

FATHERS' RECREATION ROOM
PLEASE DO NOT TAKE TO
PRIVATE ROOM 2717 $\frac{1}{2}$ 2

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

JUNE 1961

THE ATLANTIC CITY JEA MEETING

HUMANISM AND HUNGER OR IN PRAISE OF FOLLY

EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES FOR JESUIT
SECONDARY SCHOOLS

BOTH NOBLE AND REWARDING

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

Vol. XXIV, No. 1

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Our Contributors

FATHER WALTER C. McCAULEY, S.J. is principal of Jesuit High School, Dallas, Texas

FATHER GERALD R. SHEAHAN, S.J. is principal of Saint Louis University High School, Saint Louis, Missouri

FATHER BRIAN A. McGRATH, S.J. is Academic Vice President of Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

FATHER W. SEAVEY JOYCE, S.J. is Dean of the College of Business Administration, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

FATHER CHARLES F. DONOVAN, S.J. is Dean of the School of Education, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

FATHER L. W. FRIEDRICH, S.J. is Dean of the Graduate School, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

FATHER JOHN N. FELTON, S.J. is professor of classics at Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio.

FATHER JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J., veteran Province Prefect of the Detroit Province, and former Province Prefect of the Chicago Province has just assumed the post of Rector of the University of Detroit High School.

FATHER JOSEPH D. AYD, S.J. is Principal of St. Joseph's Prep, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

331795

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

June 1961

CONTENTS

THE ATLANTIC CITY JEA MEETING

Walter C. McCauley, S.J. 5

THE IMPACT OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS ON OUR JESUIT SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Gerald R. Sheahan, S.J. 15

THE IMPACT OF MODERN DEVELOPMENTS ON EDUCATION

Brian A. McGrath, S.J. 23

TRENDS IN BUSINESS EDUCATION

W. Seavey Joyce, S.J. 30

TRENDS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Charles F. Donovan, S.J. 35

TRENDS IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

L. W. Friedrich, S.J. 40

HUMANISM AND HUNGER OR IN PRAISE OF FOLLY

John N. Felton, S.J. 46

EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES FOR JESUIT SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Julian L. Maline, S.J. 50

BOTH NOBLE AND REWARDING

Joseph D. Ayd, S.J. 53

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF A LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION? . . . 58

NEWS FROM THE FIELD 61

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

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

Assistant Editor

PAUL A. FITZGERALD, S.J.

Managing Editor

EUGENE F. MANGOLD, 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>
CORNELIUS J. CARR, S.J.	<i>Buffalo Province</i>
EDWARD A. DOYLE, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JOSEPH D. FITZGERALD, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
ROBERT F. HARVANEK, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
HERMAN J. HAUCK, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
JOHN M. HYNES, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
LEO B. KAUFMANN, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
ADRIAN J. KOCHANSKI, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JOHN F. LENNY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
WILLIAM D. RYAN, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
CLAUDE J. STALLWORTH, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

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

COPYRIGHT, 1961

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

The Atlantic City J E A Meeting

APRIL 2-3, 1961

WALTER C. McCAULEY, S.J.

For the first time in many years, the Jesuit Educational Association Annual Meeting was held away from the campus of a Jesuit institution. This year's meeting convened Easter Sunday and Monday in the Chalfonte-Haddon Hall Hotel in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

At the First General Session greetings were extended to the 235 Jesuit and lay delegates by Very Reverend John M. Daley, S.J., Provincial of the Maryland Province, in whose jurisdiction Atlantic City lies. Despite the absence of a Jesuit school in the vicinity, further gracious greetings were extended by the titular host of the meeting, the Reverend John J. Long, S.J., President of the University of Scranton.

In line with previous word received by all the delegates, the theme of the annual meeting was the "Impact of Educational Developments on Our Jesuit Institutions." In the opening addresses of the First General Session this theme was developed from two points of view, that of the Jesuit secondary school and that of the Jesuit school of higher education.

Speaking of Jesuit secondary education was Father Gerald R. Sheahan, S.J., Principal of St. Louis University High School. Father Sheahan's address was a forceful and thought-provoking attack on the problem from five points of view. He spoke of students, curriculum, professional leadership, teacher preparation, and teaching aids.

In the section on students, Father Sheahan mentioned the increasing number of Catholic elementary school graduates and the proportionally increasing number of Catholic elementary school graduates qualified to do good work in a Jesuit high school. If we try to choose the best of these applicants, then we are obliged to give them the best in teaching, in curricula, and in opportunities for creativity and leadership.

This led Father Sheahan into his discussion of curriculum enrichment and changes, the principal section of his paper. He began this section with a series of very pointed questions about our participation and leadership in the area of curriculum studies. Much is being done to emphasize new programs for the gifted, to insist on the study of modern foreign languages for longer periods of time, to develop the fields of mathematics and science, to organize the college preparatory English curriculum. Without saying so directly Father Sheahan hinted that we

are far from being the leaders in these new movements or in the groups that are shaping the curricula of the future.

The big question in curriculum improvement is the question of enrichment or advanced placement or both. In other words should we, asked Father Sheahan, teach calculus to our most gifted seniors or enrich their program with other high school courses, such as an extra year of history or of a modern foreign language? Is it better to teach a year and a half each of chemistry and physics or to teach one year each of biology, chemistry, and physics? Father suggested that perhaps we should do all of these things for different segments of our student body.

Another point at issue, if we favor advanced placement, is the leadership we should take in selling these programs to department heads in our local Jesuit colleges. We would seem to have, in Jesuit colleges and Jesuit high schools, the ideal arrangement for assuming leadership in advanced placement—a leadership we so far have not shown.

A logical complement to advanced placement for our high school graduates is advanced placement for our entering freshmen. More and more of our eighth-grade applicants are coming to us with training in modern language and/or high school mathematics. Surely we should be ready to provide for them.

Father Sheahan then suggested that we could find another means for improving our curriculum by putting more emphasis on modern foreign languages, even at the expense of Latin and Greek. While admitting the cultural advantages and even the mind-training qualities of Latin and Greek, Father Sheahan wondered if Latin and Latin teachers might not profit by healthy competition with a four-year course of French or German or Spanish, offered as an option in place of Latin. He believes that whatever the curriculum might lose in disciplinary values would be more than made up by the psychological values to the students of the strong natural motivation to learn the language of their choice, rather than the language that is required of them. If this proposal seems too radical, Father Sheahan suggested that a possible alternate proposal would be to require in the first two years four hours per week of Latin and four of a modern foreign language, with the option of dropping the Latin at the end of sophomore year. Even if a boy drops Latin, he would have much of the mental discipline involved in the study of Latin, and he could acquire enough of its cultural value by a course in Latin and Greek literature in translation.

Father Sheahan admitted the problems of turning Latin teachers into French or German or Spanish teachers. He admitted, too, that it will take much time and effort to train Jesuits as thoroughly in modern

foreign languages as they are trained in Latin. But he feels the advantages, psychological and pedagogical, are well worth the effort.

In the area of professional leadership, Father Sheahan feels we are not carrying our weight. There are outstanding exceptions, of course: Father Lorenzo K. Reed and his work on the 1960 revision of the Evaluative Criteria; Father Julian Maline and his work with several committees of the North Central Association. Yet, in the overall picture, there are not nearly enough Jesuits on national, regional, and state commissions.

Father Sheahan then went on to our teacher preparation with the suggestion that a greater flexibility in our seminary programs might help greatly in our preparation as teachers. This is all the more important because of the very limited stability of our high school faculties. Of course, the turnover of scholastics has its advantages in the energy and cooperation they bring to the school, but these turnovers do hurt our schools in comparison with the stability in teachers and administrators of some of the better private and public high schools. An important source of stability in our schools are our lay teachers. Here, of course, we are faced with the problem of salary and the ever-increasing rise in the public school scales. If federal aid to public schools becomes a reality, we will be unable to compete without a drastic rise in tuition.

Father Sheahan's last point had to do with teaching aids. Here he stressed the increasing importance of teaching machines for more efficient and faster teaching. As these machines become more and more sophisticated, they will be increasingly important to us. He feels that we have neglected this area of assistance to our teaching and that we should cultivate work with tapes, slides, even closed-circuit TV. We will have to be inventive and experimental and we will have to leave some of our comfortable teaching and administrative ruts, but this is the price of progress in our schools.

The second paper of the First General Session was read by Father Brian A. McGrath, S.J., Academic Vice President of Georgetown University. In assessing the impact of educational developments on Jesuit institutions of higher learning, Father McGrath concentrated on the effect of federal aid.

Without entering into discussion on the question of whether there should be more federal aid and how it should be given, Father McGrath summarized the present facts of federal aid and its effect on higher education, private and public, tax-supported and non-tax-supported.

He divided federal activity in education into three areas: 1) aid to special groups of individuals or individuals in special fields of study; 2) federal grants for research at various colleges and universities; and

3) federal grants for things besides research. No one knows the total amount the federal government spends on higher education, though it is estimated that between 16 and 20 per cent of the budget for higher education comes from the federal government. The estimated cost of higher education in 1958-59 was four billion dollars.

Father McGrath stated that the substantial impact of federal funds has been centered on the faculty, on the curriculum, and on the student. The impact on faculty has been of an indirect kind, in the sense that federal support of research has drawn many faculty members from teaching to research, either inside or outside the university.

In curriculum the great emphasis has been on mathematics, natural sciences, and languages and linguistics. As a result all of these areas are developing rapidly. Federal aid to students is available primarily for loans, for fellowships and research grants, and for aid to members of the government or the military. Here again the emphasis in fellowships and research grants is on the natural sciences.

In order to meet the challenges of the many new problems presented, it will be necessary to develop our faculties. They must have opportunities to do research, lead institutes, travel as experts, develop their knowledge and competence by more time off. And our institutions of higher learning must contend with the inroads into the faculty made by industry and private research institutes.

