustained to loosen the piles of secularism in our teachers' colleges and universities.

Statistics show a rise in church attendance. Signs urge us to take our families to church next Sunday. "Religion can be fun" reads an ad for a movie about Senate chaplain Peter Marshall. Harvard is collecting \$6 million to take the cobwebs off its dusty old Divinity School. President Eisenhower speaks often—and sincerely—of religious values. The Rockefeller Foundation cut off its funds to Dr. Kinsey, and John D. Rockefeller, Jr. ticketed \$20 million to stimulate Protestant theology. Radio and T V are swamped with religious programs. The director of the Oak Ridge Institute for Nuclear Studies, Dr. William G. Pollard, was ordained last May to the Protestant Episcopal ministry. Seminars are forever forming to discuss an "ethics for our time." Railroads print prayers on their dining-car menus. Prof. Arnold Toynbee prays in his tenth volume to Christ, Buddha, Zeno, Francis Xavier and John Wesley.²⁷ What does it all mean?

Dean Liston Pope of Yale last month scored our religious T V shows. They confuse, he said, "convulsions and conversions"; they promise you

²⁰ *And Madly Teach*; A layman looks at public school education. Chicago: Regnery, 1949.

²¹ *Educational Wastelands*; The retreat from learning in our public schools. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1953.

²² *The Republic and the Person*; A discussion of necessities in modern American education. Chicago: Regnery, 1952.

²³ "Education for All Is Education for None," *New York Times Magazine*, Jan. 9, 1955, p. 13.

²⁴ By Mortimer Smith. Chicago: Regnery, 1954.

²⁵ By P. K. Crosser. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955.

²⁶ "Education, Pedagogy and Dr. Bestor," *School and Society*, Nov. 14, 1953, pp. 153-154.

²⁷ Toynbee, A. J., *A Study of History*. New York: Oxford, 10 vols., 1948-1954. Vol. X, pp. 143-144.

"a song in your heart or a shot in the arm." Dr. Norman Vincent Peale's *Power of Positive Thinking*²⁸ has been getting a lot of negative criticism lately. Rev. James A. Pike, dean of the Episcopal Cathedral of St. John the Divine, disapproves of our "noisy religiosity on the public level." In a little book called *The Drive Toward Reason*, Lyman Bryson suggests that our religious renaissance does not involve our key people. It is taking place, he says, on a populous but unimportant periphery of our society. The "intellectual leaders" of contemporary America "are after other quarry."²⁹ Our best brains and finest imaginations "are not primarily concerned with values." Bryson says: "It is a simple matter of fact, from which respectable public opinion shrinks in dismay, that the ablest men do not now go into the priesthoods and the ministries as much as they have done in the past."³⁰ They become scientists and engineers.

Yet it is an undeniable fact that religion is having a revival in the colleges. Religion-in-Life programs are multiplying. The Religious Education Association reports real progress. The Newman Clubs are jumping with new life. These are honest gains which deserve all the cooperation we can give them. They may be making no more than a dent on the tough hide of academic secularism, but they are worth a hundred times more than all the weasel-worded cant about "moral and spiritual values," as that phrase is bandied about by secularists.

Bolstering the new interest which higher education is taking in religion is the intelligent and respected movement known as the New Conservatism. The name should not confuse us. This is not a group of paid pamphleteers engaged by the National Association of Manufacturers. The New Conservatives are a serious and growing band of young intellectuals who are trying to make two points. The first is critical, the second constructive. They believe that democracy has become too egalitarian, has lost touch with its roots, is threatened by an apotheosis of the "common man," is hag-ridden by the tyranny of public opinion. On the other hand, they want to do something positive to prevent democracy's breakdown.

This conservative revolution has produced quite an extensive literature by now. The merest sampling gives us Alan Valentine's *The Age of Conformity*,³¹ Russell Kirk's *The Conservative Mind*,³² *A Program for Conservatives*³³ and the new book, *Academic Freedom*,³⁴ Walter Lippmann's

²⁸ New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.

²⁹ New York: Harper, 1954, p. 50.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

³¹ Chicago: Regnery, 1954.

³² Chicago: Regnery, 1953.

³³ Chicago: Regnery, 1954.

³⁴ Chicago: Regnery, 1955.

Essays in the Public Philosophy,³⁵ Peter Viereck's *Conservatism Revisited*³⁶ and Robert A. Nisbet's *The Quest for Community*.³⁷ Clinton Rossiter's newly-published *Conservatism in America*³⁸ not only puts the case extremely well, but has an extensive bibliography on the subject.

These men, and others with them, each with the accent and emphasis proper to his special discipline, are insisting on a complete rejection of the Jacobinism which is slowly eroding the foundations of Western democracy. We must have reverence, they say, for the history, traditions and internal structure of our society. We must reaffirm the natural law, which Lippmann felicitously names "the public philosophy." The freedoms we defend rest on a philosophy of man which stems from the religious tradition of Western civilization. We have inherited those freedoms, but we shall lose them if we abandon the ground in which they are rooted.

These reflections, repeated to a roomful of Jesuits, do not dazzle with their originality, but the fact that insights like these are dawning for the first time—and with a startling impact—on many of our contemporaries is highly significant.

With the quiet eloquence which marks his final pages, Walter Lippmann says: "... philosophy and theology are the ultimate and decisive studies in which we engage. . . . I do not contend, though I hope, that the decline of Western society will be arrested if the teachers in our schools and universities come back to the great tradition of the public philosophy. But I do contend that the decline, which is already far advanced, cannot be arrested if the prevailing philosophers oppose this restoration and revival. . . ."³⁹

This is the spirit and these the principles by which the New Conservatism would rid our house of its termites and shore up its ancient pillars. The movement has only begun. If there is time, it will advance and perhaps prevail.

One conclusion suggests itself. Right now our Catholic colleges have an incomparable opportunity to enter by this door into the intellectual life of the nation. These questions will soon form the topic of a great national debate. This is an hour when Catholic higher education can make a matchless contribution to the formulation of national policy. If we participate with sympathy, competence and charity, there is no telling what we may achieve. Fighting secularism means talking, often and at length, with secularists. Because this is not easy and has not seemed fruitful, we have neglected it. As you well know, the capacity of many university

³⁵ Boston: Little, Brown, 1955.

³⁶ New York: Scribner, 1949.

³⁷ New York: Oxford, 1953.

³⁸ New York: Knopf, 1955.

³⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

people for misunderstanding words such as "reason," "ethics," "tradition," "natural law," "causality" or "metaphysics" has to be experienced to be believed. We may call it a semantic problem, but its roots go deep into a snarl of attitudes on history, society, philosophy and religion. Nevertheless, the dialogue with secularism should not be postponed.

The alleged Catholic ghetto, if it ever existed, exists no longer. Archbishop Richard J. Cushing made that point last May 4 to the Clergy Alumni of Boston College.⁴⁰ We have been here a long time now. What we have accomplished is good. Today respect for the Church and for Catholic education is greater than we realize. Those who would keep us on the periphery of American higher education are challenged by those who look to us, far more hopefully than we imagine, for the great affirmations they know we have to make. D. W. Brogan, the Cambridge historian, recently chided American Catholics for their overly apologetic attitude toward their own universities. American Catholics, he writes, do not "allow enough for the recent rapid rise in the general academic status of some Catholic universities."⁴¹

The educational weather is far from fair. We live, to borrow a phrase from Robert Oppenheimer, in "a great open windy world." There have been ages when the sailing was smoother, and when colleges could afford to be tight little ships. This is not one of them. But it is a great time to be alive and working, for both the challenge and the opportunity are great. The horizon is open, wide open. And if it is a bit windy—well, the wind is ever a bringer of new things.

⁴⁰ "A Never-Failing Source," *Woodstock Letters*, Feb. 1955, pp. 10-17.

⁴¹ In a review of *The Catholic Church and World Affairs* (eds. Waldemar Gurian and M. A. Fitzsimons), in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, Jan. 1955, p. 158.

St. Ignatius and Jesuit Education

GEORGE E. GANSS, S.J.*

Without binding me, your Program Committee kindly suggested that this paper should aim: to summarize the problem, chief data, and conclusions in *St. Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University*;¹ to discuss any controversial ideas which might appear so far in reviews; and to point up applications to Jesuit higher education in the United States. I gladly make these points my outline. Thus the paper will give the audience an opportunity, as the Committee hoped, to propose difficulties about the book which might not appropriately be raised in public print. Also, presentation of a paper to this all-Jesuit audience will enable me to use documents and to treat some matters which seemed improper in the book destined for the general public.

I. THE PROBLEM, CHIEF DATA, AND CONCLUSIONS

The central problem of the book can be phrased thus. In Jesuit education, what are the perennial principles, derived from Saint Ignatius himself, by which we can guide ourselves in adapting Jesuit education to the changing circumstances around us? Further, what is their documentation in the writings and practice of Ignatius?

Was there reason to raise that question again? There seemed to be, because of experiences which came to me within the past sixteen years at Marquette University in my day to day work as teacher, chaplain, counsellor, director of a department, member of various committees, and chairman of the Committee on Spiritual Welfare. Whether we liked it or not, the educational world was changing. For example, to achieve the objectives of Jesuit education through the medium of Latin or Greek was growing harder year by year. Moreover, precisely what were those objectives? And what was their documentation? In discussions, there seemed to be uncertainty or even false assumption about the ages of the students and about the meaning in Jesuit documents of terms such as college, university, faculty, the liberal arts, scholastics, and externs. Also, what did the early Jesuits conceive education to be? Was it the formation of the

* Address delivered at the General Meeting of All Delegates, Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, April 10, 1955, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

¹ Ganss, George E., S.J., *St. Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University*, Milwaukee, Marquette University Press, 1954.

man—and that alone? Then perhaps the curricular offerings would need little change from century to century. Or was it the formation of the man to take his part capably in the social order of his own era? In that case, a curriculum adequate in 1905 might require many readjustments by 1955. In these discussions, the spirit of the *Ratio Studiorum* was mentioned often, its precise nature remained vague or subjective.

To clarify these issues no better source appeared than Ignatius' own writings. In the book which finally issued from studying them, the chief data have been drawn from his *Constitutions* and *Letters*, and from the historical, social, cultural, and educational environment of his era.

Evidence soon showed that Ignatius accepted the education of lay students among the ministries of the Society as a means of promoting the salvation and perfection of the students, in the hope that they might vigorously and intelligently leaven their social environment with the doctrine and spirit of the Kingdom of Christ. Since solid and strong intellectual formation was necessary to achieve this, he appropriated the best elements he could find emerging in the educational systems of his day, Catholicized them, and organized them into an instrument truly fitted to achieve his purposes in his own era.²

Chapter nine lists fifteen important educational principles which may be said to comprise the spirit of Ignatius' *Constitutions* on education. Among them are these. For Ignatius, education was a process of training the whole man to the excellence or virtue of all his natural and supernatural faculties that he might become a capable social apostle. In this training, accomplished especially through self-activity to supplement the lectures, an important, basic place was given to intellectual formation. But Ignatius did not want the training to stop there. He desired the officials and teachers to penetrate through the intellect to the will, and to further the highest moral and theological virtues. He planned a sequence of studies to lead to a scientifically reasoned Catholic outlook on life. That outlook was the center of integration for all the elements in the curriculum. He made theology the foremost branch in the curriculum. It furnishes the evidence for the truths which are the chief source of the well-reasoned Catholic outlook and the most effective motive of intensive Christian living. The other principles concern the teachers' personal interest in the students, training psychologically fitted to students' ages, transmission of old truths and discovery of new ones, adaptation of procedures to varying circumstances, alertness to preserve, discard, and add according to contemporary interests and needs, integrated lower and higher faculties which furnish indeed a complete plan of Jesuit liberal education.

These perennial principles comprise the spirit permeating the more

² *Ibid.*, p. 18.

changeable³ procedures detailed in the *Ratio Studiorum* of 1599. The *Ratio* presupposed rather than stated them, and aimed to carry them into practice with the greatest possible efficiency for its own era.

Also, as we shall see, these principles have been compressed with phenomenal accuracy into Very Reverend Father General Janssen's *Instructio* of 1948, especially in Articles 7 and 8.

II. IDEAS ARISING FROM BOOK REVIEWS

Apparently time has not been sufficient for the appearance of many learned reviews raising controversial ideas. The first in print is the scholarly article of Father Matthew J. Fitzsimons, S.J., in the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* for March, 1955. His criticism is thoroughly constructive, and I value it highly. It will receive careful consideration when opportunity allows. To mention two of his points briefly, I did not intend to depreciate *eloquentia*, but slipped into an incomplete description. To form the *vir et doctus et bonus et peritus dicendi* is an admirable educational ideal. About the meaning, nature, and importance of *praelectio* my mind will remain open until I can complete further investigation.

Father Fitzsimons fortunately raised another point which requires explanation here. I heartily concur in his statement that the *Instructio pro Assistentia Americae* (approved by Very Reverend Father General Janssen in 1948) is the depository of the best American Jesuit thought on education. I did use the *Instructio* constantly while writing the book. References to it were omitted solely because its cover states "For Private Circulation," and also because it prints on page 8 the words of Very Reverend Father General Ledochowski that "it is not intended for the general public." My book was meant for the general public.

III. POSSIBLE APPLICATIONS TO AMERICAN JESUIT HIGHER EDUCATION

Time permits mention of five possible applications of the book to Jesuit higher education in the United States today.

First, the book may enable our lay faculty members to know better the true nature and purposes of Jesuit education. Thus, they may be enabled to participate in it with greater understanding and enthusiasm.

Second, it may contribute towards healthful discussion among Jesuits. Ignatius' principles, if readily at hand, can guide us in the difficult problem of holding fast to the truly perennial principles of Jesuit education while adjusting to the new situations which face us.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 194-207. See also *Ratio Studiorum Superiorum S.J., ad Norman Congregationum Generalium XXVIII et XXIX Exarata*, Romae, 1954, pp. 3-6.

Third, the book may furnish light and inspiration in our efforts to develop theology for the laity. Here our hope of achievement is greater than it was in the days of Ignatius. Perhaps the chief opportunity of the Society in bringing liberal education up to the needs of our times now lies in the field of theology. Fortunately, once more clarification and new impetus has been added through the excellent article of Father Gerald Van Ackeren in the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*.⁴

Fourth, the book may throw some light on the problem of the growing numbers to be educated. Like ourselves, Ignatius lived in an era when education was rapidly expanding. He met the problem head on by expanding educational facilities in order to place well educated Catholics in society in sufficient numbers to leaven it effectively. The task, though difficult, was perhaps easier than now. Cities were smaller then. Rome itself had only 40,000 to 50,000 inhabitants, whereas today it has over 1,600,000 and nearly 3,000,000 in its metropolitan area. That same expansion has occurred everywhere else. Furthermore, only a very small percentage of the population was receiving any education. As statistics from Florence indicate,⁵ possibly one to three percent of the people in a city were all who were receiving any education above the lower elements of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Hence, in Ignatius' day, advanced elementary education, or the secondary education of boys from ten to fourteen years of age, could produce on society as much or more influence than a college education does today.

Perhaps that is one chief reason why the manpower of the Society was apparently absorbed by secondary education, or by the lower part of higher education terminating with philosophy, rather than by university education keeping the students in school till twenty-one. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that much education was not necessary to achieve Ignatius' social objectives. Those who completed a secondary education were sure to be the chief leaders in the small cities of the day. Furthermore, for two or three centuries after Ignatius, universities were at the lowest ebb of their influence on society.⁶ Also, the Jesuit college (secondary or high school in our terminology) was the only school in the city, and it was the public school supported by the municipality. Hence it was comparatively easy for a Jesuit college to produce the leaders or influential citizens. It was not in competition with one, much less ten or fifty, other secondary schools in a city.

⁴ Gerald Van Ackeren, S.J., "Basic Functions of College Theology," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XVII, No. 3 (December, 1954), pp. 134-146.

⁵ Ganss, *op. cit.*, pp. 164, 165.

⁶ Kane, W. J., S.J., revised by J. J. O'Brien, *History of Education*, Chicago, Loyola University Press, 1954, pp. 251, 252.

To achieve Ignatius' social objectives of education, possibly we today should put more stress on college and university education. Possibly, too, we should try to expand our facilities for the large numbers which the coming years will bring, by bringing more and more Catholic laymen to assist in this work, but simultaneously making sure that they are collaborators thoroughly imbued with our principles and spirit. For, an expanding society can be properly leavened only by increasing numbers of men and women well educated in their Faith. Otherwise the leaven will not raise the dough, but the dough will smother the leaven. An institution, by remaining exactly what it was, can by that very fact be growing uninfluent and insignificant.

Possibly, too, we should become more conscious of, and advertise more, the contribution which Jesuit schools can make in our American pluralistic school system. This contribution is complementary to that of the tax supported schools, not necessarily in competition with it. In American democracy there still are many persons deeply attached to the theistic outlook on life, and eager to transmit it to their children. Jesuit schools can be outstanding in imparting the intellectual foundations of theism and of the Judaeo-Christian values. They can even impart those foundations to numbers large enough to be an effective leaven in the secularistic schools.

Such a leaven is gravely necessary in the United States, even for our Catholics. Facing the coming situation realistically, we can scarcely expect the majority of Catholic pupils to be in Catholic schools. But, especially through programs for training teachers, we can do much to spread a Catholic influence into the public schools.

Since their foundation, our American Jesuit high schools, colleges and universities have achieved highly effective work in sending into the parishes of big cities and surrounding villages numerous priests, sisters, Catholic lawyers, physicians, dentists, business men, engineers, nurses, fathers and mothers. Since our colleges and universities are established in so many of the largest cities of America, this seems to have been one of the chief roles which Providence and the Church have assigned to us American Jesuits, and which they will expect us to carry on. To produce eminent research scholars is indeed an important objective and opportunity for our colleges and universities in the years ahead. But it is by no means their only objective. To carry on Ignatius' social aims of education is one of the tasks for which the Church approved our *Constitutions*, and for which she restored the Society in 1814.

Fifth, by making the documentation of Ignatius' educational principles and procedures readily available, the book can perhaps be helpful in discussions about a matter of deep concern to many of us now: the formula-

tion of objectives. What should they be in a Catholic university? and, more specifically, in a Jesuit university?

Ignatius' procedure in formulating his educational objectives is an example to us. He did not confine himself to some one general, abstract statement, such as "the pursuit of learning," or of "scholarship," or of "truth for its own sake," or of "the intellectual virtues" which can be understood accurately only by metaphysicians already highly trained. In his *Letter to Father Araoz*⁷ Ignatius went into details which could be understood by the teachers in his schools, the students actual and prospective, their parents, and the citizens of the region. He listed four benefits—they are objectives—for the teachers, five for the extern students, and six for the inhabitants of the province where the college is established. He is similarly detailed in Part Four of the *Constitutions*.

Beyond this example, Ignatius' clearly stated principles are norms by which we can guide ourselves safely through the welter of current opinions about higher education and its objectives. In the United States today there is a healthy movement to express the purpose of a university in Thomistic terminology. So far the discussion seems to contain both wheat and chaff.

In his *Higher Learning in America*, first published in 1936, Mr. Robert M. Hutchins maintained that the purpose of a university is the single-minded pursuit of the intellectual virtues as defined by St. Thomas.⁸ "The common aim of all parts of a university may and should be the pursuit of truth for its own sake." . . . "It is a good principle of educational administration that a college or university should do nothing that another agency such as the home or the church can do as well." Thus Mr. Hutchins fails to include moral virtues or social purposes within the specific purpose and direct objectives of a college or university.⁹ In discussions, I have heard Catholic admirers of Mr. Hutchins state the matter thus. "To make people learned is the direct, immediate, and specific end of a university; to make them good is the direct, immediate, and specific end of the Church. By these diverse objectives are the two institutions distinct."

Mr. Hutchins' book contains many valuable ideas. Happily, in the secularistic universities, where theology ought to reign but is unacceptable, he has done great good by restoring much honor at least to metaphysics. Even so, in this important matter we need the full light of truth drawn from the Church's traditions; and we would act unwisely if in order to find it we should turn to a book which a non-Catholic composed

⁷ Cited in Ganss, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-29.

⁸ Hutchins, Robert M., *The Higher Learning in America*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1936, pp. 32, 57, 62, 63; 68-70; 95.

⁹ See *ibid.*, pp. 95; 68-70.

for secularistic scholars. Mr. Hutchins himself would not have us do this.

Viewed in the light of theology and history, his doctrine—or at least the interpretation of it by Catholics mentioned above—appears to be fallacious when it omits to mention teaching as being within the direct, specific end of the Church, or cultivation of moral virtues and social objectives as being within the direct, specific concern of the school. Christ founded the Church to teach the doctrine which God revealed to lead men to pursue holiness (*Titus* 1, 1), to rule men in spiritual matters, and to sanctify them. In actual practice throughout her history the Church, in turn, has exercised, and recently vindicated afresh, her right to conduct schools. Furthermore, these schools are of such a type that they are designed to train, by means of subjects profane and sacred, both the intellect and the will, in order to make men simultaneously learned, good, and useful to society.¹⁰

Ignatius clearly teaches this doctrine of the Church, and is thereby at variance with Mr. Hutchins. Ignatius regarded his colleges and universities, not as something distinct from the Church, but as a part of the Church, that is, as an organ through which she exercises her ministry of teaching, and endeavors to reach men whom she cannot reach as effectively through other means such as pulpit, catechetical instruction, or pastoral care. Otherwise, it would have been improper for Ignatius in his schools to take up the time of the Church's priests, his Jesuits, in teaching grammar or mathematics.

All through her history the Church had possessed all the truth which God revealed; (and within it was much truth attainable by reason alone). God revealed it to bring men's wills into action, that is, to bring them to live morally and holily unto the salvation and perfection of their souls. But in the time of St. Ignatius she was having only poor success in causing her message to penetrate to the people at large and in bringing them to live out that revealed truth. Ignatius, going beyond the ordinary means of pulpit and instruction in elementary Christian Doctrine, devised an effective instrument for her mission of teaching unto holiness and then social apostolate: colleges and universities to educate relatively large numbers who would permeate and influence society.

Ideas more or less similar to Mr. Hutchins' are winning acceptance in Catholic schools too. Much work remains to be done to clarify the issues.

Most of us have heard remarks roughly similar to these. 'The paramount commitment of a Catholic university is to the Kingdom of God and to moral values. However, it need devote very little time and planning to these. For, its paramount specific end, and the only direct and

¹⁰ Pius XI, encyclical on *Christian Education*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. XXI, No. 16, Dec. 31, 1929, pp. 727, 728; 758-760; America Press edition, pp. 4-6, 32-34. See also *Code of Canon Law*, Canon 1372.

primary concern of its officials and teachers, is to pursue the truth (which is variously termed scholarship, or advanced intellectual activity, or truth for its own sake, or cultivation of intellectual virtue). To foster moral virtues or social improvement is outside the work with which a university is directly or specifically concerned. The indirect care of the moral virtues is enough, especially in a Catholic university. For, they will follow quite surely from the attainment of the intellectual virtues, since the pursuit of truth is taking place within a framework of grace, prayer, the sacraments, and available pastoral care.'

In the above remarks and in discussions of a similar nature, there still remain many terms with ambiguous and changing meanings. For example, it is impossible to know whether "intellectual virtue" is used non-technically to denote power, knowledge, ability, or skill of the intellect, or technically to mean the five intellectual virtues of Thomism: understanding, science, wisdom, art, and prudence. One cannot discern whether "primary" means "first in the order of time," or "highest in value."

But, in any case, we are in a world of thought far different from that of Ignatius. His educational thought too can be expressed by means of Thomistic terminology; and the effort to do this reveals how great the difference is.

The *Summa Theologiae* is a treatise chiefly theological, metaphysical, and speculative. In it St. Thomas is expounding what are the nature and destiny of supernaturalized man, rather than the chronological or practical procedures of teaching a young person how to live for this world and the next. He explains three sets of virtues: 1) the intellectual virtues mentioned above; 2) the moral virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance; and 3) the infused theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity. Treating the education which parents should give their children—and even university education is an extension of this—the *Supplement* (compiled chiefly from St. Thomas' notes) defines education as "*promotio proles usque ad perfectum statum hominis, in quantum homo est, qui est virtutis status.*"¹¹ To be in his fully completed state of virtue on earth, a man must surely have all three groups of virtues, the intellectual, moral, and theological.

Passages of Ignatius' *Constitutions* clearly oblige officials and teachers alike in his schools to be directly concerned about the intellectual, moral, and theological virtues.

He certainly wanted thoroughgoing intellectual training. He bids the students to "keep firm their resolution to be indeed genuine students."¹²

¹¹ *Summa Theologiae, Supplementum*, q. 41, a. 1.

¹² *Cons.* p. 4, c. 6, n. 2. See also c. 4, n. 2; c. 5, nn. 1, 2, C, D; c. 6, n. 3; C 13, n. 4.

In an Ignatian university, the end of *the intellectual training* can well be said to be intellectual virtue, in the non-technical senses of intellectual capability, power, knowledge, skill, technique. This method of speaking is applicable to any of his curricula, in languages, arts, theology, law, or medicine. Further, in the graded curriculum of languages ordained to arts (or philosophy) and arts in turn to theology, the specific, direct end of the *intellectual* activities can well be stated to be the intellectual virtues in their technical senses: understanding, science, wisdom, art, and prudence. Ignatius' curriculum was planned as skillfully as any in his era to lead to precisely those virtues.

But although intellectual training is a necessary part of Ignatius' education, it is by no means the whole of it. For, he obliged the teachers and officials to work through the intellect to the will, and thus to concern themselves seriously to foster the moral and theological virtues, especially charity.

He inculcates concern for the moral virtues thus.

Very special care should be taken that those who come to the universities of the Society to acquire letters should learn along with them good and Christian morals.¹³

His emphasis on the theological virtues appears from this statement.

Since the end of the Society *and of its studies* is to aid our fellow men to the knowledge *and love* of God . . . the principal emphasis should be put upon [theology].¹⁴ (Italics supplied.)

Furthermore, he desired the students, both while in school and after graduation, to practice these virtues in ascetical self-perfection and in apostolic improvement of society. He explicitly stated that one objective of a Jesuit university is to form leaders for society,¹⁵ men who will use elsewhere what they learned well in the Jesuit university. Hence the intellectual virtues, taken alone, cannot correctly be said to be the specific end of the college or university as a whole.

Assuredly, education trains the will through the medium of the intellect, and in that sense works upon the will only indirectly. But in Christian education, the educator should deliberately and directly intend to reach the will through the intellect. He might select and present truths in such a way that they are little likely to influence the will. Or he can select and present them in such a way that they are likely to have a great effect in moving the man to self-perfection and social activity. Ignatius directed that the latter method should be diligently employed in his schools. The

¹³ *Cons.* p. 4, c. 16, n. 1. See also Ganss, *op. cit.*, pp. 59, 60, 66, 187, 308-310, 327, 329-331.