In the area of curriculum, much experimentation is needed. Many basic courses will come to be handled more and more by the high school. Departments will have to step up and integrate their programs, and some things will have to be dropped. Duplication will have to be stopped in individual departments and among departments. Balance in the demands of the various departments is necessary. New methods of teaching must be considered and studied—the conference method, TV. If possible an optimum class size should be determined.

As Father McGrath suggested, these and many other challenges are now facing us on every level of the educational process, but particularly at the college and university level. Our courage and resourcefulness in meeting them will determine whether or not we are worthy heirs of the Ignatian tradition.

The Easter Monday meetings were divided into Sectional Sessions in the morning and Mixed Group Sessions in the afternoon. The four Sectional Sessions were made up of delegates representing Secondary Schools, Colleges and Universities, Schools of Business, and Graduate Schools, respectively.

Because of the size of the Secondary School group and because of the

limited time for discussion, it was decided beforehand to limit discussion to the principal points on the discussion outline. The Chairman, Father Bernard J. Dooley, S.J., Principal of Georgetown Preparatory School, arranged these points in the order selected by the delegates. Actually only one point was covered with any degree of thoroughness—the question of the influence of national testing programs on our instruction.

There appeared a number of conflicting viewpoints on this matter, although most of the principals present seemed to feel that such examinations as the College Boards and the National Merit have not been a major influence on our instruction. In the fields of mathematics and English, however, we have learned a great deal about our weaknesses, particularly in methodology.

There was a general feeling that more work was necessary in the area of reading. It was suggested that work in speed reading would be of great value in increasing the verbal scores on the SAT. The stress should be on quantity and comprehension rather than on memory and analysis, though these latter should certainly not be allowed to drop from our curriculum.

Despite the rather general belief of the principals that their own recommendation was a better norm than College Board scores for the evaluation of a prospective college student, it was recognized that the College Board scores are becoming more important each year in the matter of college admissions. At this point some discussion developed on the possibility and advisability of drilling boys for the College Boards and the National Merit. Some of the delegates expressed the conviction that such drill was impossible, since the examination companies claim it has no effect on the students' scores. On the other hand, a number of the delegates were able to give examples of special schools which had an amazing record for raising students' scores in comparatively short periods of time. It was generally agreed, however, that such courses should not replace our regular curriculum, though there should be more emphasis on developmental and speed reading and on word study in our English courses.

The question of a four-year modern language program came up for very brief comment. The question of the relationship such a program would have with our traditional four year Latin course, either as a parallel course or as a replacement, was touched on only lightly. It was decided that this matter could best be studied by a Secondary School Commission, which could look into the matter of the theory of modern language study as well as the practical problems our graduates have on the collegiate level because of a weakness in modern languages.

The College and University Section met under the chairmanship of Father William G. Kelly, S.J., Dean of Studies at the University of Scranton. It was proposed that a general master plan be drawn up for Jesuit higher education in the entire Assistancy in order to further institutional co-operation and to reduce the duplication of programs, especially on the graduate level and in professional schools. For such a master plan to be possible, it was agreed that a study on Jesuit higher education in the United States as a whole should be made, with particular reference to the number, variety, and geographic distribution of graduate and professional programs, and that this study should conclude with an evaluation of the facts and appropriate recommendations. The proper sponsor of this study would be the Jesuit Educational Association itself.

There was considerable discussion of the manpower resources of our institutions. In addition to the problems of a basic manpower shortage, there was question as to the possibility of greater interchange of men from Province to Province where their specific abilities are needed.

Lay faculty recruitment brought in the factors of research and self-development opportunities and of fringe benefits. In addition to the possibility of obtaining government grants for research, some colleges have established working arrangements with private and industrial research institutes. Fringe benefits for lay members of the faculty can take various forms: insurance, housing facilities, free tuition for children, pension plans for the faculty and for the widows of faculty members. The meeting concluded with a brief discussion of the amount of authority a University or College President could or should delegate to an academic Vice President. It was generally felt that there was no need for him to delegate his authority in any great degree.

The Schools of Business Section included representatives of nine Jesuit Schools of Business. Dr. Raymond Pelissier, Dean of the Business School of Georgetown, was chairman.

Discussion centered on four areas: individual student needs, modern teaching devices, recruitment of lay faculty, and business curricula. On the first point it was suggested that special programs should be set up for superior students. Superior students from the various schools or colleges on the campus could be helped and challenged by common classes in common subjects.

Few of the schools represented have developed audio-visual devices, television, or other such instructional media to any great extent. It was felt, however, that, as more experimentation is done in these areas, proper emphasis on the more productive media will be learned. Lay faculty recruitment seems to emphasize the hiring of young men. After they are

evaluated, the most promising are helped to go on for terminal degrees before becoming regular faculty members.

No consensus could be reached on the subject of an "ideal" undergraduate collegiate business curriculum. It was felt, however, that studies should be made in specific areas of the curriculum. A number of questions should be answered. How should new developments in business administration be combined with traditional Jesuit emphasis on philosophy, theology, and cultural courses? How is behavioral science to be introduced? In general, what are the proper norms for reaching an ideal collegiate business curriculum for our schools?

In the Graduate School Section the entire discussion centered around one point in the discussion outline:

"Planning their apostolates in view of the growth of our college-age population, and in view of other commitments, particularly of an international character, to what extent should the American Jesuit Provinces allow their colleges to develop into universities, and their universities into complete complex universities (comprising undergraduate professional schools, graduate professional schools, and graduate schools granting the doctorate in a number of fields)?"

There were two diametrically opposed positions presented in the group. The first, as presented in the recorder's report, ran like this:

"The Jesuit Colleges and Universities should use the present national and international educational possibilities to assume leadership in graduate work either by originating or by developing doctoral and master's programs."

This position was based on the availability of governmental and private grants, the presence of many good graduate students around the country, the importance of our graduates to many colleges around the country, the local and regional (if not national) prestige of many of our graduate schools, and the importance of continuing the upward trend in Catholic Education which has progressed so far in the past two decades.

The opposite position stated that there should be no new graduate schools nor expansion of programs in those already established. Reasons for this position included: expense of laboratory and library resources, our financial inability to compete with other universities in teachers and students, the fact that most top students (even from Catholic colleges) select Ivy League or state graduate schools, the fact that we have a better chance of becoming outstanding on the undergraduate level if we put all our resources into developing top undergraduate programs.

After considerable discussion of the two positions, it was generally agreed that *cautious* and *well-planned* development of new graduate schools and new graduate programs would be most to the advantage of the Church, both here and abroad.

In the Monday afternoon Mixed Group Sessions almost every topic on the entire discussion outline was touched upon by one group or other. These groups were set up as cross-sections of the various types of educational institutions represented. Since they cut across both geographical and institutional lines, a great variety of experience, background, and interest was brought to each of the fifteen groups. While not much was settled in these small group meetings, new ideas and approaches were introduced and discussed in many of them. Since they were conducted in small units and on an informal basis, almost every delegate had the opportunity to express his opinion on some point or other.

The final session of the meeting was the Second General Session of all the delegates on Easter Monday evening after a fine dinner in one of the Haddon Hall dining rooms. Father J. Joseph Bluett, S.J., President of St. Joseph's College, was chairman.

Instead of the usual summaries of the previous meetings, the Second General Session featured three excellent papers on trends in three areas of education: business education, teacher training, and graduate education. Although space will not permit the amount of treatment each of these papers deserves, I will attempt to give a few of the highlights of each.

Father W. Seavey Joyce, S.J., Dean of the College of Business Administration at Boston College, began the papers with a discussion of business education. He hastened to disassociate business administration courses in our colleges from the exclusively utilitarian courses of the "business college" and of many of the larger urban universities. Emphasis in our schools is on "administration" rather than "business."

Father Joyce cited the need for an outstanding Catholic graduate program in business administration, though his remarks were aimed primarily at business administration on the under-graduate level. There is undoubtedly a need for a high percentage of "liberal" courses in a school of business administration. This need, Father Joyce feels, is adequately taken care of in our Jesuit institutions. In the strictly professional area, there is more and more being done to work out a science of administration. The content of this emerging science has five divisions: 1) Functional Fields, of finance, production, and distribution—emphasis is more analytic than descriptive; 2) Quantitative Analysis—accounting, mathematics, and statistics used to interpret data, control enterprises, and reach

decisions; 3) Human Behavior—behavioral sciences are being stressed because the administrator works with human beings; 4) Environmental Perceptiveness—emphasis on social sciences and economics, especially the national political economy; 5) Integration or Synthesis—some kind of business policy course must synthesize all these factors.

Trends in the area of teacher training were discussed by Father Charles F. Donovan, S.J., Dean of the School of Education of Boston College. He spoke of the interesting, but still experimental, possibilities of educational TV and the self-instructional machines on the future of teacher education. But his principal points had to do with the position of various associations in formulating teacher-training policy.

The present reaction against the purely pragmatic approach of the "methodology school" fits well with the strong liberal education program which Jesuit teacher-preparation schools have always insisted on. We must be careful, of course, that the pendulum doesn't swing too far and exclude as irrelevant the legitimate claims of professional education.

At present five of our Jesuit Colleges have received the accreditation of NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education), the organization which handles all teacher-education accreditation in the country. There has been some discussion on the advisability of seeking its accreditation. For one thing, it is NEA—dominated. Private education has little voice on its Council, and higher education does not really control it.

At the same time, NCATE is becoming stronger every year. Seventeen states make graduation from an NCATE-approved institution a condition of certification for teaching. This trend will likely continue. The Jesuit colleges which have been accredited have praised the accreditation process. Most important would seem to be the need for Jesuit schools and for other private colleges and universities to be in a position to exert real influence on the accrediting association. There is a serious danger, Father Donovan stated, that half-educated and non-intellectual groups might gradually get control of all teacher accreditation. This could quickly extend their control beyond the elementary and secondary school into the college and university. Such groups cannot be adequately opposed outside the organizations in which they work. It would seem that this last argument is the strongest inducement we have for entering NCATE.