¹⁴ *Cons.* p. 4, c. 12, n. 1.

¹⁵ *Cons.* p. 4, c. 11, n. 1; p. 7, c. 2, n. 1, D.

teachers should "keep alert to touch upon matters helpful for morals and Christian living."¹⁶

The specific end of the Church is at least three fold: to teach, rule, and sanctify. Similarly, the specific end of a Jesuit university is at least three-fold: directly and deliberately to cultivate the intellectual, moral, and theological virtues, in order that the student may practice them in private and social improvement.

If the university does not stress the intellectual training, it ceases to be a school at all. But also, if it does not aim directly, immediately, and energetically to promote also the moral and ascetical welfare of the students, it ceases to be a school characteristically Jesuit.

Ideas similar to those in Mr. Hutchins' *Higher Learning in America* are arising not only in discussions among Catholics, but also in writing. In 1949 they appeared in Catholic dress in Father Leo R. Ward's *Blueprint for a Catholic University*,¹⁷ which seems to be an important source of the remarks quoted above. The somewhat humorous fact is that two years previously Mr. Hutchins had altered his opinion and claimed that

. . . wisdom *and goodness* are the aim of higher education. . . . By way of metaphysics . . . students must lay the foundations of their *moral, intellectual, and spiritual* life. By way of metaphysics I arrive at the conclusion that the aim of education is wisdom *and goodness* and that studies which do not bring us closer to this goal have no place in a university.¹⁸ (Italics supplied.)

Father Ward's is a stimulating book. But many of its assertions seem incompatible with Ignatius' concept of university education. Father Ward thinks that hitherto American Catholic colleges have been poor ones because they have been directly concerned to make people good, not learned. Then, setting out to an opposite extreme, he affirms of the Catholic *higher learning* that it

. . . has as its end learning and higher learning and Catholic higher learning. Any other end, no matter how excellent, is secondary, remote, and ancillary . . . Nothing (to paraphrase Gilson) can forgive me for half-done mathematics, half-done poetry, half-done philosophy.¹⁹

By a little twisting, this statement can be understood to be another way of stating Ignatius' desire that the students should attain to intellectual excellence. It is tantamount to saying that the specific and proximate end of the *intellectual activities* in Catholic higher education is intellectual

¹⁶ *Cons.* p. 4, c. 8, n. 3, A.

¹⁷ Leo R. Ward, C.S.C., *Blueprint for a Catholic University*, St. Louis, Herder, 1949.

¹⁸ Hutchins, R. M., *Education for Freedom*, Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1947, Chapter II, The Aims of Education, pp. 22, 23, 26.

¹⁹ Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

virtue or even, more technically, the intellectual virtues. Who ever doubted this?

But elsewhere Father Ward applies the same doctrine to the end of a Catholic *university* taken as a whole. Without substantiating evidence, he uses *higher learning* and *university* as interchangeable synonyms. "Nor, it was argued in the preceding chapter, is moral virtue the specific end of a Catholic or other university. The direct, specific end is intellectual virtue."²⁰ ". . . to make men good, an end not directly the university's work. . . . We create confusion if we claim that a university makes men morally good."²¹ Here his view and Ignatius' are in strong contrast.

He also differs from Ignatius about the social purposes of learning. Father Ward clearly wants social apostles to result from the university's work; but he does not clearly state that the university should directly concern itself to produce them. "Such an intellectual result, though truly an end in itself, does have further results in and for the person and in and for the social body."²² The implication seems to be that if the student is trained to the intellectual virtues, social action will result, because else he would not truly have mastered the intellectual virtues. The parallel case previously argued was that from training in the intellectual virtues moral virtue will surely result, because unless the student is living morally he would not be mastering the intellectual virtue of prudence. Is this a recrudescence of Socrates' dictum, "knowledge is virtue"? Perhaps I have misread Father Ward. His reasonings, or rather, assertions, are very hard to follow. He lacks the clear straightforward presentation characteristic of Ignatius. In any case, St. Paul's text comes to mind: "I do not the good that I wish; but the evil that I do not wish, that I perform."²³

Like Mr. Hutchins, Father Ward misconstrues the concept of educating the whole man, caricatures it, and ridicules the caricature.

But does the Catholic higher learning exist to make people good? Is it not to develop character? No, its direct and specific business is not to form character or to make the students good. Nor is any part of its direct and specific business to look after teeth and biceps, as the whole-man theory would affirm.²⁴

How different this sounds from the words of Pope Pius XI in the encyclical on *Education*:

In fact it must never be forgotten that the subject of Christian education is man whole and entire, soul united to body in unity of nature, with all his faculties natural and supernatural, such as right reason and Revelation show him to be.²⁵

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 101, 164.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 331.

²³ *Romans*, 7, 10.

²⁴ R. M. Hutchins, *Education for Freedom*, pp. 36, 37; Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

²⁵ *A.A.S.*, Vol. XXI, No. 16, pp. 744, 745; America Press edition, p. 19.

How different Father Ward's words sound from those in Canon 1372: "All the faithful should be so educated from childhood on . . . that religious and moral education have the principal place." How different they sound from that admirable summary of Ignatian educational tradition found in the *Instructio*. Article 7 of it directs us to keep in mind and to carry out in practice everywhere:

1º. The *prescribed* end of our education, namely, to lead our fellow men to the *knowledge and love* of God. Consequently, our foremost concern should be this: that the students should acquire along with learning the morals worthy of Christians; also, that in all our schools the moral and religious education of the students should have the principal place, according to the principles and directions of the Church. By means of this procedure we shall produce eminent men for the sake of the family, the country, and the Church; that is, men who (each one in his own walk of life) will be examples to others both in the rectitude of their principles and the strength of their Christian virtues; men who will be able to promote Catholic Action competently under the leadership of the Hierarchy.

2º. Certain distinctive means conducive to this education: . . . c) Our long-standing method of teaching, which aims not merely at erudition, but especially at the proper *formation of the whole man* with all his faculties. (Italics supplied.)

How different, too, is Father Ward's outlook from the Ignatian spirit which shines through these words in Very Reverend Father General Janssen's letter promulgating the *Instructio* of 1948.

Now, as we know, according to the mind of our holy founder the work of the Society in this field is primarily a spiritual work. Colleges for externs were permitted by St. Ignatius to help youth advance in upright moral conduct as well as knowledge (*Cons. P. IV, c. 7, 1*); and hence spiritual direction and instruction in Christian Doctrine were of prime importance (*ibid. n. 2*). It is the charity of Christ that has led the Society to assume the direction of Universities, hoping that with the increase in the number of faculties and students a vaster legion might be trained of those who would go forth to the various sections of the country to spread the knowledge and practical faith they had learned from us . . . (*ibid. c. XI, 1*). And so it is our duty to provide that all who come to the Society's Universities to acquire knowledge should at the same time acquire habits of conduct becoming exemplary Catholics (*ibid. c. 16, 1*). And surely if our schools were to graduate men learned in their profession but poorly instructed in their faith and irresolute in its practice and in zeal for its propagation, they would not warrant our present vast expenditure of men and energies.²⁶

Other modern thinkers who expound the concept of educating the whole man are Mr. Frank J. Sheed and Mr. Jacques Maritain. Mr. Sheed writes: Education fits a man for living. Man exists in a universe; man is; other things are; successful living means a right relation between *man* and all *else that is*. A treatise on education would work this out in relation to all man's faculties and powers—mind, will imagination, emotions.²⁷

²⁶ *Instructio pro Assistentia Americae*, p. 8.

²⁷ Frank J. Sheed, *A Ground Plan for Catholic Reading*, New York, Sheed and Ward, p. 3.

Mr. Maritain's statement is:

We may now define in a more precise manner the aim of education. It is to guide man in the evolving dynamism through which he shapes himself as a human person—armed with knowledge, strength of judgment, and moral virtues—while at the same time conveying to him the spiritual heritage of the nation and the civilization in which he is involved.²⁸

Suppose that the Church should desire to found a college or university which has as its specific end to train the whole man, through the intellectual virtues, to the supernatural moral and theological virtues, in order that he may be in his thought and action an imitation of Christ, and may be a useful citizen promoting social welfare. Will any man, such as Mr. Hutchins or anyone else, deny that she has a right to found that university? As a matter of fact she has in history exercised that right. For that is the concept of a Catholic university clearly contained in Part Four of Ignatius' *Constitutions*; and those *Constitutions*, in turn, received her solemn approbation while she was exercising a function in which she is negatively infallible, namely, the approbation of the constitutions of a religious order. That, too, is the concept of a Catholic school enshrined in the encyclical *On Education*. To found such a school is her right which she has reasserted:

Education belongs pre-eminently to the Church. . . . With regard to every kind of human learning and instruction, the Church has an independent right to make use of it.²⁹

Necessary to achieve Ignatius' educational ideals is a planned program for the moral or spiritual formation of the students. The planning must include the objectives of the university, the curriculum, the instruction, and the supplementary but necessary extra-curricular spiritual activities, such as sodalities, spiritual exercises, and available pastoral care. To conduct our Jesuit universities according to Father Ward's theory would soon deprive this planned program, and especially the extra-curricular spiritual activities, from organic integration in the university. The top officials, who alone possess the authority and means necessary to make such programs truly effective, would soon deem them not their direct or important concern, and would give them comparatively little of their time and careful planning. The activities to promote spiritual welfare would be left to subordinate priests, without authority, means, or voice in the formulation of university policy, who would have to carry them on merely as almost unrelated extra-curricular activities. These programs would have a status little different from that of Newman Clubs, whereas,

²⁸ J. Maritain, *Education at the Crossroads*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1943, p. 10.

²⁹ Encyclical *on Education*, A.A.S., Vol. XXI, No. 16, pp. 727, 728; America Press edition, pp. 4-6.

in the view of Ignatius and the encyclical *on Education*, the fostering of the Catholic outlook and practice ought to permeate everything in the school. That a school may be truly Christian:

It is necessary that all the teaching and the whole organization of the school, and its teachers, syllabus and textbooks in every branch, be regulated by the Christian spirit, under the direction and maternal supervision of the Church; so that Religion may be in very truth the foundation and crown of the youth's entire training, and this in every grade of school, not only the elementary, but the intermediate *and the higher institutions* of learning as well.³⁰ (*Italics supplied.*)

Many think—and I am one—that the intellectual formation should be intensified in Jesuit colleges and universities for the students of higher ability and interest. Ignatius' *Constitutions* afford us ample opportunity and leeway to cultivate the intellectual virtues to any heights envisaged by Mr. Hutchins or Father Ward. But to achieve this end there is no need to sacrifice the social mission, so dear to Ignatius, which Providence has allotted to us, that of putting well educated Catholics into American metropolitan areas in numbers large enough to be an effective leaven. Above all, we need not sacrifice the Ignatian concept and tradition of Christian education. To remain faithful to it, we must directly intend to cultivate the intellectual, moral, and theological virtues, in order to train the whole man harmoniously and make him a social apostle. *Bonum ex integra causa oritur, malum ex quolibet defectu.*

The well documented truth is that Ignatius obliged the teachers and officials of a Jesuit university to be directly concerned with training for all three groups of virtues. Hence, to state or imply that the specific purpose of a Jesuit university is to pursue truth alone, or the intellectual virtues alone, is to suppress at least two thirds of the truth which is essential to the Jesuit concept of education.

The intellect and will are two complementary faculties harmoniously united in the human person. Ignatius wanted his educators to give attention to each with the same harmonious balance which the faculties have in the person. Philosophers may argue which of the two faculties is the more dignified. But no one desires to lack either, or disputes which is the more necessary. In the practical order (which is the concern of Ignatius and other educators), to dispute that would be as academic as to argue which is the more necessary for a railroad track, the left rail or the right. To be truly Ignatian, we need a planned program which gives a well balanced concern to all the elements in the educative process: the students' progress intellectual and moral, private and social, academic and spiritual.

What then is the specific end of a Jesuit university, by which it is distinct from others?

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 752; America Press edition, p. 27.

Among the schools of spirituality within the Church, all accept the entire Deposit of Faith. But each emphasizes certain aspects of it, those stressed by its founder. Thus religious orders are generically one in so far as they are orders accepting the whole Deposit, and specifically distinct by what they emphasize.

The Benedictines stress the praise of God by liturgical prayer and manual or intellectual work in a spirit of peace. The Franciscans emphasize poverty, humility, and love of the human Christ, especially as He appears in the crib and on the cross. The Dominicans turn their attention to the deeper mysteries of the faith and explain them by metaphysics to draw men to supernatural wisdom. The Jesuits after St. Ignatius have endeavored to win men by starting with a learned and practical approach through the intellect in the *First Principle and Foundation*, and then by moving on to stir them to personal love of Christ and a desire to spread His kingdom.

In parallel fashion, all Catholic colleges and universities accept all the principles of education proclaimed by the Church through Tradition, Canon Law, and the encyclical on *Christian Education*. But Benedictine schools will rightly stress the Benedictine outlook, and Franciscan schools the Franciscan loves, and Dominican schools the Dominican preoccupations. By these differences of emphasis they are specifically distinct. The specific end of a Jesuit college or university is that, in the spirit of Ignatius, it places its emphasis on the effort to put into practice *all* the essential educational principles which he made obligatory upon teachers and officials alike in his schools. They are contained in his *Constitutions* approved by the infallible Church. They are approximately the fifteen mentioned above, and admirably compressed into Article 7 of the *Instructio* of 1948. By this emphasis is a Jesuit university specifically distinct from any other, secular or Catholic.

CONCLUSION

Ignatius conceived Jesuit education to be, not the training of the whole man in the abstract, but rather training him to take his part capably in the social order of his day. Ignatius began his studies so late in life that we would scarcely expect him to be a genius of the speculative order like St. Thomas Aquinas. But he had marvelous practical wisdom. Occasionally his premises are expressed in a heavy style; but his practical conclusions are full of wisdom. Whence did his penetrating practical wisdom arise? The excellent posthumous work of Father Joseph de Guibert,³¹ our foremost modern ascetical writer, shows that Ignatius ranks among the very

³¹ Joseph De Guibert, S.J., *La Spiritualité de la Compagnie de Jésus, Esquisse Historique*, Roma, Institutum Historicum S.I., 1953, pp. 12-14, 20-21, 23-24, 27-49.

greatest mystics of the Church. It contains evidence which makes me think that a scientific case can be made for this statement. Ignatius' outstanding practical wisdom arose from his unusually intense mystical union with God. We American Jesuits shall not err in clinging fast to his traditions as we strive, according to his directions, to adjust our schools to the needs of this young nation, in such a way that we too can leaven American democracy with the spirit of the Kingdom of Christ.

Social Relations of Adolescent Students

THEORY

ROBERT H. SPRINGER, S.J.*

The subject assigned for this discussion is a broad one. Fortunately I am to limit myself to the theoretical aspect, leaving the practical problems to Fr. Vincent McCorry. Again, the topic is further delimited in that I am to touch on only the psychological and moral principles involved. I say "touch on" because obviously either the psychology or the morality of adolescent social relations would fill a whole book. I shall attempt, then, only to sketch in broad outline the fundamental principles underlying the question, first as regards the relationship itself. Does the psychology of adolescence postulate the association of boys and girls for the proper development of the adolescent personality? What do the principles of Christian moral conduct prescribe regarding this relationship? Secondly, I will treat a particular form of boy-girl relationship, indigenous to our times, "going steady." Here again the question will be: is going steady psychologically and morally advisable or reprehensible?

To begin with the relationship itself, then, is association between the sexes of adolescent age permitted by the natural law? Consulting the moral authors, it may come as a surprise to read the rules they set down governing this area of conduct. *The first rule* says: courtship in itself is an occasion of sin. The reason assigned for this is that human nature is such, particularly in those of adolescent age, that frequent association between the sexes excites illicit love. These authors conclude that courting may not be permitted, unless there is a sufficient reason for allowing a person to place himself in this occasion of sin.¹

The occasion of sin spoken of here is not the near occasion of sin we generally associate with this expression. To place oneself in a near occasion is by that very fact a sin in itself; it is never permitted by the moral law. Rather the occasion here meant is the remote occasion of sin, consisting in a person, place or thing which attracts to sin, but in which it is less

* Part of a panel discussion held at the Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Meeting of Secondary School Delegates, April 11, 1955, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

¹ Noldin-Schmitt, ed. 26, III, n. 419.

likely that one will fall. There is only slight danger of sinning, but there is danger nonetheless.

The second rule of conduct: dating that is done by those who have matrimony in view is permissible. The circumstance of prospective marriage is a sufficient justifying cause to permit the remote danger. However, dating must be prohibited when there is no hope for future marriage between the parties, or when marriage can be entered into only a long time after the association has been begun. The prospect of marriage within, say, a year suffices. We see that these authors rule out from the outset the liceity of dating among our adolescents of high school age; it is rare that marriage is a proximate possibility for them.

Additional rules are given regarding precautions to be observed by the couple intending marriage: 1) The boy and girl should never be alone together; as we would express it today, there must either be a chaperon in the back seat of the car, or at least another couple. 2) A second precaution states: the dates should not be too frequent, nor for too long a time on each occasion. Some of these authors particularize saying that as a general rule one date a week, where they are together for not more than an hour or two, is permissible. 3) Finally, there must be moderation in the licit signs of affection they exchange, lest their association become a near occasion of sin, and the boy and girl should strengthen themselves spiritually against a moral lapse by frequent reception of the sacraments.

Summarizing the statements of these writers, then, with regard to the general question: should boys be allowed to date girls, we may say that moralists who treat this subject state that it is permissible only when there is the prospect of marriage in the reasonable future. This is the only sufficient cause permitting the relationship. When they do intend marriage, certain precautions should be observed as to the circumstances of the courtship.²

These rules of conduct require some interpretation. It would be unscientific moral theology were we to accept them at their face value. There are several reasons for this. First, these writers were speaking for a different age and culture than our own. As an instance of this, St. Alphonsus is formulating rules of conduct for the 18th century milieu of the Naples in which he lived. This is clear from the way he writes: "Generally speaking, with regard to boys and girls who love each other, although they are not all to be charged indiscriminately with mortal sin, ordinarily, I believe, they find it difficult to be outside the proximate occasion of sinning gravely. This is more than evident from experience; for out of a hundred youths hardly two or three in this occasion will be found free of mortal sins."³ I know of no director of youth who takes so dim a view of our own

² *Ibid.*

³ *Praxis Confessarii*, n. 65.

boys and girls. In general it is true to say that the authors who codified these rules lived in an age in which social conventions prohibited a girl from being seen alone on the street. In some countries the family even arranged her marriage for her, choosing her husband and permitting him to woo her fair hand only in the home and under the watchful gaze of a zealous parent.

In taking exception to the prescriptions of these writers I am not advocating moral relativism. I am not denying the principles they set down relative to the danger of sin nor the advisability of prudent precautions. I am merely taking exception to the *application* of those principles in their full rigor to modern American mores. There is no denying that our girls and boys live in an atmosphere where too great freedom of association is permitted them. However, the solution to this abuse does not lie in a reversion to the age of chaperonage, nor in the conclusion that dating by those not yet of marriageable age is to be ruled out. The answer is to be sought rather in the education of our youth to a deeper realization of their greater moral responsibility consequent to the present pattern of social liberty.⁴ There is a second reason for disagreeing with this strict view of dating. A more lenient theological opinion holds that there is no moral obligation to avoid a remote occasion of sin. The world in which we live is teeming with such dangers. If the moral law required us to avoid them, we should all have to flee away to a desert somewhere, each to live in his own little cave. Given this dispute among theologians, no obligation can be imposed on youth to abstain from dating. A fundamental principle taught by all moralists holds: no obligation under pain of sin may be imposed unless it is certain.

An added reason for taking exception is this: if a boy must wait until he is looking for a wife, before he may seek the companionship of girls, is he not condemned to engagement to a girl he hardly knows? The argument must not be pushed too far; these authors would not insist that the engagement take place at the very beginning of the company keeping. Yet I think we would agree that the boy's chances of finding a wife will be seriously compromised if he has not been permitted to cultivate the social graces and learn the ways to a woman's heart by personal experience in the period previous to his search for a partner.

There is a fourth reason for challenging the wait-till-you-think-of-getting-married doctrine. It is drawn from the psychology of adolescence. This science teaches us that association with the opposite sex is definitely required for the normal development of the adolescent personality and the satisfaction of the social impulses of his nature. It is a truism to say that adolescence is a critical period in the life of the human. It is just as

⁴ *L'Ami du clerge*, 60 (Aug. 17, 1950), 522; *Theological Studies*, 12 (March, 1951), 74.

obvious that adjustment precisely to social environment is an essential element of this crisis. Indeed, if a boy or girl is inclined to be introverted, social adjustment may well be the most difficult part of growing up. As proof of this we may recall the ever-present anxiety over getting along with others and the exaggerated fear of ridicule of adolescents. Now, at a certain point in the physical and psychological development of the boy and girl, the social impulse and interest expand beyond the sphere of his or her own sex. It becomes strongly heterosexual. The boy becomes conscious that he likes girls. As it unfolds still farther, the interest tends to center on one fair object more and more to the exclusion of others.

In its nature this sexual attraction is not at all necessarily, nor even primarily, physical. It is not in itself a desire for physical union, despite what certain Freudians and pansexualists would have us believe. As Father Raphael McCarthy describes it, "It is a manifestation of the natural desire one feels to arouse interest in the members of the opposite sex and to be admired by them. In itself this is a normal and healthy impulse."⁵ However it be described, it is natural in the good sense of the word, not in the sense of a rebellious instinct of lower nature to be repressed at all cost.

Indeed, efforts to repress this other-sex orientation of the adolescent lead to abnormality. There comes to mind the example often cited in the literature of the boys and girls in boarding school, rigidly barred from association with the opposite sex. When social contact is finally made between them, say at a dance, the abnormal reaction varies from that of the wall flower to the cave man. Besides there is the danger, as psychiatry testifies, that the sexual interest become self-centered resulting in any of the aberrations of eroticism. The available statistics on this subject indicate that the majority of boys who have acquired the habit of self-abuse earlier in life lose it, once the sexual attraction finds its natural object through association with the opposite sex.

In his *Self-Revelation of the Adolescent Boy* Urban H. Fleege reports that boys testify they are spiritually helped by their association with girls.⁶ In answer to the question: "Do girls help or hinder you in your spiritual life?" typical responses of the boys were: "I don't think of sex with girls around; their holiness is an inspiration to me; they make me want to respect them . . ." The conclusions reached by Fleege in this matter read as follows: "The chances are the least that girls will have a harmful effect on the spiritual life of the boys who frequently and occasionally associate with them. The chances are the greatest that thoughts about girls will be harmful to boys who never go out with them . . . Thus our findings seem to support the idea that a moderate association between the sexes during the adolescent period is beneficial to the boy's spiritual life, and that a lack

⁵ *Training the Adolescent*, Bruce, Milwaukee, 1934, p. 115.

⁶ Bruce, Milwaukee, 1945.

of this association tends to emphasize the difficulties that girls may cause boys along moral lines.”⁷ These findings are a statistical justification of the policy of Father Daniel Lord, who certainly believed in the innate wholesomeness of the boy-girl relationship. His great labors to promote social relations between the sexes, as well as his writings, give abundant evidence of his optimistic philosophy in the matter.

We may conclude from the psychological considerations thus far presented that youth has a moral right to associate with the opposite sex. It is required for the normal development of personality in its social and sexual aspects. I might also mention in passing that it is part of education for later life. For ordinarily human living involves a mingling of the sexes in family, business and recreational circles.

I have dwelt at some length on this first point of the paper, the social relationship in itself, for two reasons. It shows how wrong are parents who rigidly insist that there be no dating until after the boy is in college, as well as the fallacy of following certain teachers of morality who speak for a different cultural milieu. Secondly, the fundamental psychological and moral issues treated in the first part will serve as a background for the considerations of the second section of the paper.

We come, then, to the concrete pattern of boy-girl association as found in our own social milieu. Obviously the pattern takes many and varied shapes, and there are scores of questions that arise here. At what age should a boy start dating? What is the proper place for such association? How often should adolescents be allowed to date? How late should they be permitted out at night? However, to bring some order into my treatment and to keep it within time limits, I propose to consider only the form of association known as “going steady.” The psychology and morality concerned with this problem will suggest answers to some of the allied questions that arise.

Steady company keeping, as we find it among our young people, has received timely treatment by Father Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., in a recent article.⁸ Suppose we take the *status quaestionis* pretty much as he sets it up. We may define going steady as frequent and exclusive association. By “frequent” we understand two or three dates a week, or even one a week when they are together for three or four hours. “Exclusive association” is taken here in the sense that Joe claims, “Jane is my girl,” even though he goes out with another girl once in a while. Further, the association we have in mind is characterized by mutual affection. It is not just a relationship of convenience, where Joe has a car, so Jane always goes to the games, picnics and dances with him; but once there they mingle freely with other boys and girls their age. Mutual affection means that the

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 195-196.

⁸ *American Ecclesiastical Review*, 132 (March, 1955), 181-190.

two love each other with the exclusive love characteristic of a particular friendship. Finally, we have in mind boys and girls up to and including fourth year high school students; but we exclude the few who have prospects of marrying within a year after graduation.

What judgment are we to pass then on such association as a general behavior pattern? It is reprehensible both for psychological and moral reasons. First, it is psychologically undesirable because it stunts the flowering of the personality. The boy and girl of high school age should be learning to get along with persons of varied temperament and character. There is no need to develop this well known argument. Father Lord and others have already done so far better than I could. Secondly, there is the fact of the psychic union between the two to be reckoned with. As their love centers more and more on each other to the exclusion of others, there arises the desire to make of their lives one life. They become two in one mind. They experience a sense of frustration because they cannot enjoy the continued physical presence of each other. In matrimony this desire is a good thing, but in adolescents it is an obstacle to preparation for their future career in life. There is striking confirmation of this in the boys entering seminaries today. According to the spiritual directors of seminaries there exists a major problem of adjustment for those who have gone steady. The problem is not that the boy is home-sick; he is love-sick for the first five months or so. Naturally this difficulty is only to be expected, engendered as it is by a year, two years, or perhaps even three years of association with the same girl.

A third psychological factor is "the menace of overexcitement," as Father McCarthy terms it.⁹ This is both of a sexual and a general nature. Immoderate association of the sexes in an extended period of steady companionship awakens sexual desires and undesirable sexual excitation. And it has this effect prematurely, at a time when such desires may not find their licit satisfaction. The boy and girl are thus in a state of tension from the frustration of this natural and unsatisfied impulse that has been aroused. In addition to this there is the psychological and physiological harm resulting from excessive excitement in general. Boys and girls are permitted to act as adults, staying out till the late hours of the morning. But they lack the physical stability and maturity that adults have. From this strain on their nervous system, and from the overexcitement characteristic of modern teen-age recreation, an emotional imbalance and excitability often result. When this condition is present, even though produced by excitement not specifically sexual, there is a carry-over to the sexual sphere. As a consequence boys and girls are more easily and deeply

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 119.

tempted. This is hardly desirable from a psychological viewpoint, not to mention the moral viewpoint.