Father L. W. Friedrich, S.J., Dean of the Graduate School of Marquette University, gave the final paper of the evening on trends in graduate education. He indicated a good number of trends in this area, most of which are in some way connected with increased government spend-

ing for research and fellowships. This spending is doing much good for graduate schools but it is also creating many problems. Among others is the fight for good graduate students with lush fellowships and the problem of allocating university funds from needy areas to match government funds in special research projects.

Preparation of future college teachers is a growing concern among graduate schools in the light of growing enrollments on the college level. Various suggestions for speeding up the doctoral program have been bogged down, usually by the dissertation. Yet there is quite a bit of re-thinking being done on the possibility of the dissertation being training in original and independent study rather than an original contribution to man's fund of knowledge. There is worry, too, about the deterioration of graduate work under the pressure of boards of education which give increases in pay to teachers for *graduate* credit.

There is a growing development of interdisciplinary programs, where a number of departments work on areas affecting all of them. In this new field, Jesuit graduate schools have some fine opportunities for leadership.

Father Friedrich suggested that some kind of graduate school accreditation is coming, because of the demand for good graduate schools and the temptation of unprepared universities to set up doctoral programs in order to qualify for NDEA fellowship funds.

After a few minutes of discussion, the Second General Session adjourned and ended the JEA Atlantic City Meeting. The Program and Arrangements Committee was deservedly complimented on an excellent job. Particular thanks went to the chairman and principal arranger, Father Joseph K. Drane, S.J., Prefect of Studies for the Maryland Province.

RELIGIOUS TRUTH

In a word, religious truth is not only a portion, but a condition of general knowledge. To blot it out is nothing short, if I may so speak, of unravelling the web of university teaching. It is, according to the Greek proverb, to take the spring from out of the year; it is to imitate the preposterous proceeding of those tragedians who represented a drama with omission of its principal party. (Cardinal Newman, "Idea of a University.")

The Impact of Educational Developments on Our Jesuit Secondary Schools*

GERALD R. SHEAHAN, S.J.

My job tonight is to promote discussion. A man doesn't promote discussion by making statements with which everyone will agree. I don't expect you to agree with everything I say tonight, but I do hope that you will find my comments more catalytic than anesthetic.

We have much to be thankful for in our Jesuit secondary schools. We have some of the most gifted groups of students to be found in any high schools in the Nation; we have some of the best and most closely integrated curricula to be found in any high schools in the Nation; one of the most widely educated and deeply dedicated groups of teachers; one of the most loyal groups of alumni, parents, and friends; one of the most widespread reputations for excellence in secondary school education. And I think that we are doing an effective job of preparing our graduates for college and for life, both here and in eternity.

However, we also have much to be concerned about. Are we, for instance, caring for our gifted students as well as we should? Are we improving our curricula as rapidly as we should? Are we really as thoroughly educated, as deeply dedicated, and as professionally minded as people think us to be? For if we fail in these areas, then we shall fail to maintain the high degree of loyalty that we now enjoy among our alumni, our parents, and our friends. And if we lose this loyalty, we may as well close our schools.

Tonight I shall limit my remarks to the areas of students, curriculum, professional leadership, teacher preparation, and teaching aids. I shall leave for the morning sessions the introduction of the other items given on the two-page lists for our discussion.

Students

There is no shortage of gifted students applying for admission to our schools. In St. Louis City and County alone, a total of almost 7,000 chil-

* Paper presented at Annual J.E.A. Meeting, Atlantic City, April 2, 1961.

dren, 3,500 boys and an equal number of girls, graduated from Catholic elementary schools in 1961. At least 1,500 of those boys could have done good work in a Jesuit high school. Next year the total number of graduates will rise to more than 8,000; the following year to more than 9,000. And this picture is being duplicated in every city in the Nation where a Jesuit high school exists.

This population explosion causes many problems. I shall mention only one. If we choose from among the best of these applicants, and I certainly think we should, then we shall see a steady rise in the intellectual level of our student body. And if we concentrate on admitting such talented students, then we owe them, and we owe the community, the best in curricula, the best in teaching, the best in opportunities for creativity and leadership. If we do not intend to provide these services, we have no right to take such students. And if we think that such students could develop their talents for creativity and for leadership better in other Catholic high schools, we should encourage them to attend those schools.

On the other hand, if we use other criteria for admission, whether it be beauty or brawn, money or ambition, connections or obligations, we must justify our position with our superiors and tailor our curriculum to fit the needs of the students we take.

Curriculum (general)

Our second question is whether we are improving our curricula as we should. There is a new emphasis in every high school association in the Nation on the improvement of curricula. There is new emphasis on programs for the gifted; new pressure for the study of at least one modern foreign language for six years or more before entering college; new efforts to take up the slack in the fields of mathematics and science; new efforts to organize and stabilize the college preparatory English curriculum; and there are strong demands being made by accrediting agencies that we offer courses in the fine arts and in the practical arts, with the argument that even college-bound students need some acquaintance with these arts for the profitable use of their leisure time.

We should be in the vanguard of most of these movements to stiffen and enrich the high school curriculum. We should welcome these developments in the aftermath of Dewey permissivism, of supermarket electivism, of curriculum integration by juxtaposition. However, are we in the vanguard? Or are we surrendering our leadership to other groups

in other schools? Are we doing all we should to improve our own curricula? And are we doing all we can to gain membership in other groups that will shape the curricula of the future?

Curriculum Enrichment

A good place to start on the improvement of our own curricula is to provide more enrichment and more advanced placement courses for the gifted. The question is, which should we provide? Enrichment? Advanced Placement? Or both?

For instance, you might ask whether it is better to teach calculus to our most gifted seniors or to enrich their course with other high school courses such as a fourth year of history or a third year of a modern foreign language; whether it is better to teach 1½ years each of Chemistry and Physics or to teach one year each of Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. Perhaps the answer is that we should do all of these things for different segments of our student body. For is it not true that most so-called advanced placement courses are merely high school courses that deserted the high school with the advent of Deweyism and are only now returning to their proper place. For instance, the content of some courses such as Virgil's *Aeneid*, college algebra and trigonometry, Modern European History has always been taught in the better high schools, but it has usually been required again in the colleges, even of the graduates of better high schools, because most high school graduates came to college without these courses.

However, if we favor Advanced Placement, then we should take the leadership in providing the courses and in selling the value of these courses to the head of the various departments in our local Jesuit college or university. Leading officials of the National Advanced Placement Program are much surprised at the poor degree of co-operation between Jesuit colleges and Jesuit high schools. They believe that we have the ideal machinery for assuming leadership in advanced placement.

Carrying the idea of advanced placement one step further, if we believe in advanced placement for our graduates, we should also be willing to consider advanced placement for our entering freshmen. An increasing number of eighth-grade applicants will come to us from the better private and public schools with one or more years of excellent training in modern language and/or high school mathematics. This number will continue to grow, and we should be ready to provide for them.

Modern Foreign Languages in the Curriculum

Another means for improving our curricula is to put much more emphasis on modern foreign languages, even at the expense of Latin and Greek.

I agree with Father Harvanek's report on "The Changing Structure of the Jesuit High School" that "Jesuit high schools should consider their phase of the educational process as primarily concerned with languages."¹ I see the general value in the study of any foreign language, and in the study of the culture of the people who use that language. I also see the importance of the study of the Latin and Greek cultures as the main source of western civilization. I agree that since the vast majority of our high school graduates will not continue the study of Latin or Greek in college, they must get this cultural background in high school, if they are to get it at all. I agree with recent efforts to improve the teaching of Latin and to improve the imparting of an appreciation of Latin and Greek culture. I agree in theory that Latin is a better mind trainer than are the modern languages. However, I do not agree with the practice of making Latin so sacrosanct in our curriculum. I wonder whether both Latin and Latin teachers suffer from having a near monopoly on the foreign language instruction given in most of our high schools. Latin teachers are often frustrated in their attempts to sell Latin to boys with a very high sales resistance.

I wonder whether both Latin and Latin teachers might profit from the challenge of having to compete with four years of French or German or Spanish, offered as an option in place of Latin. What our curriculum would lose in disciplinary values it would gain in psychological values. I believe that many of our students would be more highly motivated to learn the language of their choice than the language that was required of them. I do not claim that students who hate Latin will clamor for admission to classes of French or German or Spanish, but I do claim that they would bring at least a stronger natural motivation to the study of the language and culture of a people whom they know to be active in modern world affairs, and whose authors are producing some of today's best humanistic and scientific literature. I vote for putting modern languages on an equal footing with the ancient languages.

However, if this proposal is too radical, then I suggest another. I suggest that we give every freshman and sophomore four hours per week of Latin and four of a modern foreign language, with the option of drop-

¹ *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, Oct. 1960.

ping the Latin at the end of his sophomore year. If he drops Latin, he will already have acquired much of the mental discipline involved in the study of Latin, and he could acquire enough of the cultural value through a one year course in Latin and Greek literature in translation. And in the meantime, he can continue to work toward mastery of his modern foreign language.

Both of these plans do, of course, have drawbacks. The act of changing a mediocre teacher from the field of Latin to that of French or German or Spanish will not automatically make make him a better teacher. And it will take years, many years, to train Jesuits as thoroughly in modern languages as we are now training them in Latin. However, I think the advantages, both psychological and pedagogical, are worth the effort.

Many thoughtful civic leaders have accused us as a Nation of being too smug. When we go abroad, we expect the natives to understand our language. When the natives come to America we expect them to speak our language. Never a thought to our understanding their culture or speaking their language. Perhaps Jesuit high schools are helping to foster that smugness by their neglect of modern foreign languages. If so, it is time we changed.

Professional Leadership

I asked above whether we are doing all we can, not only to improve our own curricula, but also to gain membership in other groups that are shaping the curricula of the future.

A quick survey of the names of educators who are working on the national commissions on English, mathematics, and science reveals the names of not one secondary school Jesuit. A survey of the lists of members of state committees of regional accrediting associations reveals the names of two Jesuits. A survey of the applicants for the first two administrators' seminars sponsored by the National Council of Independent Schools, and largely financed by them, reveals the names of only two Jesuits.