Next, this frequent and exclusive association is morally reprehensible. Nor is this condemnation based only on the fact of sexual licence. Also to be considered is the neglect of the duties of one's state in life—for students their studies—which may be verified. Where the association is extreme, there can likewise be a neglect of the obligations of charity toward the boy's family. Nor should we omit consideration of the violation of obedience, where parents have prohibited the relationship. A boy may also fail in charity towards himself; he may make the wrong choice faced with this difficult decision: "Will I go on to college, as I can and should, postponing marriage another four years, or will I marry now the girl I have dated steadily these past two years?"

But these effects of going steady are not necessarily and always present. The real moral objection to the whole thing is of course that, as psychic intimacy grows, this will carry over to physical intimacy—the indulgence in liberties permitted only to the married. The point needs no exposition. It is the same problem as that of engaged couples forced by circumstances to postpone marriage for a year or more. As far as the question of fact is concerned, I think this danger is an actual problem for many of our young people who go steady. The danger meant here is not only that of consummated physical union but also that of "going too far," as adolescents express it.

Are we to say that the association leads to sin for most young people? The answer to this question is important. For if going steady is a proximate occasion of sin for youth in general, then no boy or girl may even begin a steady relationship without by that very fact committing mortal sin. He is putting himself in a proximate occasion of sin. It would seem that some authorities hold this opinion.¹⁰ I would not go so far. For many boys and girls it is a proximate occasion, yes. For most? I see no conclusive evidence that this is the case. For one thing I am not convinced that all steady couples, or that most of them, continue the association for the length of time necessary for the proximate danger to be present. Do not many of them go steady for only a matter of months, then choose a new partner? At any rate before an obligation under pain of sin may be imposed as a general rule forbidding all young people to enter a steady relationship, it must be based on certain evidence. Let us not run the risk of creating sin where it may not exist.

Still, going steady must be deprecated. The psychological disadvantages are varified to a greater or lesser degree in every instance. It is an occasion

¹⁰ For adolescents up to the age of fifteen Father Connell firmly believes that going steady is forbidden under pain of serious sin. Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 186.

of sin for many young people. As a social pattern it must somehow be eradicated.

So much for going steady as an institution. What about the morality of it as applied to the individual? Even if it is a proximate occasion of sin for youth in general, it is not such for the boy or girl for whom personal experience shows otherwise. The opinion which holds the existence of a proximate danger to morals is based on "*ordinaria contingentia*" (what ordinarily happens); it therefore creates an *a priori* presumption that such is the case for this individual now entering a steady relationship. But according to a valid principle, the presumption yields to the truth, so that when *post factum* it has not been such a danger for the individual, he is not obliged to abstain from it for this reason.

But let us suppose that the boy has sinned seriously with the girl. Of this case Father Connell says: "The fact that they have committed grave sin together is a sufficient proof that their steady company keeping is a proximate occasion of grave sin and hence must be given up."¹¹ I find it hard to see how one sin verifies the moral concept of proximate occasion. Does one fall mean that more probably they will sin again in their future association? For a boy of weak character, perhaps yes. For young people in general? I would not make a general statement to this effect.

When, however, the couple have sinned more often together, and to the extent that the confessor judges it morally certain, or very probable, that they will sin again in the course of their future companionship, then a grave obligation comes into play. There are only two courses open to the individual in these circumstances: either he must agree to take the necessary means, e.g., never to be alone with the girl, or the relationship must be broken up.

Speaking again from the aspect of the individual, are we ever justified in permitting a boy or girl to go steady? Where he or she is in good faith, though they have gone beyond the limits dictated by prudence, and the confessor or spiritual director judges that his advice will be of no avail, he may remain silent. This does not mean he should close his eyes to sin or grave danger of sin when such exists. It means he may prudently omit mention of an obligation when mention would mean that objective imprudence by the young person would become subjective sin.¹²

An exception may be made for an individual case also where there is no question of a proximate occasion of sin and provided extenuating circumstances are present. Just when an individual boy or girl may be permitted to go steady no general answer can be given. There are too many variants involved: the boy's age and character, the frequency of the intended association, its probable duration, etc. Then extenuating circumstances are to

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 186.

¹² Genicot-Salsmans, I, n. 410 bis.

be considered. How great is the difficulty of finding other girls as companions? What is the prevailing pattern of association in his circle of friends? To what extent is there social pressure on him as a result of this pattern? Weighing these and similar factors against the relative danger of moral and psychological bad effects, one makes a prudent moral judgment. Where going steady has not been precluded by parental order, there are instances in which the association may be tolerated. A more definite answer can hardly be formulated because the circumstances are so different in each case. The matter of individual differences is as important in moral theology as in education.

In conclusion we may say that the question of the frequency of the association between the boy and girl, its concrete form, and the age at which it is to begin, is a complex one. That there should be some association between the sexes in the adolescent period seems advisable from the psychological and spiritual benefits it affords. Frequent and exclusive association is undesirable because of the moral dangers that are probable and the harmful psychological effects it engenders. The ideal form of association is an elusive thing to determine. It lies somewhere in between too great familiarity of the sexes on the one hand and absolute segregation on the other. We can, however, state decisively that the social pattern called going steady demands of us every effort to effect its abolition though exceptions may be tolerated in individual instances.

There is danger to be avoided here—that of too great restriction and of too hurried reform. We do not wish to drive underground the social relations of adolescents. We do not wish to lose the confidence and trust of our youth. Lacking this our efforts toward educating them to the social conduct dictated by sound psychology and morality are doomed from the outset. Prudence is better than misguided or overzealous reform.

PRACTICE

VINCENT P. MCCORRY, S.J.*

In order to justify the sharp limitation which, in this paper, we propose to place upon the general subject, let us initiate our discussion with the most familiar and reliable scholastic gambit; let us begin with a distinction. Surely it is just to distinguish between the atypical if alarming Catholic young man who is simply promiscuous, for whom every girl and

* Part of a panel discussion on "Social Relations of Adolescent Students" held at the Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Meeting of Secondary School Delegates, April 11, 1955, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

every date represents a possibility for eroticism, and the ordinary, average, typical Catholic boy for whom a particular girl on a particular date or series of dates may come to be a temptation. Since we have no present intention of considering at all that first, most unpalatable youth, it follows as an inference that what we must necessarily discuss with reference to the typical Catholic boy is the contemporary phenomenon known as going steady. To this subject, therefore, and only to this subject we now address ourselves.

The first step in our consideration of going steady must be an assumption, a hypothesis, a presupposition. Moreover, this presupposition must at the outset seem strikingly remote from the matter in hand, and it will be the task of this essay to demonstrate true relevance. Anyhow, here is our assumption. We take it as a fact, however melancholy and deplorable, that women in general have usurped, in our society, a position of practical dominance which is unscriptural, unchristian, unjust, false, and strongly destructive of essential social values. As a consequence, women exercise in our contemporary society an influence which is not only disproportionate, but positively and ultimately harmful. True or false, we ask leave to suppose this dismal hypothesis in order that we may proceed to our proper thesis.

We propose that the admitted evil of going steady among adolescents should be attacked chiefly, though not, of course, exclusively, on a natural level. The program which we conceive would be addressed primarily to our high-school boys, secondarily to the parents of our boys.

In our approach, on this whole matter, to the boys themselves, the plan might run somewhat in the following fashion.

First, our young men, particularly in third and fourth year, should be awakened to the feminist problem in general. Obviously, a suggestion of this sort could be understood in a way that would reduce it to rank absurdity. There is question neither of attempting a systematic inculcation of misogynism in lads of such a tender age, nor of introducing a full-blown and dyspeptic course in specialized sociology. Indeed, even if we describe our proposed maneuver in the manner in which we have described it, namely, as awakening our young men to the feminist problem, the thing sounds much more pretentious and stuffy than we would wish.

It is only suggested that since Juniors and Seniors in high school will naturally spend a certain amount of time thinking about young girls either sexually or sentimentally, they could easily be led to think a little about all women sociologically, and under one special social aspect. Any number of classroom subjects, incidents and news-items, ranging from original sin to female wrestlers, may serve to acquaint young men with

the real problem about women, the frightening contemporary problem of the sexes which has nothing to do with sex. Boys can surely be instructed, at once simply and readily and persuasively, in such pertinent matters as the position which women once held in the world, the position which they now hold, and the devouring female ambition, coupled with male sloth and lassitude, which has brought about such a disastrous social upheaval in seventy-five years or less.

What would be the point of such zealous anti-feminist indoctrination? The immediate objective would be to convince the maximum number of males, even while they are yet young and tender, that altogether too many contemporary men are being ruled and run and, in a sense, ruined by too many contemporary women. We would wish to alert young men to the disturbing fact that more and more men are being more and more despoiled by more and more women of a free man's highest prerogative, the true power of choice and decision. In plain terms, even high-school boys should be made to perceive that it is women, and not men, who are making the really effective decisions that actually govern daily life. The bizarre phenomenon should be represented and portrayed as an unjust invasion, an indignity that amounts to a degradation.

The final end envisioned in this beneficent brain-washing may be debatable, but it is clear, and it represents the prime contention of the present somewhat excited discourse. The point is to convince our young men that going steady is nothing but a female conspiracy in which the male plays the unwitting and uncomplicated part of simple victim. We boldly advance the proposition that boy goes steady with girl not because boy really wishes to do any such thing, but because girl wants to go steady with boy.

In other words, our first blow against the evil of going steady would be to explain to young males the predatory female. The job may be done without undue prejudice, and with only the reasonable proportion of venom and ridicule.

We have all heard it said a hundred times that the deepest, most instinctive of all feminine desires is the yearning for security. Now the concept of security is strictly convertible, in the typical female mind, with the concept of marriage. But here precisely is where the female, and especially the young female, stands at a serious disadvantage to the male. The boy is perfectly free to seek out, in countless small ways, the girl of his choice; but the girl must wait to be sought. This disadvantage can become acute among girls who are reared in a strict religious tradition of maidenly modesty. The good Catholic girl, in her search for a suitable husband, may be presumed to be in a particularly trying position. The latest national census made it official that there are now more women in the country

than men. Strictly speaking, then, there are not enough men to go around, in any event. But the Catholic girl's prospects of marriage are at once sharply reduced, first, by the resolute and somewhat relieved departure for seminary and noviceship of such sterling and nubile characters as ourselves, and, secondly, by the lesser fact that a certain number of acceptable young men seem to be natural bachelors by temperament. The upshot of the whole complex situation is that the competition among young Catholic girls for a satisfactory young man is apt to be practically blood-thirsty.

It is, therefore, our present contention that the prime mover in the high-school problem of going steady is this quite innocent but predatory female. The girl may not be explicitly thinking nearly as far ahead as a possible marriage, although I doubt if that issue is ever entirely absent from her mind. What the young miss desires at the moment and desires, I am convinced, with an intensity amounting to either mania or panic, is not to be without a date on all those numerous occasions when a date is essential or helpful. Now, clearly, the girl's safest and surest solution to this gnawing problem is to keep in somnolent captivity a reliable male pet who will be on hand for any and all emergencies. In plainer terms, the handiest answer to the young woman's most troublesome question is simple. It is going steady.

Incidentally, the current college phrase for going steady is to be pinned; the reference, I believe, is to an exchange of fraternity and sorority pins. The expression strikes this observer as being accurate in every way. For one thing, it is characteristic of the female to speak with pretty, dewy-eyed helplessness of being pinned, when the pinning process is almost all of her doing. In addition, the fellow who pins is unquestionably pinned: his ears are pinned back, and he is pinned down.

Try as I will, I can think of only two reasons why a high-school boy would really wish to go steady. The first reason would be shyness. This boy is afraid of girls. However, he knows and is accustomed to one particular girl, so it is easiest for him to go along with her. Boys should be instructed that such shyness is not only foolish in the extreme, but is ultimately nothing less than another form of typical male sloth. The other reason for a lad's interest in going steady would be much less creditable. This girl provides this boy with a definite amount of sexual stimulation which he could not be sure to receive from another girl. In the first case the young man is enslaved by comfortable routine; in the second, by his body. It is obvious that this second youth needs not instruction, but fundamental reconstruction.

If there be any truth at all in the theory that we have been spinning, then we confidently suggest that our initial attack upon the evil of going

steady should take the candid form of urging self-interest. The young man should have it drilled into him that his marriage will be the most critical decision of his life, that he, and no other, must be the one who will freely make that decision, and that he simply must make that decision, as far as may be and in peril of singular unhappiness, under ideal conditions. Marriage must repeatedly be explained as a matter of proximity rather than of divine interference. In this connection the predatory female must be unmasked and expounded, not to say pounded.

Concretely, the young man should be urged to adopt three specific measures as conducive to his own greater happiness in this present and menacing world. First, he must regard the systematic enlarging of his circle of acquaintances as a favorable first step in a number of directions, chiefly in the direction of a successful marriage. Secondly, he must conceive that he owes it to himself, if to no one else, to remain strictly unattached and unpossessed until, through wider experience and a deepening maturity, he finds himself in a rational position to make the wisest possible choice. Thirdly, he must fight as he would fight the devil—for he is doing no less—the suffocation of emotional commitment and the blindness which would be induced by his own aroused passions. In much plainer terms, he must be bluntly warned to cut out the petting and necking because, in the most exact sense of the tired old saying, there is no future in it.