I submit that we must do much better than this. We need more men like Father Lorenzo K. Reed, who spent several summers working to make the 1960 revision of the Evaluative Criteria a much better instrument for the evaluation of all schools, both private and public. We need more men like Father Julian Maline, who has worked closely on several committees of the North Central Association. One of his latest contributions to the good of all schools, private and public, was to guide the revision of the policies and criteria of the Secondary School Commission

of the North Central along reasonable lines. These men have shown the kind of educational leadership that can rightly be expected of many more high school Jesuits, both administrators and teachers.

Teacher Preparation

However, there are new problems for the Jesuit high school teacher. For centuries we Jesuits have enjoyed an enviable reputation as being one of the best groups of teachers in the educational field. Until recent years we have also been considered as the best educated group within the Church. But this reputation is not necessarily so universal today, at least not in our secondary schools. The many years that we spend in studies beyond the high school and college level have equipped us with a wide, cultural background. But the curricula in our seminaries have not kept pace with latest educational developments, and our young Jesuits are finding it more and more difficult to keep up with priests and brothers and sisters in other teaching orders that are more modern in their approach and more single minded in their purpose. A Brother of Mary or a Brother of the Christian Schools, for example, can finish his religious training and his Ph.D. in History or English or Physics long before he would have finished his theology as a Jesuit. And he can do this without interruption and with singleness of purpose.

This competition is healthy. It should make us rethink our years of training and make us question the general inflexibility of our seminary programs of studies. I leave it to our seminary rectors and deans and teachers to judge whether I am correct, and, if so, what should be done about it. However, if I am even partly correct, perhaps I may be allowed the liberty of making a few observations or recommendations. I think, for instance, that allowing math and science majors in the juniorate to make progress in their field is a step in the right direction. I also think that allowing theological students to take summer courses in the subjects they will teach is another good step. I would even recommend allowing most theological students to substitute courses in their major field for courses such as Hebrew and for seminars, although I realize that Rome might never sanction such a move. However, and this has even greater possibilities, the day may come when superiors will find a way to cut one or two years off the training period of the average Jesuit without sacrificing the quality or effectiveness of that training.

Another problem with the Jesuit part of our high school faculties is their very limited stability. Scholastics not only leave the school after two or three years; most of them leave high schools permanently. The

experience they have received may help the colleges to which they are assigned after theology, but losing them hurts the high schools. Recent province splits have shifted many high school priest teachers from one school to another and have thrown into serious imbalance the supply of priest teachers in some subject areas. The turnover of scholastics has its advantages in the energy and drive and co-operation they bring to the school, and the province splits are far beyond our control. However, they are factors that hurt our schools in comparison with some of the better and higher paying private and public schools that enjoy considerable stability in both teachers and administrators.

Lay Teachers

The biggest problem with our lay teachers is, of course, that of salary. Many Jesuit high schools in recent years have raised their salaries to bring them close to the local public school scales. However, public school salary scales continue to rise; and, if federal aid to public schools becomes a reality, salaries will jump by another \$600 or \$800 per year. In St. Louis today three county school systems have a maximum salary of between \$9,000 and \$12,000 for nine months of high school teaching. If our schools were to match these salaries, most of them would have to raise their tuition by more than 50%.

Teaching Aids

My final sub-topic for tonight is teaching aids, and the most startling development in the field of teaching aids is that of teaching machines.

Early studies show that the average student can learn a one semester course in half the time through the aid of the machine. The reasons are that the machine stresses individual attention and closer pupil concentration. It does not waste time on the day dreamer or the desk carver, and it gives each student an immediate evaluation of his every answer.

Most machines are programmed today with multiple choice or completion items. However, they will in time become more and more sophisticated and could eventually take much of the drudgery out of teaching.

The very title causes many educators to recoil. It brings images of cold, impersonal robots invading the intensely human sphere of close dialog between teacher and student. But we must realize that the teaching machine is merely an instrument, one more teaching aid that can make a good teacher better but will rarely make a poor teacher good. The thought of leaving familiar and comfortable teaching techniques

will make some teachers fearful and insecure, but it will make others happy at the thought of making their own teaching more effective.

The problem with older teaching aids in many Jesuit high schools is their neglect. Most teachers in our schools have never studied these electronic teaching aids, at least in relation to their own subjects. And most principals have not become so convinced of the value of these aids as to be willing to buy them in sufficient quantity or to appoint an energetic and well organized co-ordinator who will make it his business to sell his fellow teachers on the value of the machines and who will make special efforts to keep the machines readily available and promptly repaired. The large Jesuit high school should have hundreds of tapes, dozens of tape recorders, several slide projectors, several opaque projectors, several rooms that can be readily darkened.

Finally, closed-circuit TV is next on the horizon and can be had at reasonable prices. I confess a fear of what closed-circuit TV and other new and radical approaches to classroom and teacher scheduling could do to the familiar and comfortable rut into which I have fallen as a high school administrator. It is time for me to practice what I preach and to prepare for adjustments that are certain to come. And as they come I pray that St. Ignatius, the daring innovator of the sixteenth century, will inspire all of us to set a rapid pace of steady progress in the schools that we run for the Greater Glory of God.

If the major problem of the scientist is to understand the universe, the philosopher must help him with the problem of what the world is which he is to understand. But the scientist's thirst for a unified knowledge stems not from himself as scientist but as man, and in man there is an immense field into which science cannot penetrate. In paraphrase we may say: What does it profit to know the whole universe if the scientist does not know himself as man?

—H. Austin Taylor, in *Thought*, Summer, 1960

Impact of Modern Developments on Education*

BRIAN A. McGRATH, S.J.

The topic for this evening is so broad and so vague that one could spend a semester discussing various aspects of the Impact of Modern Developments on Education. The impact of economic factors has been treated by Seymour Harris. Some sociological factors have been discussed in "Goals for Americans", the report of the President's Commission on National Goals, and practically every major educational group has its own study. As a major element in all this discussion there is constantly recurring the question of Federal aid. Hence, I have chosen to review with you this evening the present factors of Federal aid and to suggest how it is influencing the educational picture. You can discuss, if you will, the problem of whether there should be more Federal aid and how it can best be given. I am not interested in the current discussion at the present time. Rather, I want to explore the present fact of Federal aid in the light of its impact on our schools, private and public, tax supported and non-tax supported.

Let us look, then, at the record for a minute to gauge the scope and intensity of Federal aid, and then we can discuss some facets of its impact on our schools and educational programs.

At the present time, every major executive Department of Cabinet rank is engaged in educational activities. Some temporary, some permanent, some direct, some indirect, some in-service training, some external training. Although we have had an "Office of Education" in the National Government since 1867—and one might expect the influence of Federal aid to come through the Office of Education—until the NDEA of 1958 the Office of Education handled only 1% of Federal funds in education. Most people think of the Morrill Act of 1862 as the first major entry of the Federal Government in the field of education. But the signs of interest had been steady long before that Act. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 provided for public lands to be available for schools.

Today the Federal activity in education is usually divided into three categories: (1) aid to special groups of individuals and to individuals in special fields of study; (2) Federal grants and contracts for research at

* Paper presented at Annual J.E.A. Meeting, Atlantic City, April 2, 1961.

various colleges and universities; and (3) annual Federal grants for other than research. No one has ever extranced from a Federal budget the amount of money that goes into education or higher education. Some figures are available and they give a fairly clear indication of the trend and movement. There is a sound basis for the estimate that between 16% and 20% of the budget for Higher Education comes from the Federal Government. In 1958-59 the estimated cost of Higher Education was 4 billion dollars.

The Wriston Report on the Federal Government and Higher Education acknowledges, among other points, that in the main, natural sciences, agriculture, and engineering have been helped more than the humanities or social science; practical research more than basic; and public institutions more than private. This does not mean that some private schools have not been substantially helped by Federal programs. One private school has 60% of its operating budget from Federal and State funds.

The first area of Federal impact is in the area of research. In 1959 the Federal Government contributed 383 million dollars to research in educational institutions directly and 303 million to research centers managed by Universities. Of this 686 million the Cabinet division was as follows:

Defense	221 million
Health, Education and Welfare	111 million
Atomic Energy Commission	243 million
National Science Foundation	46 million
Agriculture	31 million
Aeronautics and Space	8 million
All others	5 million

The Government is spending over 1.4 billion and 96% is in life sciences, physical sciences, and engineering. It has been estimated that the Government carries over 90% of the university research in physical sciences, 50% in life sciences, and over 80% in engineering.

Besides the area of research Federal aid has been extensive in other related areas. The first of these is in the House and Home Finance. Starting off in 1950 with a strictly narrow interpretation of housing space and limiting itself to dormitories for faculty and students and appropriate dining space for the beds provided under the act, it has gradually expanded to include separate dining or student activity facilities and over the period since 1950, 925 million dollars in loans have been made that have ranged from 2¾% to 3¼% based on the average rate of Government loan term securities and short term notes and bills. This had en-

abled the State Universities to provide adequate housing while they have been granted State aid for educational facilities. State-Private ratio from 50-50 to 60-40 has allowed some non-residential colleges to change their character from day schools to residential colleges and universities.

Along with this there has been substantial aid to land-grant colleges. The sum here amounts to 90 million dollars annually which has enabled some agricultural or small engineering schools to become large universities. (Maryland—Michigan State) This amount is divided as follows:

Resident Teaching	10 million
Agricultural Research	30 million
Extension	50 million

In the field of International Exchange, through the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs, approximately 5 million dollars is available for students and professors going abroad and students and professors coming here.

Now the impact of these Federal programs may be variously measured. With the qualification that must be attached to any general statement, it can reasonably be said that Federal aid has had a substantial and important impact on faculty, on curricula and programs, on students, and on facilities in American education.