Concerning our approach on this subject to the parents of our boys, it would seem that we might readily enlist their cooperation. As with the young men, so also I would urge upon parents not so much the argument from possible unchastity as the more general if not more cogent consideration of the best interests and well-being of their sons. Parents should be particularly warned not to connive at or second any arrangement like going steady. It is conceivable that a mother, for example, might prefer that her young daughter regularly go out with a young man who is not only already well known to mother, but who is one of those nice boys trained by the Jesuits, and everybody except possibly the Jesuits knows that a girl couldn't be in better company. In her own way and for her own perhaps complex reasons the mother of the young lady might not be altogether averse to the fact of going steady.

On our part, however, we may continue to recommend to the parents of both girls and boys that they positively encourage multiplicity and variety in the social life of their children. We might even, in all good conscience and within reason, do what we can to exploit the profound distrust which a boy's mother instinctively feels for young females, all of whom she will be delighted to regard as predatory with reference to her precious son.

The difficulty with regard to such a thesis as this which we have advanced is that it always appears to deny that which it simply does not mention. I would not be understood to suggest that a natural approach to a moral problem is always or strictly the preferable procedure. I do not for a moment imply that moral or supernatural considerations carry no weight in such a matter as we have discussed. No one, surely, need read a lecture to an assemblage of religious men on the critical importance of Mass, the Sacraments and the Sodality in solving the moral problems of our young students. This essay is only concerned to make one passing suggestion which might possibly be of some use in this discouraging struggle of ours to persuade young people to pass their lives both rationally and holily, and, in particular, to grow old with a certain sane deliberation, not aping at the age of fifteen what people reasonably do when they are twenty-five.

We all know how a man is apt to become so obsessed with an individual problem that he sees it everywhere, so hag-ridden is he by his special grievance. Nevertheless, this person continues to believe that going steady is only part of a larger social and moral problem, the sorry task of restoring the male, the man, the character who in Canon Law is known as *mas baptizatus*, to his proper place in Christian society. The true challenge here is the urgent problem of disarming the modern warrior-woman, the contemporary Brunhilde, and sending her back either to the kitchen, like Martha, or to the convent, like Mary. Only so will we bring about the new redemption and rehabilitation of the debilitated male of all ages.

Colleges Attended by 1954 Jesuit High School Graduates

Just seven years ago (April 1948) Father Lorenzo Reed of the New York Province stood before this weary and wonderful group to give a report on the activities of the Secondary School Commission during the year of 1947-1948.¹ This area of the report by the current Commission (Fathers John A. Convery of Maryland, John P. Foley of New England, Michael F. Kennelly of New Orleans, J. Vincent Watson of New York, R. A. Bernert of Wisconsin) must necessarily be little more than a paraphrase of the report of 1948. The reason is simply this that the Commission has conducted a study on the colleges attended by the graduates of 1954 just as the commission in 1948 made a similar study of the graduates of 1947.

The framework of the study set up by Father Reed impressed us as completely satisfactory under the circumstances. In fact, we felt the sensible thing to do was to follow it exactly because only in this way would the various percentages of increases and decreases in various areas take on their true significance. The pattern of our study this year, therefore, follows in every detail the outline of the study of 1948. We can, for instance, repeat almost word for word Father Reed's introduction where he says that the request for the information needed for the study caught the principals at a very bad time—just before the turn of the semester.

But this is as far as we can go. In the report of '48 "some information was received from 32 of the 38 schools." Thanks to the generous cooperation of all the principals and the magnificent efficiency of all the members of the Commission, we can say that we received information from all of the 40 high schools in the country. Only two of these could not furnish us with statistical data (Brophy Prep at Phoenix and Loyola at Missoula, Montana) and that because they are still too young to have offspring. Distributed according to provinces this data runs as follows: California 4 of 4; Chicago 3 of 3; Maryland 5 of 5; Missouri 3 of 3; New England 4 of 4; New Orleans 4 of 4; New York 7 of 7; Ohio 2 of 2; Oregon 5 of 5; and Wisconsin 3 of 3.

¹ Cf. Commission on Secondary Schools, "Colleges Attended by 1947 Jesuit High School Graduates," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XI, No. 4, (March, 1949), pp. 242-249. This is the only previous report referred to in this article. To avoid confusion it is to be noted that it dealt with graduates of 1947; the report was made in 1948 and printed in 1949.

I am sure you would find it extremely fatiguing at this time to be subjected to a barrage of facts and figures and percentages which, in general, are difficult to remember. We thought it best, therefore, to prepare six significant tables which carry the burden of our study. We should, however, like to point out just a few more or less interesting figures.

First of all, Table 1 shows there were close to 1000 more graduates from Jesuit high schools in 1954 than in 1947. We note likewise that 82.8 percent of last year's graduates are in college, a percentage which certainly qualifies our schools as strictly college preparatory in fact as well as in theory. We take pride also in the 12 percent increase in the number of replies to the questionnaire.

TABLE 1. NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES OF 1954 ATTENDING COLLEGE; NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES REPLYING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

PROVINCE	GRADUATED		ATTENDING COLLEGE				REPLIED TO QUESTIONNAIRE			
			Number		Percent		Number		Percent	
	1954	1947	1954	1947	1954	1947	1954	1947	1954	1947
California	526	202	386	<i>150</i>	73.3	74.2	250	97	47.5	48.0
Chicago	555	956	513	<i>451</i>	92.4	81.9	416	535	74.0	55.9
Maryland	503	339	440	<i>148</i>	87.4	75.3	374	<i>154</i>	74.3	45.4
Missouri	330	702	302	<i>574</i>	91.5	81.7	174	<i>370</i>	52.7	52.6
New England	539	<i>311</i>	412	<i>236</i>	76.4	75.9	388	<i>125</i>	71.9	40.2
New Orleans	303	255	258	<i>172</i>	81.8	79.2	163	77	53.7	30.2
New York	892	901	799	<i>278</i>	89.5	73.2	467	402	52.3	44.5
Ohio Regio	361	—	318	—	86.4	—	196	—	54.3	—
Oregon	291	<i>231</i>	180	<i>169</i>	61.8	73.1	130	40	44.6	17.3
Wis. Regio	419	—	302	—	72.0	—	219	—	50.3	—
Total	4719	3897	3910	<i>2178</i>	82.8	78.0	2777	1800	58.8	46.2

NOTE: Number in italics is corresponding number from study of graduates of 1947.

Worthy of comment in Table 2 are, of course, the totals. The percentage of last year's graduates in Jesuit colleges is 65.7 as compared to 72.2 for the class of 1947 at a similar time, whereas the percentage attending non-Jesuit Catholic colleges has increased from 10.0 to 16.9, approximately one percent per year for the last seven years. Of all the percentages given, this one perhaps would be of most interest and concern to the deans of our Jesuit colleges. The trend, if this is not too strong a term, is on the other hand somewhat away from the non-Catholic college. In 1948 17.8 percent of the graduates enrolled at a non-Catholic college; in 1955 we find the percentage at 17.4, with Wisconsin showing 7.3 as compared to New Orleans with 49.1.

The figures in Table 3 bear out Father Reed's statement in '48 to the

effect that our Jesuit colleges are losing their characteristic mark, namely, the liberal arts curriculum. Only 19.4 percent enrolled in the arts courses, Greek and non-Greek combined. This time the percentage drops to 13.3. The largest number of our graduates enter pre-engineering courses where there has been an amazing upshoot from 8.4 percent to 20.8 percent. Other rather surprising percentages are: pre-medical from 15.9 to 11.1; pre-legal from a low of 8.8 to an even lower 6.1.

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

COLLEGES ATTENDED														
PROVINCE	JESUIT				CATHOLIC NON-JESUIT				NON-CATHOLIC				TOTAL	
	Number		Percent		Number		Percent		Number		Percent			
	California. . .	165	71	79.3	74.7	10	6	4.8	6.3	33	18	15.9	18.9	208
Chicago. . . .	254	367	61.9	76.6	72	42	17.6	8.7	84	70	20.5	14.5	410	479
Maryland . . .	214	130	56.5	65.6	97	34	25.6	17.2	68	34	17.9	17.2	379	198
Missouri . . .	129	362	71.2	76.0	26	37	14.4	7.7	26	77	14.4	16.2	181	476
New England .	234	104	67.6	74.8	49	14	14.1	10.0	63	21	18.3	15.1	346	139
New Orleans .	65	86	40.9	56.6	16	2	10.0	1.3	78	64	49.1	42.1	159	152
New York . .	376	270	60.7	71.4	159	59	25.6	15.6	85	49	13.7	12.9	620	378
Ohio Regio . .	144	—	73.5	—	29	—	14.7	—	23	—	11.8	—	196	—
Oregon	104	57	80.0	64.8	11	7	8.4	7.9	15	24	11.6	27.2	130	88
Vis. Regio . .	174	—	84.1	—	18	—	8.6	—	15	—	7.3	—	207	—
Total	1859	1447	65.7	72.2	487	201	16.9	10.0	490	357	17.4	17.8	2836	2005

NOTE: Number in italics is corresponding number from study of graduates of 1947.

TABLE 3. COURSES CHOSEN IN JESUIT COLLEGES BY 1954 GRADUATES OF JESUIT SCHOOLS

		California	Chicago	Maryland	Missouri	New England	New Orleans	New York	Ohio	Oregon	Wisconsin	Total	Percent
AB with Greek .	5	12	16	4	44	2	40	9	2	1	135	5.2	7.7
AB with Math. .	6	24	23	12	22	2	42	8	8	5	152	6.1	11.7
BS in Science . .	7	22	28	13	39	17	41	13	8	18	206	8.2	8.6
BS—Soc.Science .	33	18	27	9	56	4	39	16	10	6	218	8.6	6.7
Bus.Adm. . . .	52	79	55	22	71	23	70	37	16	46	471	18.0	21.1
Pre-Medical . . .	13	40	47	16	26	23	61	24	10	27	287	11.1	15.9
Pre-Dental . . .	6	5	10	5	9	11	11	13	10	14	94	3.7	3.4
Pre-Engineer . .	62	51	80	46	27	37	107	47	18	57	532	20.8	8.4
Pre-Legal	18	26	21	9	6	12	17	8	18	17	152	6.1	8.8
BS in Commerce .	—	1	—	2	—	1	2	1	1	1	7	.2	1.4
Ph.B.	1	1	—	—	—	1	—	2	—	—	5	.1	1.1
Miscellaneous . .	10	36	19	18	15	21	29	20	7	16	191	7.6	4.0
Lib.Arts	9	17	3	7	12	—	4	—	—	—	52	2.0	—
Architecture . .	2	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	.1	—
Economics . . .	—	—	3	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	5	.1	—
Total	224	334	332	164	327	154	465	196	108	208	2512	98.8	98.8

It is interesting to notice which course has the lead in numbers enrolled in each province: California, Maryland, Missouri, New Orleans, New York, Ohio, Oregon, and Wisconsin—pre-engineering; Chicago and New England—business administration.

Figures in Table 4 again show the predominance of choices for pre-engineering and business administration. Chicago, New England, New Orleans, and Ohio show dominance in business administration whereas all the others are strongest in pre-engineering.

TABLE 4. COURSES CHOSEN IN CATHOLIC, NON-JESUIT COLLEGES BY GRADUATES OF 1954

	California	Chicago	Maryland	Missouri	New England	New Orleans	New York	Ohio	Oregon	Wisconsin	Total	Percent
AB with Greek	—	2	8	1	22	1	8	2	1	—	45	10.8
AB with Math.	3	10	8	4	3	1	10	—	1	3	43	10.3
BS in Science	—	1	3	2	4	1	6	—	—	—	17	4.0
BS—Soc.Science	2	1	2	—	1	—	5	1	1	—	13	3.1
Bus.Adm.	3	17	17	2	6	6	22	10	1	3	87	21.1
Pre-Medical	—	4	5	3	1	—	12	7	1	1	34	8.1
Pre-Dental	—	—	2	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	5	1.0
Pre-Engineer	2	9	35	9	1	3	54	4	1	4	122	29.3
Pre-Legal	—	3	3	2	4	2	4	3	—	1	22	5.2
BS—Commerce	—	2	—	1	—	—	3	—	—	—	6	1.3
Ph.B.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lib.Arts	—	—	2	1	3	2	3	—	—	1	12	2.8
Architecture	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	.2
Economics	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	2	.4
Miscellaneous	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	2	1	7	1.6
Total	10	50	85	25	45	16	134	29	8	14	416	99.2

Among the graduates of 1954 who enrolled in a non-Catholic college, pre-engineering again is by far the most popular course. Forty-three and four tenths percent are in engineering while the next closest are business administration with only 11.1 percent and pre-medical with 10.2 percent.

Table 6 is self-explanatory. In this table the graduates' programs are analyzed to determine which are the principal subjects they are studying, that is, which subjects occupy most time in their schedules. The results follow exactly the same pattern as in 1948; actual totals, of course, are higher but the ratios remain nearly identical. In Jesuit colleges, for instance, the subject which occupies most time in most programs is chemistry (433), followed by mathematics (290), and English (240). In 1948 Latin was second; now it is fourth.