The impact on faculty is more indirect than direct, more subtle than open, more important than the other areas. The Federal support of research has drawn many faculty members from teaching to research and often times has practically separated them from much of their traditional university work. By supporting work outside of the University it has attracted men from the University. So strong was the attraction that the University research institutes reflect in large part the attempt to hold men of ability and distinction on their staffs. No doubt this began as a war-emergency, but it has continued through the atomic and hydrogen period to the space age. It may now be a fixed part of our institutional patterns.

The second area of impact of Federal aid is in curricula and programs. (These might be synonymous but if you want a distinction, a curriculum leads to a degree; a program does not necessarily lead to a degree.)

By its choice of fields as critical for national defense, by its pay classification, and by its subsidies, the Federal Government has marked mathematics, the natural sciences, and languages and linguistics as vital areas and thus has influenced programs and curricula. The M.A. for teachers of mathematics sponsored and supported by the National Science Foundation, the intensive retooling in modern languages, mathematics and

physics, the special institutes and centers available under the National Defense Education Act have changed plans in many schools. In theory schools are interested in basic research and teaching, but the idealism here often gives way to the practical problems of paying teachers and promoting scholars. There are signs of a new interesting technique here. A Foundation gives original support and then goes to the Government for support for a program as critical for national defense or general welfare. Watch the coming developments in applied linguistics and the renewed attempt to create a National Academy or Foundation in Languages. Federal aid for TV has already passed the Senate this year.

It would not be too much of an exaggeration to say that the multiplication of courses and the growth of training in many fields is the result of Federal subsidies for research and development. There is a constant pressure here that arises from the sincere desire to explore new areas, the wish to make the results of the research available to promising students and the growing costs of both teaching and research. A faculty member of MIT informed his Washington Alumni group that what was taught in the graduate school ten years ago is now part of the college curriculum. His remarks applied to aero-space science but could be equally applied in other natural and social sciences.

This year 2 billion dollars is available for research and development in aero-space and a large part of it will go to educational institutions, mainly engineering.

This is not to deny that there would have been change and development in education and research, but to emphasize that the hand of Federal aid has substantially accelerated the rate of research and thus has also influenced the academic programs and courses. It is also an acknowledgement that you cannot separate education from research and development, the mutual activity between the two necessarily influence each other. This can be indicated more in detail when we have considered the impact of Federal aid on the student.

Federal aid to students has been available in three main areas: 1) Federal loans, 2) Fellowships and research grants for predoctoral and postdoctoral work, and 3) full or partial aid to members of the government or the military to complete their undergraduate work or to receive training in specialized fields as diversified as electronics and international relations.

Most of us are acquainted with the loan provisions under the National Defense Education Act. They have a large influence on the financially marginal student who can now make reasonably satisfactory arrangements to finish college, professional school, or graduate school. The

amount recommended from 1959 to 1964 will average 10 million dollars a year. This is distributed on a regional and state basis.

The grant and fellowship programs are under NDEA, NSF, NIH, and AEC. The impact of these various programs has been so strong in the natural sciences that the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship program was in part an attempt to balance the question.

At the present time it would be fair to state that the superior student has wide choice of fellowship opportunities and, as a result of the promotion of these, 30% of the Ph.D. degrees in 1958 and 1959 were awarded to people in the biological sciences, physical sciences, and mathematics. Many schools are having difficulty filling their own fellowship programs because the Government offers carry more prestige and monetary reimbursement. The NIH has so many types of programs that it is instituting a new orientation for its staff to keep up with developments in this field. The medical schools are reporting a substantial fall-off in applications from top students as the student finds that the challenge, the prestige, and the salaries or support that are offered by the Federal programs equal or surpass what is available in the medical schools.

The third group aided by government grants is the large number of government employees or military personnel who are allowed to finish their college work or to do graduate or specialized training that is fully or partially subsidized by government funds. These programs may range from the "Bootstrap" and "Sage" program to specialized work in radar or Russian in practically every major department in the government. In some cases this may be adult education, in others it may be highly specialized graduate work. A look at the catalog of the Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture or the Maryland University General Studies Overseas program will reveal the diversity. These programs reach around the world.

Federal aid to education reflects then, in a real way, the impact of modern developments on education. Some may conceive of it as a massive glacier that is gradually absorbing the system. Others prefer to think of it as a reflection of the underlying dynamic forces of this country. For the government reflects in many ways the basic needs and demands of its citizens. In a real sense we are riding the tide of a revolution, in knowledge, in communication, in politics—national and international. The college and university that does not realize and sense this period of transition and growth, this evolution that is revolution will be left behind till a future cataclysm calls all to a fresh start. New and radical procedures will be necessary in the areas of impact, faculty, curricula, and students.

It is no longer sufficient to get good Ph.D.'s as faculty members. They must be given a challenging opportunity to do research, to lead Institutes, to travel as experts and put their knowledge and skill at the service of the national and international community. If the United States is accepting the challenge to world leadership, her university faculties must play an important role in that challenge. Madison Avenue soap sellers and tail fin creators will not suffice as a source to decide that what is good for NAM is good for us.

The rate of growth of knowledge is so fast today that a first class teacher will need regular periods to catch up with the development in his field. He will have to be freed of the clerical work and some of the committee work to enable him to devote more time to the important matters. If the ratio of tenure faculty is 40-60% of the regular full time faculty, the finances and the schedule should be adapted to allow 5% off each year for improvement in knowledge of content and techniques. The crisis of the war, the veterans and the Korean affair have delayed, in some schools, any serious attempt to meet these problems. The added expense of faculty salaries, the enticing offers from industry and private research institutes have added new pressures on faculty position and prestige. Today not one-half of the Ph.D.'s in natural sciences and mathematics are staying in college and university work.

The second area of impact is the curriculum—both the actual content and the questions of technique and class size. It is often stated that the college is still doing at least one year of high school work, especially in the fields of modern languages, mathematics, and science. If the high school development continues at its present pace, there is a good chance that a large part of this problem will be solved and that the average student coming into college will be qualified in these areas. The college will, I suggest, have to rethink its curriculum and refashion the programs, getting away from the survey courses in literature, history, and the introductory courses in mathematics, science, and modern languages. (There will still be the departmental battles on). New material cannot be added by just adding courses. The department will have to reorder their syllabi to present an integrated program. Some things will have to be dropped. If philosophy is the integrating and distinctive feature of our Liberal Arts program, can we really maintain it with an output of 20 Ph.D.'s a year in Scholastic Philosophy? How do you balance out the development in psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, and government? How much duplication is there in philosophy and theology and who resolves them? What are the fads and fashions as distinct from the long range, the traditional and the important? It would seem

that the Ford Foundation report and the McGraw-Hill report on Business Administration have justified our emphasis on a broad liberal training. Can we resist the attempt of practically every department that wants to treat every student as a major? The medical schools are experimenting with the conference method of teaching. How far is this practical for philosophy and theology, the social sciences, the natural sciences? It is expensive and is being supported by Foundations and by research grants. When are we going into TV? The expense has proven to be double the original estimate. What are its limits? What faculty arrangements have to be made? One TV class seems to take the time of two ordinary preparations. It is as certain here as in the use of language laboratories that a new technique requires special handling. We know we need 600 to 1,000 hours of class and laboratory to teach a language. Where do we fit it? Class size—no one knows the optimum here. How much experimentation should we do? 30—60—90—125. What substitute can the small liberal arts college use for the graduate student who serves as proctor, corrector, and general handy man for the professor? All these problems will require some radical thinking at all levels of the educational process, but especially at collegiate and university levels.

The signs and portents seem to be ominous. We are presented with basic difficulties of principle and method. If we look back in history for an analogous situation, the 16th century presents an amazing parallel. The era of discovery, the age of the new learning, the revival of the Greek and Latin tradition, the political pressures of the Turks on Europe, and the religious dissension—all are paralleled today by the entry into space, the developments of the natural sciences, the pressure of Russia, and the conflict between secularism and Christianity.

St. Ignatius and the Jesuits of the 16th century met the challenge of their times. With the grace of God and the same type of work, we can prove ourselves worthy heirs of that tradition.

Trends in Business Education*

W. SEAVEY JOYCE, S.J.

I appreciate very much the privilege of appearing before this J.E.A. meeting to discuss trends in the field of Business Administration. In a sense we business educators should be the envy of the educational profession, because all are agreed on the value of criticism and we have been the recipients of more avid criticism than any other educational group. While much of this criticism was unsolicited, doubtless it has been well meant and some of it is certainly constructive. All this criticism has not made us over-sensitive. We, therefore, ascribe entirely to coincidence—and by no means to the low esteem in which we are currently held—the fact that our Business Administration sectional meeting was scheduled this morning in the Navaho Room. The Navahoes were, as you know, a primitive Indian tribe.

Neither do we wish to appear ungracious or ungrateful for the opportunity of speaking here, if we pick a quarrel with the title assigned to this talk—"Trends in Business Education". The term "business education" is an unfortunately broad term and it includes many fields, from which our Schools of Business Administration would rather be dissociated. Business education would include, for example, the so-called Business Colleges that offer training in routine accounting practices or in the operation of business machines. More specifically, the term "business education" applies to commercial courses offered in high schools. Such courses usually stress bookkeeping, typing, shorthand, office procedures and the operation of business machines. The term may also be extended to include the education of those who will teach the business or commercial courses in secondary schools. Without wishing to invalidate the work or the objectives of these fields of business education, may I state as emphatically as possible that this is not the activity appropriate to Schools of Business Administration. Our schools do not aim at turning out office clerks or technicians, but qualified persons, schooled in organizational techniques and capable of advancing to administrative positions. In the phrase "Business Administration" the important word is not "business" but "administration". Our schools aim to train administrators.

Unfortunately, even among the Schools that explicitly label themselves

* Paper presented at Annual J.E.A. Meeting, Atlantic City, April 3, 1961.

"Business Administration" there is a vast variety of standards. At one extreme are the "Name" Graduate Schools, such as the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, an institution as far beyond suspicion as Caesar's wife. At the other extreme are the factory-type, part-time, night courses offered by some larger urban institutions. These courses are practical in the worst sense and tailored to specific demand. There's no limit to how ridiculous they can get. Catalogs of major universities have listed courses in Retailing of Bakery Goods, Front Office Procedures in Hotel Management and Fashions in Men's Wear.

I'm sure you will believe me when I say that this utterly utilitarian, money-making approach to Business Administration programs is far more offensive to those of us within the field, who are concerned with running sound schools, than it can possibly be to more disinterested observers.

Fortunately, our own schools avoid these gross excesses. We are not guilty of great faults. Of the 98 member schools of the AACSB—which is our only accrediting agency—ten are Jesuit schools. (The only other Catholic member school is DePaul.) Our other Schools and Departments adhere closely to high standards and are either preparing to join the Association or are excluded by some technicality. Departments, for example, simply are not eligible to join. While the current status of our Jesuit work in business administration may be sound and solid, nonetheless it seems to me a kind of public disgrace to our Assistancy that we have not developed a single "name" school, not one really outstanding School of Business Administration.

In this connection may I offer just a few brief comments about graduate programs. Both the Ford and Carnegie Reports concluded that a two year graduate program based upon a four year course in liberal arts was preferable to four years spent in an undergraduate school of Business Administration. There is an obviosity about this: six years should be more effective than four. Whether we accept this premise or not, the fact remains that really distinguished programs in business administration seem far more likely to occur at the graduate than at the undergraduate level. Believe me I am not suggesting that we should all run hastily into graduate programs: this would be calamitous. But I should like to see the development of some outstanding and distinguished graduate programs, which would include hopefully the offering of the D.B.A.

I shall confine my remaining remarks to undergraduate schools of business administration. For undergraduate schools, the AACSB has long prescribed a minimum of 40% of the curriculum both in the area

of liberal arts and the professional subjects, with the remaining 20% of the courses to be divided at the option of the school. The Carnegie and Ford Reports have advocated a minimum of 50% of the curriculum in the area of liberal arts. None of our schools would have difficulty in meeting this minimum of 50%, if they were to add up all of their courses conventionally regarded as liberal. At Boston College, if I may cite this as an example, 79 out of 136 credits, or 58%, may be regarded. The remaining 57 credits, or 42%, are devoted to specifically professional courses.

As regards the "liberal" part of the business administration curriculum, it is clear that the student who is preparing for a career as an administrator should share in the common heritage of educated men. His program should insure substantial involvement in the study of literature, history and mathematics. It should provide a meaningful and moral synthesis of life; a perceptive grasp of changing society; a keenness for beauty and literary expression. Specifically, he should take study in the fields of theology, philosophy, literature—hopefully including some language other than his own—history, mathematics, and some area of science, both physical and social.

What of the professional part of the curriculum? Schools of Business Administration are trying to work out a science of administration. The content of this emerging science may be divided into five parts. They are:

1. Functional Fields. It would be silly to have an economist who was skilled in abstract theory but had never heard of the Federal Reserve System. It would be equally absurd to train a man in business administration without introducing him to business institutions. This is done through courses that acquaint the student with the functional fields of finance, production and distribution. The emphasis in these fields is placed less on mere description than on analysis and on the study of motivations, interrelations and development.

2. Quantitative Analysis. The student of business administration has always studied a fair amount of accounting and some statistics. Today the role of accounting is changing. The new emphasis is on accounting as an instrument for management. The accountant is becoming less the recorder and more the interpreter of financial data. Statistics, especially the study of probability, has achieved new importance. And most important of all, mathematics is becoming an integrated part of the business administration curriculum as it has been for decades in physical science and engineering. This new business mathematics has nothing in common with the older courses that used to be so labeled. There are some impressive problems in the way of the effective utilization of this

new business mathematics but the potential is surely there. Quantitative Analysis, therefore, combines Accounting, Mathematics and Statistics. It helps us to control the enterprise and to reach meaningful decisions.

3. Human Behavior. Administrators work with human beings. These are much more complicated than raw materials or even market factors. Older courses in personnel administration are being supplemented, if not replaced, by new courses in the behavioral sciences. The science of administration is drawing from sociology and from psychology. The crucial role of communications and the observable regularities of group behavior are being investigated and integrated into courses in behavioral science.

4. Environmental perceptiveness. Increasingly the business man, the administrator, must take cognizance of the socio-economic complex that surrounds him. He must have an awareness of social problems, of economic trends, of community responsibilities, and of moral issues. Hence, there is a new stress on social sciences and economics, especially macro-economics, which is the overall view of the national political economy.

5. Finally, there must be integration, synthesis. Some kind of a business policy course must bring all this together. For years now the case method has been used for this purpose. More recently the development of computers has made possible the playing of "business games". The triviality of this nomenclature is deceiving. By the use of computers it is possible to simulate in a reasonably short time a range of business activity that in real life would extend over months or even years. But the emphasis must be on decision making—on interpreting in a total way all the varied and variable factors involved when business decisions must be made.

The line of demarcation between liberal and professional subjects is hard to draw. In the area of Quantitative Analysis, for example, shall we say that mathematics is liberal but the statistics is illiberal, especially if they are inextricably involved? Shall we say that a course in industrial sociology is liberal, if taught in an Arts School but illiberal if taught in a School of Business Administration? What shall we say of economics courses? Are they liberal or not? To me it seems that the discussion of which courses are liberal and which are not is relatively unimportant. What does matter is that the curriculum of the School of Business Administration should be sound, cohesive, coordinated and governed by the objective of turning out an educated man, prepared to launch on his career as an administrator.

The responsibilities facing these administrators in our day and in the foreseeable future are such that their proper education is a matter of

prime concern. The decisions of business leaders are fraught with more fateful consequences than the mandates of kings in ages past. And the future of our Western world may well rest on how effectively these decisions are made.

We believe that the curriculum in business administration has real substance. We believe it provides an excellent medium for the education of the student, whose interests and talents lie in this direction. On this occasion I cannot resist registering a special appeal to the secondary school personnel who are present. Please abandon the prejudice you may have held. Send us some of your good students; at least don't deter good students from coming to us. In philosophy we say, "Quidquid recipitur secundum modum recipientis recipitur". I think this may be translated, "You can't pour a gallon of wisdom into a half pint mind." No matter how excellent our curriculum may be, its value is limited by the capacity of the students you send us.

HAVE YOU BEEN TO A JESUIT TRAINED DENTIST RECENTLY? More than 7,000 dentists have been graduated from Loyola Chicago Dental School since its founding. More than 48 per cent of Chicago-area dentists are graduates of the School. Omaha residents, too, have a good chance of visiting a Jesuit trained dentist from Creighton Dental School. 73 per cent of practising dentists in Omaha and 50 per cent in Nebraska are graduates of Creighton. Marquette Dental of Milwaukee ranks second in the country in number of freshmen applications, according to a survey of the American Dental association.

Trends in Teacher Education*

CHARLES F. DONOVAN, S.J.

By way of prologue I would like to say a word about the commitment of the Society of Jesus to teacher preparation. St. Ignatius and the early Jesuits were no believers in the myth that he who knows can teach. They held that there are pedagogical arts distinct from and built upon scholarship. Because of this belief Ignatius wrote rules which became the groundwork for the *Ratio Studiorum*, which is not a theoretical treatise on education or a philosophy of education. The *Ratio* is a practical handbook. Let's face it, if one had to assign it to an academic course of our day, it clearly would belong with courses, anathematized by so many modern academicians, in methods or techniques of teaching. So pedagogically practical is the *Ratio* that it even prescribes practice teaching. Christopher Dawson contends that the great contribution of the *Ratio* was not in subject matter but in technique and organization. Before the suppression the Jesuits earned the reputation as the world's leading schoolmasters not primarily because of their scholarship but because of effective teaching methods. When Francis Bacon wrote *De Augmentis Scientiarum* he said "As for the pedagogical part the shortest rule would be 'consult the schools of the Jesuits' for nothing better has been put in practice." If ever there was a group of schoolmen dedicated by governing documents and long tradition to the proposition that teaching ability is not something to be taken for granted as an automatic outcome of learning, but that pedagogical arts are both acquirable and perfectible under guidance, it is the Jesuits.

I say this by way of indicating that whatever external developments there may be impinging on and shaping our involvement in teacher education, for us the major inspiration and commitment in the field of teacher preparation should come from our own inner tradition. Of course we must adapt to worthwhile developments and we must conform, perhaps with some reluctance at times, to local or national standards not of our own making. But such external movements and pressures should be merely part of the setting, but by no means the dynamic or the 'ratio' for our involvement in teacher education.

To mention at the outset some of the mechanical devices that may have an impact upon teacher education, such as educational TV and self-

* Paper presented at Annual J.E.A. Meeting, Atlantic City, April 3, 1961.

instructional machines, it seems to me that these instruments are still in such an experimental state that no safe prediction can be made as to how important their influence will be in the next twenty years. In January I was one of some fifty representatives of teacher education attending a conference on Teacher Education and the New Media sponsored at the University of Michigan by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The conference was supported by a grant from the National Defense Education Act, and it seems as though the main purpose was to have the conferees advise the U. S. Office of Education how to spend its money under Title VII. To me the meeting seemed like a rerun of a conference that might have been held in the 30's on audio-visual aids in education. I don't think we have had the breakthrough here as yet.

Certainly the volume and variety of criticism of teacher education is a development of recent years that has affected teacher preparation programs. Lynd, Bestor, Douglas Bush, Mortimer Smith and the Council for Basic Education are among the more prominent members of a critical chorus that has been loud and at times shrill. By and large Jesuit colleges with teacher preparation programs have fared well under this criticism which has complained mostly about the weak liberal education given in some teachers colleges. Since with us liberal education is not an afterthought or an appendage to a professional program, current recommendations for the betterment of teacher education have in general pointed to the development of programs such as we are already running. Any emphasis on mastery of content, academic balance, and breadth of education for future teachers naturally favors our colleges. The current swing of the pendulum is towards values that have always been a cherished part of Jesuit education. This is good. We obviously believe that it is good for teacher preparation and at the same time we feel that it is good for our colleges to be recognized for the sound educational programs they maintain. There is a possible danger here, though. There is the danger that the pendulum may swing so far to the right that the legitimate claims of professional education may be neglected. Teachers colleges themselves may contribute to an imbalance, since most of them are trying to prove their right to be included in the fraternity of liberal arts colleges, and they may yield meekly to the demands of liberal arts extremists. Whatever they do, surely it would not be in keeping with the authentic and venerable tradition of the Society were our colleges to adopt the policy that subject matter alone is important for future teachers.