In the non-Jesuit Catholic colleges the subjects which occupy first

TABLE 5. COURSES CHOSEN IN NON-CATHOLIC COLLEGES BY 1954 GRADUATES OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS

	California	Chicago	Maryland	Missouri	New England	New Orleans	New York	Ohio	Oregon	Wisconsin	Total	Percent
AB with Greek . . .	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	0.2
AB with Math. . .	1	1	3	1	2	1	1	3	—	—	13	2.8
BS in Science . . .	2	5	2	—	5	2	2	1	1	—	20	4.4
BS—Soc.Science . .	5	4	2	—	5	1	1	—	2	—	20	4.4
Bus.Adm.	10	7	9	—	5	7	7	1	2	2	50	11.1
Pre-Medical . . .	3	9	3	3	3	10	8	2	3	2	46	10.2
Pre-Dental . . .	—	—	—	1	1	3	3	—	—	—	8	1.7
Pre-Engineer . . .	8	21	36	18	23	33	35	14	2	6	196	43.4
Pre-Legal	3	5	2	—	—	3	1	1	2	1	18	3.9
BS in Commerce . .	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	0.2
Ph.B.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lib.Arts	—	—	2	—	7	—	—	—	—	—	9	1.9
Architecture . . .	1	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	5	1.1
Economics	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	0.2
Miscellaneous . . .	4	14	3	2	7	12	11	4	2	4	63	13.9
Total	38	67	63	26	58	74	69	26	14	16	451	98.4

TABLE 6. SUBJECTS OCCUPYING FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD PLACES IN TIME SCHEDULE OF 1954 GRADUATES OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS NOW ATTENDING JESUIT, NON-JESUIT CATHOLIC, AND NON-CATHOLIC COLLEGES

FIRST, SECOND, THIRD PLACES IN TIME SCHEDULE

	JESUIT			NON-JESUIT CATHOLIC			NON-CATHOLIC		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
English	240	361	516	47	87	81	32	64	102
Latin	195	37	11	48	5	6	1	4	0
Greek	41	55	7	7	12	9	0	1	0
Mathematics	290	363	234	87	74	97	116	86	80
Physics	30	84	21	5	10	8	24	20	19
Chemistry	433	178	31	72	72	29	128	93	16
Biology	117	63	13	28	16	5	15	15	6
Soc.Science	106	139	163	18	28	21	21	26	39
Religion	2	77	190	7	12	25	0	0	1
French	53	78	74	18	10	11	5	15	11
German	38	59	72	10	5	9	4	7	6
Spanish	30	28	19	13	5	4	6	10	9
Economics	72	46	27	2	7	3	6	5	0
History	21	41	31	9	11	10	5	2	2
Philosophy	21	24	27	3	4	15	0	1	2
Accounting	141	16	6	44	11	6	6	1	2

place in most time schedules are mathematics (87), chemistry (72), Latin (48) and English (47). In '48 it was mathematics, English, Latin.

The order of importance in non-Catholic colleges follows the order of

'48, where chemistry claims first place in 128 schedules, mathematics in 116, and English in 32.

Since a cursory study of the reasons given by graduates for choosing a Jesuit, non-Jesuit Catholic, or non-Catholic college verify the conclusions of Table 7 of the 1948 study, that table is not repeated. In other words the analysis strengthens "the conclusions that graduates of Jesuit high schools have confidence in Jesuit education and in Catholic education in general." The same indication appears in the fact that it is a particular course, often a course not available in a Catholic college, which is the leading motive in drawing students to non-Catholic colleges. The fact that the financial motive places so prominently in the case of the non-Catholic college points in the same direction, as in not a few cases the students are attending tuition-free state or municipal institutions.

COMMISSION ON SECONDARY SCHOOLS

R. A. Bernert, S.J., *Chairman*

John A. Convery, S.J.

John J. Foley, S.J.

Michael F. Kennelly, S.J.

J. Vincent Watson, S.J.

Program of Annual Meeting Jesuit Educational Association

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

APRIL 10, 11, 1955

Registration: Summer School Office, First Floor, Healy Building



GENERAL MEETING OF ALL DELEGATES

EASTER SUNDAY, APRIL 10, 4:30 P.M.

Gaston Hall, Healy Building

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

Welcome to Georgetown REV. EDWARD B. BUNN, S.J.

Greetings VERY REV. WILLIAM F. MALONEY, S.J.
Provincial, Maryland Province

Report of Executive Director REV. EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

Saint Ignatius and Jesuit Education REV. GEORGE E. GANSS, S.J.



DINNER MEETING OF ALL DELEGATES

EASTER SUNDAY, APRIL 10, 6:30 P.M.

Students' Dining Room, Maguire Building

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

Major Trends in Non-Jesuit American

Higher Education REV. THURSTON N. DAVIS, S.J.



MEETING OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DELEGATES

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 10:00 A.M.-12:30 P.M.

Gaston Hall, Healy Building

Presiding: REV. A. A. LEMIEUX, S.J.

Functions of the Lay Advisory Board REV. FREDERICK E. WELFLE, S.J.

Basic Problems in Financing Jesuit

Institutions REV. CHARLES S. CASASSA, S.J.

Progress Report on 1955 Deans' Institute REV. ANDREW C. SMITH, S.J.

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 2:00-4:30 P.M.

Presiding: REV. EDWARD G. JACKLIN, S.J.

The Director of Student Personnel

Services REV. JOSEPH A. ROCK, S.J.

Junior Year Abroad	REV. JOSEPH R. FRESE, S.J.
Report of JEA Commission on Liberal Arts Colleges	REV. EDWARD A. DOYLE, S.J. <i>Chairman</i>



MEETING OF SECONDARY SCHOOL DELEGATES

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 10:00 A.M.-12:30 P.M.

Copley Lounge, First Floor, Copley Building

Presiding: REV. WILLIAM A. RYAN, S.J.

Progress Report on Study of College Success of Jesuit High School Graduates in Jesuit Colleges	REV. PAUL V. SIEGFRIED, S.J.
Survey of 1954 Jesuit High School Graduates: JEA Commission on Secondary Schools	REV. ROMAN A. BERNERT, S.J. <i>Chairman</i>
Training in Natural Virtues and Manners	REV. WILLIAM P. CORVI, S.J.
Social Relations of Adolescent Students: Theory	REV. ROBERT H. SPRINGER, S.J.
Practice	REV. VINCENT P. MCCORRY, S.J.

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 2:00-4:30 P.M.

Presiding: REV. D. AUGUSTINE KEANE, S.J.

Faculty Relationships with Parents	REV. JAMES B. CORRIGAN, S.J.
Panel Discussion, Relationships of the High School with Other Agencies	REV. JOHN P. FOLEY, S.J. <i>Moderator</i>
The C.Y.O.	REV. MICHAEL J. BLEE, S.J.
The C.E.E.B.	REV. WILLIAM F. TROY, S.J.
The Diocesan School Authorities	REV. THOMAS F. MURRAY, S.J.
The Colleges	REV. CLAUDE J. STALLWORTH, S.J.



MEETING OF GRADUATE SCHOOL DELEGATES

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 2:00-4:30 P.M.

Philodemic Room, Second Floor, Healy Building

Presiding: REV. ALLAN P. FARRELL, S.J.

Pilot Study on Fordham University Classics Department	ARTHUR A. NORTH, S.J.
Fields of Pre-eminence on Doctoral Level	DISCUSSION BY MEMBERS
Problems and Plans in Master's Area	OF THE COMMISSION



MEETING OF THE JUNIORATE DEANS

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 10:00 A.M.-12:30 P.M.; 2:00-4:30 P.M.

Student Activity Room, First Floor, Old North Building

Presiding: REV. NEIL J. TWOMBLY, S.J.



MEETING OF SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS OF
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DELEGATES

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 2:00-4:30 P.M.

Constitution Room, First Floor, Healy Building

Presiding: REV. HENRY J. WIRTENBERGER, S.J.

Problem Clinic in Business Education:

Panel: REV. W. SEAVEY JOYCE, S.J., REV. JOSEPH A. BUTT, S.J., REV.
MARTIN F. HENNEBERRY, S.J.

Discussion and Problems from the House.



LUNCHEON FOR ALL DELEGATES

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 12:45 P.M.

Students' Dining Room, Maguire Building



LOCAL COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS

REV. EDWARD B. BUNN, S.J., *Chairman*

REV. JAMES F. DOUGHERTY, S.J.

REV. JOSEPH J. MCGOVERN, S.J.

REV. JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.

REV. BRIAN A. MCGRATH, S.J.

REV. JOHN F. LENNY, S.J.

REV. JOSEPH A. ROCK, S.J.



J.E.A. COMMISSIONS 1955-1959

GRADUATE SCHOOLS: A. P. Farrell, S.J., *Chairman*; J. M. Daley, S.J., R. J. Henle, S.J., J. H. Martin, S.J., A. A. North, S.J.

LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES: E. A. Doyle, S.J., *Chairman*; J. E. Fitzgerald, S.J., W. F. Kelley, S.J., A. I. Mei, S.J., B. A. McGrath, S.J.

PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS: E. F. Gallagher, S.J., J. L. Maline, S.J., E. B. Rooney, S.J.

SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION: J. A. Ryan, S.J., *Chairman*; J. A. Butt, S.J., M. F. Henneberry, S.J., W. S. Joyce, S.J., H. J. Wirtenberger, S.J.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS: R. A. Bernert, S.J., *Chairman*; J. A. Convery, S.J., J. P. Foley, S.J., M. F. Kennelly, S.J., J. V. Watson, S.J.

SEMINARIES: P. T. Lucey, S.J., *Chairman*; R. O. Dates, S.J., G. P. Klubertanz, S.J., J. M. Moreau, S.J., M. R. Vogel, S.J., T. J. Wolf, S.J.

Letters on College Theology

LE MOYNE COLLEGE

FACULTY RESIDENCE

953 JAMES STREET

SYRACUSE 3, N. Y.

January 7, 1955

Rev. Gerald Van Ackeren, S.J.
St. Mary's College
St. Marys, Kansas

Reverend and dear Father in Christ,

P.C.

Because I am sure that no offense was intended, I am respectfully writing you this note. But we at Le Moyne, while grateful for constructive criticism, do resent the inaccurate categorization or facile over-simplification of our plan for college theology.

While in general we enjoyed your recent article in the January 1955 *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* and are in complete agreement with ninety-nine and forty-four one hundredths percent of it, we cannot agree with your reduction of our course to "the classroom version of the Spiritual Exercises." Of course, like yourself, we think much of the Exercises of St. Ignatius but, like yourself too, we question their value as a basis for an academic college course in theology.

To you, such a categorization on your part and the deep felt resentment on ours must seem trivial. Surely what you meant—that we *are* interested in influencing the wills of our students—is anything but disparaging. But I am sure that you have no idea how such happy expressions can be misunderstood and used in discussions against us, with all the authority of a man of your calibre.

Till recently, many dismissed our plan as being "scriptural"—another convenient tag and over-simplification—and some who heard only that criticism apparently suspected us of being Protestants in black robes. Fortunately, the publication of three of our textbooks, with their appeal to the Councils and Tradition of the Church, with their solid logical, dogmatic and academic approach, has finally dispelled that calumny.

But now our plan is reduced to the Spiritual Exercises applied to the college classroom. "The course is lined up according to the fundamental principles of the Spiritual Exercises. It would seem that the finality of this course is as much like an Ignatian Retreat as is possible for the classroom."

From someone superficial, who merely glanced through reports of impromptu discussions, where we were merely trying to point out—as you do so well—"that theology alone has for its subject God who is at once *the supreme good* as well as the supreme truth, such a categorization would be understandable. But surely you have our textbooks. In the light of those—even from a mere cursory reading of the tables of contents—the inaccuracy of such a statement as the one quoted above should be apparent.

I said that we agree with ninety-nine and forty-four one hundredths percent of your article. Perhaps the small area of real disagreement can be narrowed to some of the remarks in your conclusion. Let me take but one sentence. You say "To make

the *Christus totus* the one central principle of intelligibility in theology really gives an inadequate vision of world order." From that principle you go on to argue for the so-called logical order, presumably the order of the *Summa*. Aside from the practical difficulty of such an order in freshman year alone, where the student is without so much of the background necessary to comprehend even an "adapted" *Summa*, is the principle you enunciate quite so self-evident?

Of course it is, if it is taken to mean that "the Trinity . . . is referred to the Mystical Body" rather than the "Mystical Body to the Trinity." But if the students are impressed with the *totus Christus* and then led step by step logically and academically to an understanding that the Mystical Body itself is only intelligible in terms of the Triune God, then it would seem that an adequate vision of the world order can be satisfactorily achieved.

Or does St. Paul give an inadequate vision of world order? Obviously not, for he refers his master idea (the Mystical Body) to its ultimate principle of intelligibility (the Trinity). But so do we! And so does Pius XII in his encyclical on the Mystical Body, the culmination of our course in junior year as you can see from our textbooks.

We at Le Moyne realize how much work is still to be done on our college theology course. We humbly think that we have at least taken feeble steps in the right direction. But if our steps are in the right direction, even though feeble, please do not trip us with a tag. Will you please do us one favor: look through our textbooks again and decide whether or not you really think our course is a "classroom version of the Spiritual Exercises." We feel confident that we can leave that decision in your capable hands.

Respectfully in Christ,

EDWARD J. MESSEMER, S.J.

SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE

SAINT MARYS, KANSAS

January 29, 1955

Rev. Edward J. Messemmer, S.J.
Le Moyne College
Syracuse 3, N.Y.

Dear Father Messemmer:

P.C.

Thank you very much for your letter telling me of the reaction at Le Moyne to my article in the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* on the basic functions of college theology. I am sorry I have not been able to answer before this; the delay is not to be taken as a lack of interest or sympathy in the reaction which the article has caused.

I am very sorry about the unhappy expression, "classroom version of the Spiritual Exercises," which turns out to be a misleading caricature of the Le Moyne plan. If you read the article again, you will see that I was not referring immediately to the Le Moyne plan itself, but rather to the extreme to which it could be carried. Even so, I regret having used it.

I hope you realize that I did not intend to depreciate in any way the Le Moyne plan. Personally, I think that there are many wonderful things to your program. It commends itself not least of all because you have therein done something constructive and definite in working toward a solution to the college religion program. It is much easier for anyone to talk and to criticize than to do what you have done. I

regret very much that my way of speaking suggested to your minds that I was only tagging your program with an epithet just to condemn it.

I can also see that I should not have said that the course was "lined up" according to the principles of the Spiritual Exercises; that expression too is misleading. However, I am still wondering, even after going back over your books and the brochure written by Father Fernan on the plan, whether the course *in its finality* is not as much like an Ignatian retreat as is possible for the classroom. Perhaps I have been too much influenced by Father Fernan's interpretation of the course, as he sets it forth in his brochure. Moreover, in talking with him at the Catholic Theological Convention in Baltimore in summer of 1953, I can remember him saying in this regard almost verbatim what I have said. Of course, my impression may be only my own interpretation of what he said, not what he actually meant. There is certainly nothing demeaning in an undertaking which has this finality. The textbooks themselves, apart from Father Fernan's brochure, did not give me the same strong impression in this regard. If I am still wrong on this point, then perhaps it would be worth your while to clear up this difficulty not only for me, but for many others, at least in this region, who have the same impression.

I do not have the opportunity to teach college religion except in the summer-time; so I wrote on the subject with some fear and trepidation. My article was nothing but a reworking of a paper given at a meeting of the Chicago and Missouri province religion teachers at Marquette in the fall of 1953. Our province prefect asked me to give the paper, and I wanted to emphasize that what I said was said from the viewpoint of a theologian. If, unfortunately, I should be instrumental in hindering your wonderful work at Le Moyne, I would regret it very much; for you, who are taking the lead in the solution of the problem, have had the courage to go ahead and do something about it instead of just talking about it, and you have already achieved praiseworthy results.

In regard to my remarks about the inadequacy of the *totus Christus* as the principle upon which the course is to be built, they were made from a theoretical point of view; your practical experience in the teaching of the course will be able better to guide you in deciding whether in this way you actually achieve a vision of world order in your students.

A bigger difficulty in my mind is the way Scripture is used in the course. It is my impression that you are a little too optimistic in thinking that the objection made against the course as being "scriptural" has been answered. The facetious objections about your being Protestant in your approach can be readily disregarded. But I do not think you are giving the living teaching authority of the Church the emphasis which it should have in teaching college students. This also is the opinion of Father Vollert, who teaches here and is our dean, and who has been following the developments in college theology as closely as he can.

By this time, Father, I hope you see that I did not intend to put any tag on the Le Moyne plan which would make for easy condemnation of it. There is too much in it that is good, and even if no further progress were made in the Le Moyne idea, it will serve our college religion programs many, many times better than what has been offered in the past. I would not be telling you the truth, if I said that I thought it was perfect, and you, yourself, would not believe it either.

My best wishes to Father Fernan. May Our Lord make your work very, very successful.

Yours sincerely in Our Lord,

GERALD VAN ACKEREN, S.J.

News From the Field

CENTRAL OFFICE

DIRECTORY CHANGES: The following changes have been made in the *Directory, Jesuit Educational Association, 1954-1955* since the March issue of the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*: *Page 7*: Dentistry: Chairman, Dr. James H. Pence, Creighton University; Finance Officers: Chairman, Rev. Edward P. Whalen, S.J., Boston College; Secretary, Richard J. Anthony, Georgetown University; Law: Chairman, John F. X. Finn, Fordham University. *Page 12*: Fordham University, School of General Studies, Adult Education Center, Rev. Laurence S. Atherton, S.J., Assistant Dean; College of Arts and Sciences, Rev. Charles P. Loughran, S.J., Assistant Dean; School of Business, 302 Broadway, Louis M. Spadaro, Assistant Dean; School of Education, Francis M. Crowley, Dean Emeritus; James S. Donnelly, Acting Dean. *Page 14*: Holy Cross College: Telephone, Pleasant 2-6761; College of Arts and Sciences, Rev. Eugene D. McCarthy, S.J., Dean of Men; Rev. William T. Abbot, S.J., Assistant Dean of Men. *Page 18*: Loyola University, New Orleans, School of Dentistry, Rev. William D. O'Leary, S.J., R.I.P. *Page 19*: Marquette University, Rev. Eugene H. Kessler, S.J., Acting Dean; Rev. Adrian J. Kochanski, S.J., Assistant Dean. *Page 25*: University of San Francisco, Evening Division, Rev. Lloyd R. Burns, S.J., Acting Director. *Page 27*: Boston College High School, Change address to 150 Morrissey Boulevard. *Page 30*: St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco, Rev. Robert R. Leonard, S.J., Acting Principal; Rev. David J. Walsh, S.J., Assistant Principal. *Page 35*: St. John's College, Belize, Very Rev. Urban J. Kramer, S.J., Rector.

HIGH SCHOOLS

NEW SITE: After fifty-five years in downtown Tampa, Jesuit High is moving to a more spacious and less commercial area. Architects' plans call for a group of buildings. Plans for the administration-classroom building are nearing completion and call for 12 classrooms with necessary laboratories and offices. As of the summer of 1954, \$400,000 had been collected or pledged.

EXPANSION: New Faculty Building at Campion was recently occupied.

St. Louis University High School played its last basketball game in the old gym. Foundation is being laid for a new one.

SCHOLARSHIP: The American Legion announced an annual scholarship to the most deserving senior of Rockhurst High School.

FEATURE ARTICLE of Brooklyn Prep's magazine appeared in the January issue of *School Life*.

SPEECH: After winning 1000 National Forensic League points, Father Thomas Curry of St. Louis University earned the N.F.L. gold pin for his coaching at Marquette University High School. This represents 10,000 points won by his debaters in the incredibly short period of five years.

INTERSCHOLASTIC LATIN CONTEST of the Midwest Jesuit High Schools was won by St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland. St. Xavier and Campion followed.

POSTCARD in color is the latest means of publicizing Bellarmine College Preparatory, San Jose.

OTHELLO in modern dress was produced by Loyola High School, Los Angeles. Their printed program sets a standard not soon to be excelled.

ALL-CATHOLIC AWARD of the Catholic Student Press Association was awarded Brooklyn Prep's magazine for "promoting Catholic ideals in journalism."

COLLEGE DIRECTORY of neighboring Catholic colleges is an interesting of *Xavier Prep* of St. Xavier High School.

SODALITY INTEGRATED PLAN: Father Martin Carrabine, Sodality Secretariate, 1114 S. May Street, Chicago 7, Illinois, has prepared a four-year integrated plan for high school retreat masters, student counsellors and Sodality moderators. Details are available at the above address.

MEDITATIONS ON RADIO: Members of the Loyola Academy (Chicago) community are preparing brief meditations to be used by N.B.C. in opening and closing its hours on the air.

TALENTED: Two students of Fairfield College Preparatory School were chosen national winners in the Westinghouse Science Talent Search.

ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS: University of Detroit High School administered scholarship entrance examinations to 500 applicants.

Six hundred applicants took the entrance examination at St. Louis University High School. Nine scholarships were awarded.

At Marquette University High School 493 boys took entrance test. Fewer than 250 can be accepted.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

STUDENT HONORS: Arthur H. Hayes, Alumnus of Bellarmine College Preparatory, San Jose, and Senior at Santa Clara is one of 32 American winners of the Rhodes Scholarship.

TEACHER HONORS: "Before there was a U.S.A." 12 television programs by Father John Bannon of St. Louis University, have been selected by the Ford Foundation Educational Television and Radio Center for national distribution.

Dr. Fernand L. Vial of Fordham University received a Fulbright grant 1954-55 as research scholar in Modern French Literature at the University of Paris.

Father Joseph H. Fichter of Loyola University, New Orleans, received a Fulbright Grant, 1954-55, as lecturer in Sociology at Westphalian State University of Muenster.

NEW DEPARTMENT of Nursing was begun at the University of San Francisco.

SELF-EVALUATION is being undertaken at Gonzaga University, Mechanics of the operation call for 12 separate investigations by as many committees.

OPERATION YOUTH of Xavier University, for the third year won the Freedom Foundation award.

STUDENT COUNSELLING BROCHURES of the University of Detroit Counselling Bureau are *Know Your Colleges* and *Choosing a Vocation*. The former is sponsored by Catholic Hierarchy of Michigan and features the state's six Catholic colleges and one university.

CONVINCED that amateurs are capable of professional writing, the Freshman Magazine Committee of Marquette University gathered the best of routine class assignments in a 32 page book entitled "*Freshman Writing*."

ENGINEERING: Beginning September 1955, St. Peter's College will offer a pre-engineering program in conjunction with the College of Engineering, University of Detroit.

TEN INDUSTRY sponsored conference commended the University of Detroit Placement Bureau for circularizing the larger firms and suggested that "all universities should make available statistics and factual information concerning recent graduates as the University of Detroit has been doing for the past two years."

T.V. The June issue of P.M.L.A. (Publications of the Modern Language Association of America) credits Creighton University as being the first institution to attempt the teaching of foreign languages over television.

KICKOFF: Mr. George Strake, National Chairman of the Pope Pius XII Memorial Library Fund, opened the drive with a half million dollar gift.

MEDICAL AWARDS: Eight of the fifteen recipients of the American Medical Education Foundation's "Award of Merit" for 1953 were Creighton men. This award is made for outstanding contributions to the Foundation's program in behalf of medical education.

INTEGRATION: The New Orleans province has adopted a sane and quiet policy of accepting negro students. It is published in "Christ's Blueprint for the South." Spring Hill has accepted an unspecified number of negro students. Reactions? Here is a quote from Tulane University's *Hullabaloo* regarding the Loyola U. vs. La Salle basketball game in which a colored player participated and about 100 spectators were negroes: "We take our hats off to Loyola. We are glad that an institution of higher learning was the first to take a step in the right direction. We hope that other schools in the area will also put the past behind and realize that a new and enlightened age is upon us."

JESUIT DISPLAY: Father Paul Callens, professor of classical languages at Loyola University, New Orleans, has planned a series of displays on the Society of Jesus. These displays are designed to acquaint the students with the work done by Jesuit poets, historians, astronomers, physicists, scientists, orators, playwrights, etc. The first, which was placed in the Loyola library, caused great interest among the students on the campus.

PURCHASING HANDBOOK: Convinced that savings in purchasing are equivalent to an increase in income, Brother James Kenny of Fordham University's Purchasing Department prepared a 15 page brochure to aid faculty members in understanding the steps in placing orders.

GUIDANCE BROCHURE prepared by Dr. Alexander Schneiders of Fordham University outlines the implementation of the program begun modestly but now extended to all schools and divisions.

MISCELLANEOUS

BOOK AWARDS: The Society of Typographic Arts in its Annual Design in Chicago Printing Exhibition selected two Loyola University Press books, Curran: *The Churches and the Schools* and *Effective Writing*.

VOCATIONS: Theologians at West Baden mailed to all schools of the province a kit of photographs, pamphlets and leaflets to aid them in preparing exhibits for promoting vocations to the Jesuit priesthood and brotherhood.

MISSIONARIES: As of December 31, 1953, 24.4 percent of all male Catholic missionaries are American Jesuits. This figure, 678, represents only native born Americans.

SCIENTISTS will be interested in the newsy *Bulletin of the Albertus Magnus Guild*. Replete with brief notices of scientific research and personalities, it is available to members of the Guild, or to subscribers at the annual rate of \$1.00.

FOUR YEARS with a perfect record in number of successful candidates in the bar examination is the enviable record of the Law School of the Ateneo de Manila.

NEW COLLEGE: The Mission of Korea, recently assigned to the Wisconsin Vice-Province was the scene of Father Vice-Provincial Burns' exploration with a view toward beginning there a new college in 1956.

"INTERIM" is a mimeographed booklet sent by the students of Manresa College, Roehampton to about 8000 students of education, mostly non-Catholic. It is a series of informal essays and comments on serious subjects, very readable and not too obviously proselytizing in nature.

VIRGILIAN Summer School in Italy, directed by Father Raymond Schoder, West Baden College, West Baden Springs, Indiana, is planning its coming series of lectures and trips. Held annually from July 6 to August 15 in two-week cycles, the School offers complete academic, residence and travel facilities, complete expenses for two weeks, after arrival in Naples, normally come to \$110.00.

CREDO OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Universities are not only teachers of men but moulders of the leaders of men. In today's bitter struggle between the free world and the slave world—the free mind and the slave mind—the University of San Francisco proudly proclaims that it has always taught and will continue to teach the following creed:

We believe in God.

We believe in the personal dignity of man.

We believe that man has natural rights which come from God and not from the State.

We are therefore opposed to all forms of dictatorship which are based on the philosophy that the "total man" (totalitarianism) belongs to the State.

We believe in the sanctity of the home—the basic unit of civilization.

We believe in the natural right of private property, but likewise that private property has its social obligations.

We believe that Labor has not only rights but obligations.

We believe that Capital has not only rights but obligations.

We are vigorously opposed to all forms of "racism"—persecution or intolerance because of race.

We believe that liberty is a sacred thing, but that law, which regulates liberty, is a sacred obligation.

We believe in inculcating all the essential liberties of American Democracy and take open and frank issue with all brands of spurious "democracy."

We believe in the intense study of the tenets and tactics of those who would seek to destroy these essential liberties of American Democracy.

We believe that "academic freedom" should not be used as a pretext to advocate systems which destroy all freedom.

We believe, briefly, in the teachings of Christ, who held that morality must regulate the personal, family, economic, political, and international life of men if civilization is to endure.

(This Credo was first used by the University of San Francisco and underwent several revisions, this being the last. It is here reproduced so that any desiring to adopt it may do so without acknowledgment.)