Another healthy development which hopefully will continue in the years ahead is an increased involvement of members of college academic

departments in work with elementary and secondary schools as well as with members of college departments of education. For decades the American college professor, unless he belonged to a department of education, regarded high schools solely as producers of college students. The schools were regularly berated for doing such a poor job of preparing for college, though few suggestions were made for their improvement nor was any help offered by the college men. And the 70% of high schoolers who did not go on to college were calmly dismissed as not coming within the purview of those engaged in higher education. At the same time the typical academic department member felt that his sole relationship to the education of future teachers consisted in letting them into his classes. Since teaching consists in knowing one's subject, the professor was preparing teachers if students passed his courses.

Several things have conspired to modify this situation. NSF grants, the major studies being done on foreign language in the elementary grades, and science and mathematics courses in the grades, plus the growth of Advanced Placement programs have brought college teachers into contact with public and parochial schools and have given them a new understanding and interest in the problems and possibilities of the precollege school years as well as a new appreciation of some of the excellent work being done by teachers in elementary and secondary schools. Indeed some of the college professors who have only lately "discovered" the high school and elementary school, now tend to develop panaceas and propose suggestions independently of their colleagues in the education department who for years have been working for a closer alliance between colleges and public and parochial schools. But there is evidence that indicates that members of the academic departments are beginning to work cooperatively with members of education departments for the formation of strong undergraduate and graduate programs for teachers in the several disciplines. Such a constructive alliance is bound to strengthen teacher education in Jesuit schools in the years ahead.

Certainly the strongest external influences on Jesuit teacher preparation programs are the professional organizations for teacher education. These are the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) which used to be the accrediting agency in the field but now is simply a voluntary association working for the improvement of teacher education. 17 of the 25 Jesuit colleges with formal teacher preparation programs are members of AACTE. For the past six or seven years the accrediting of teacher education in colleges and universities has been handled by NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education). Five of our Jesuit colleges have received NCATE accredita-

tion. On Washington's Birthday this year representatives of teaching education in twenty-three of our Jesuit colleges met with Father Rooney in Chicago on the occasion of the annual AACTE meeting to discuss common problems. Most of our time was devoted to NCATE. There was division of opinion on whether we should strengthen NCATE by seeking its accreditation. The chief objection to NCATE is that it is so structured that it is NEA-dominated. It is felt that private education has not a sufficient voice on the Council; and, what might be an even more radical flaw, that higher education does not have real control of it. On the other hand it was pointed out that NCATE boasts that 72% of all teachers entering the profession now come from NCATE-approved colleges. Seventeen states so far have made graduation from an NCATE-approved institution a condition of certification for teaching. It is unlikely that this trend will be reversed, and so the feeling was expressed at Chicago that Jesuit colleges should seek NCATE accreditation or be relegated to a position of minor influence in the field of teacher preparation. Again, representatives of institutions accredited by NCATE attested that the accreditation process had done them nothing but good, had strengthened them and won gains that perhaps would not otherwise have been achieved.

Perhaps the greatest hope, not just for the good of Jesuit colleges but for the good of the teaching profession itself, is that the private colleges and universities which have been least active historically in formal organizations for teacher education will exert pressure on NCATE and keep it on a sound academic course. One shudders when one becomes aware of the nonacademic voices and attitudes that get a hearing through the several NEA affiliates. Probably the most frightening instance is a pamphlet recently published by an NEA commission called the Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, familiarly known as "TEPS." The pamphlet is called *New Horizons*, and you get an idea of what it is like when I say it could be titled *1984 of teacher education*.

When NEA representatives talk to teachers groups they chide them with the shameful fact that only 50% of American teachers are NEA members, but when the authors of *New Horizons* speak they do not modestly represent 50% of American precollege teachers. They speak, boldly, consistently, and all-inclusively for "the profession." They say for instance, "The profession must carry the major responsibility for the quality of education in schools and colleges." Again, "Procedures assuring that only qualified personnel serve in the educational program belong to the profession." The authors of *New Horizons*, writing of and

for NEA, include all college teachers in their blueprint for the future. They say, "All persons should be licensed who serve in an educational capacity as professional personnel in an organized school or institution of higher learning in a state system of education or in a private educational institution providing a parallel or corresponding educational service." Thus, in this vision of things to come, not just elementary and secondary school teachers but college and university teachers as well will be stamped with the approval of NEA. This is a prospect that makes the AAUP look like an administrator's best friend.

The threat of secular and non-intellectual control that is represented by the dreams of the NEA, operating through TEPS and NCATE, is something that Jesuit colleges or all Catholic colleges should not oppose alone. This is a battle in which we have many allies among serious non-sectarian colleges. It is a fairly safe prediction that one of the major campaigns of the next half century will be to wrest the control of standards for teacher education from the hands of half educated public school administrators and small town NEA officers. The normal schools are dead. We must make sure that the spirit of the normal schools does not survive to rule us all and laugh.

Trends in Graduate Education*

L. W. FRIEDRICH, S.J.

Let me say at the outset that Dr. Bernard Berelson has a chapter, consisting of 54 pages, in his book *Graduate Education in the United States* (McGraw-Hill, 1960), entitled "Conclusions, Commentary, and Recommendations" which gives, in summary form, a number of facets of the trends in graduate education in this country. This paper is neither patterned on his chapter nor is it a summary of it, though it contains some of the same information.

Because areas of study which have a strong professional aspect, such as Education, Business, and Nursing, have become, or are becoming, prominent in graduate schools, and have drawn them out of their strictly "academic" traditions, there is considerable discussion now on what true graduate education should be. It is, however, conceded that the semi-professional programs are here to stay, and to stay in graduate schools, hence the concept of graduate study is being defined by ever-widening boundaries.

There is still emphatic stress, at the doctoral level, on training in research. In fact, the emphasis is shifting more clearly toward training *through* research. In its November 15, 1960, report, *Scientific Progress, the Universities, and the Federal Government*, the President's Science Advisory Committee stated that "... the process of graduate education depends on 'research' just as much as upon 'teaching'—indeed the two are essentially inseparable—and there is a radical error in trying to think of them as different forms of activity . . . What is essential is that the environment as a whole should be an environment of learning, investigation, and teaching—all together. Only too often the universities fail to understand and support this image of their nature."

According to the 1960 report of the National Science Foundation on the federal research and development budget, eleven percent of total federal spending in 1960 on research and development was done in universities. This amounted to approximately 880 million dollars. If only the funds for basic research are considered, it is found that 44 percent of federal funds allocated to this category were spent in universities. This amounted to 329 million dollars.

Dr. Charles Kidd, of the Office of Program Planning of the National

* Paper presented at Annual J.E.A. Meeting, Atlantic City, April 3, 1961.

Institutes of Health, (*Higher Education*, April, 1960) points out that the Department of Defense has decreased purchase of research from universities from 73 percent in 1952 to 30 percent in 1960. He cites three important implications in this trend. First, the Federal Government is looking upon universities as intellectual centers for basic research rather than for *ad hoc* information. Second, federal support of university research would very likely be continued on a broad scale even if the armament race stopped now. Third, universities are beginning to see in federal funds a help in meeting their fundamental needs.

Whereas in 1900 three-fourths of all doctorates in this country were given by seven private universities, in 1960 the tax-supported ones gave more doctoral degrees than did the private institutions. This trend will continue. At the graduate level, however, the distinction between the public and private university is not sharp, if the public university is defined as a tax-supported institution. In an address at Ohio State University last September, Henry Bent, Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Missouri, said that "the long and honored tradition of distinguishing between public and private institutions is no longer valid, since the private institutions are frequently the greatest beneficiaries of federal aid."¹

Oliver Carmichael points out (*Universities: Commonwealth and American*, 1951, Harper) that this transition from private to public support has resulted in (1) more emphasis on science and technology which has been engendered by concern for national security, (2) more concern about giving all talented students opportunities for graduate study, (3) a more clear defining of objectives, since these have now come more sharply under public scrutiny, and (4) more emphasis on producing units of specialized manpower.

Throughout the country, at the present time, doctoral students expect to be supported by a fellowship or assistantship of some kind. Outside of universities there are now about 15,000 national fellowships available, almost entirely for doctoral students. Universities themselves supply about 25,000 fellowships. Competition is such that universities must compete almost as fiercely for the good graduate students available as they must for good faculty. Considerable concern is expressed by graduate deans over this "buying" of students with lush fellowships. A trend seems to be getting under way in the direction of inducing students to take out loans rather than to use university funds to give them a free education. Also, loans are encouraged rather than working for a degree on the basis of part-time study and part-time work. This is a move away

¹ The address is published in *The Graduate School RECORD*, Vol. 14, No. 2, (1961).

from the "pay as you go" plan toward the "pay after you have gone" plan. Since a graduate degree is an investment that ordinarily increases earning power, or at least job security, this is considered a truly business-like approach to student aid.

There is a growing interest among graduate schools in the recruiting and training of future college teachers. This is due, of course, to the prediction which has been made, and is being verified in fact, that the rate of rise in college enrollment will be considerably greater than the rate of increase of college teachers during the decade of the sixties. To help accelerate recruiting outstanding students for college teaching, the Ford Foundation granted \$2,355,000 last year to fourteen universities to experiment with master's degree programs that span the last two years of college and the first year of graduate work. This degree is designed for completing the basic work toward the doctorate, thus speeding completion of the doctorate without loss of quality. Some graduate schools have initiated a one-year post-master's program for which a college teaching certificate is awarded. Such a program is aimed at preparing teachers for the increasing number of junior colleges that are expected to arrive on the scene during this decade.

In Wisconsin, the University of Wisconsin and Marquette University are taking the leadership in planning a cooperative program involving, besides the two universities, forty-eight of the State's colleges, for recruiting and training future college teachers.

A new intermediate degree for college teachers has been suggested, the Master of Philosophy (Ph.M.). This would be awarded for completing all Ph.D. requirements except the dissertation. Response to this suggestion has been rather languid since colleges, no matter what their size, still insist on employing for their faculties people with the Ph.D. and will settle for no one with less, unless they must.

Because of the increasingly pressing need for college teachers and because of the rapidly expanding need for research people of many kinds, more and more emphasis is being put upon seeing that students finish their doctorate work in three years after the baccalaureate degree. Since graduate schools are limited in the number of Ph.D. students they can train well at any one time, lingering students reduce the rate at which good Ph.D.'s can be produced. Coupled with this there is a growing promotion of post-doctoral work to give the student more independent research experience after he has completed the Ph.D. and before he begins his career as a college teacher. In the natural sciences, the Atomic Energy Commission's National Laboratories provide excellent opportunities for such experience.

The doctoral dissertation is being scrutinized and challenged in a number of ways. Doubt is being raised about the value of the dissertation, as we now know it, in some of the subjects that are classified as humanities. A dissertation which must contribute new knowledge in such a subject as English, for example, is not considered to be really necessary, nor even always desirable. Some students in the humanities have had their interest in scholarship badly shaken because they were required to do a dissertation on an obscure, mediocre writer about whom no worthwhile positive publishable material could be written. Business schools too, are looking for a satisfactory substitute for the conventional dissertation requirement.

Because the dissertation is being looked upon now more as training in original and independent study rather than an original contribution to mankind's fund of knowledge, the publication requirement has been mitigated. The high cost of conventional publication also had something to do with this.

There is increasing concern over the number of Ph.D. candidates who have completed everything but the dissertation and are not succeeding in completing this. In a recent address, Sir Hugh Taylor, President of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, announced that it is the intention of his Foundation to ask its supporting Foundation (Ford) for funds to establish 200 Dissertation Fellowships for former Woodrow Wilson Fellows who cannot get over the "dissertation barrier" to the Ph.D. degree without help. On March 15, the Arthur Anderson Company of Chicago announced that, beginning with the Fall Semester of 1961, and annually thereafter, it will make ten Doctoral Dissertation Fellowships available to graduate students in business who are interested in teaching.

Graduate deans are worried over what they consider the deterioration of graduate work. An example of this is what National Science Foundation supported Institutes for High School Teachers are pressing graduate schools into permitting. Students in these Institutes are getting credit for studying material in science which, for majors in science, is strictly undergraduate. In this instance, graduate schools are, to a large extent, at the mercy of boards of education which give increases in pay to teachers for *graduate* credit earned. A group of graduate schools in Ohio is now trying to persuade boards of education in Ohio to grant pay increases for post-baccalaureate work on the basis of the worth of the work to the teacher's effectiveness regardless of whether this is graduate or undergraduate work. If they succeed, it is quite probable that graduate schools will relinquish some of the leadership they have been constrained to take in upgrading secondary teaching.

In the March, 1961, issue of *American Scientist*, Alan Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, wrote, "The post-war period will undoubtedly be remembered as a period in which the trend toward bringing together a variety of specialists to work on problems of common interest received great impetus." There is a growing development of interdisciplinary programs, such as Science of Materials, which encompasses engineering, chemistry, and physics; bio-mechanics; history and philosophy of science; combined programs in guidance and counseling conducted jointly by departments of education and psychology. These are usually administered by inter-departmental committees. One sees also the beginning of a trend in which whole blocks of departments work as a unit. This is apparent in engineering and in the life sciences.

In interdisciplinary programs there lie opportunities for courageous and imaginative graduate schools that are still young, to gain leadership without first going through the costly experience of catching up with a well established graduate school. Here lie, I think, some fine opportunities for Jesuit graduate schools.

A new organization of graduate institutions, called the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, which is to be truly representative of all graduate education in the United States, is in the process of being organized. This is not intended to be an accrediting organization. It is intended to fill a need which has long been felt in American graduate education.

Accreditation of graduate schools, *qua* graduate schools, seems to be coming. Federal agencies, private foundations, foreign universities and agencies, and others, want a list of the truly good graduate schools in this country. Since there is no official list of accredited graduate schools, they usually resort to using the membership of the Association of Graduate Schools, which is not a complete list of the good American graduate schools. Funds made available through the National Defense Education Act Title IV fellowships for expanding graduate programs, or beginning Ph.D. programs, have stimulated inauguration of Ph.D. programs in a number of universities not considered prepared for them. This has inclined some of the leading Ph.D. granting universities to get behind some kind of accrediting.

Because university scholars are devoting much time to advising the Federal Government, federal support at the graduate level has, by and large, taken shape in a manner quite satisfactory to most graduate schools. Research support is given primarily on merit and, in the case of some federal agencies, also with a view to strengthen the program of

the weak graduate school struggling valiantly for excellence. Both the National Science Foundation and the NDEA have set up fellowships within universities so that students must choose the university together with the fellowship, thus counteracting the large surge of fellowship winners to the well known so-called prestige universities. Graduate deans, and fellowship grantors too, feel that college teachers, and possibly even high school teachers, should do a much more informed job than they are now doing in advising their students on advanced study and where to do it.

The trend among federal agencies is toward awarding institutional grants to universities and to let these decide how best to spend the funds awarded in financing and developing their programs of graduate research. There is beginning a move away from requiring universities to meet federal grants for buildings and facilities on a 50-50 basis. The portion the university must supply is progressively becoming lower. Federal granting agencies are now allowing that portion of a faculty member's time which he spends on funded research to be charged as direct cost against his grant. Indications are that overhead allowance will rise from 15 to 25 percent. All this will leave the university with more funds to spend on those fields in which government and private foundation support is not plentiful. Research *partially* supported by federal agencies and foundations, has had the effect, I am afraid, of luring university money away from other areas to meet the needs created by new research stimulated by partial funding. Partial funding is not undesirable; but that which creates imbalance not wanted by the university is undesirable.

Graduate schools are becoming increasingly cosmopolitan in their work, as are also undergraduate colleges. Graduate schools are inaugurating cooperative research programs with foreign universities. I suspect that the Peace Corps will accelerate this trend.

Organizationally, the American graduate school is a strange phenomenon. It allows classes in which there is an intermingling of graduate and undergraduate students. It has a single administrative tent for all graduate fields and the chief in that tent has relatively weak authority. It is a German institution built on top of the English college. As the graduate school grows in importance on our university campuses we can look for changes in the position of the graduate school in the university's administrative structure.

Humanism and Hunger or In Praise of Folly

JOHN N. FELTON, S.J.

Teachers of the humanities, in their perennial dialogue with the proponents of those disciplines usually thought of as more practical, are perennially using the argument that the Liberal Arts too are practical; that they help a man to earn a living precisely because they make a well-balanced, perceptive, and articulate human being. The argument is, of course, hoary with antiquity. My own suspicion is that they themselves have not always believed it. However, proponents of the humanities at Xavier University, have recently been presented with two new collections of evidence which tend to show that the old argument may have something to it after all.

The first piece of evidence caused perhaps the greater shock in that it came from a survey conducted by a graduate student of business administration who had done his undergraduate work at Rose Polytechnic Institute. This survey, conducted among the 310 graduates of the class of 1959 of Xavier University, elicited replies from 158 members. 82.8% of those answering indicated that "the liberal subjects' they took in college had proved more valuable than (31%), or equally valuable as (51.8%), the 'technical subjects' they studied in regard to helping establish themselves in their career work." The statistics caused surprise among technicians and humanists alike. Other information from the survey, less pertinent to our present purpose but equally interesting to the faculty, were the following: 81.5% would return to Xavier if they had it to do all over again; 68.3% are now doing advanced studies or are planning to do so within the next two years. One observation was especially interesting: "the more financially 'self-supporting' the graduate of '59 was while at Xavier, the less favorable his attitude toward his total education experience."

The other survey was conducted last summer by Father William P. Hetherington, S.J. among his Honors Course graduates. These are seventy in all in this category. Nearly all replied by personal letter or postcard; only one of the seventy is unaccounted for.

A word about Father Hetherington and his unique course will make the results of the survey more relevant. Father Hetherington could be described as a die-hard humanist of the old school. But not all the old

die-hards, I think, were experts in their fields. If they had been, perhaps the humanities would not have lost as much ground as they have. Father Hetherington's competence can be gauged partly by his University of Toronto doctorate, but much more by the chance remark volunteered by the great Gilbert Norwood. Speaking to one who is currently a member of the Xavier faculty, Professor Norwood said that "young Mr. Hetherington is the best student I ever taught."

In the summer of 1948, Father Hetherington gathered around himself, with the blessings of the university administration, a handful of bright, enthusiastic high school graduates possessed of four year of Latin, and outlined for them what he thought would be an ideal liberal education. The course included a nominal Latin major, a Greek minor, a minimum of twenty-two hours of mathematics and science, at least twelve hours of history, eighteen hours of English, twenty-five hours of philosophy, and a minimum of six hours of a modern language. They were to be in sections by themselves and taught by experienced members of the faculty. The tutorial approach for nearly all courses in the classics was a later addition. Thus was the Honors A.B. Course born. The line is drawn each year when twenty freshman candidates have been accepted; the average graduating class from June 1952 to June 1960 numbered eight.

The survey shows that the sixty-nine H.A.B. graduates, on whom we have information, are currently employed as follows: 8 doctors of medicine, 7 in medical school, 7 practicing law, 5 in law school, 1 dentist, 2 civil engineers, 2 teaching mathematics, 1 working for I.B.M., 1 I.B.M. representative, 5 teaching at university level (classics, English, mathematics, abnormal psychology), 5 teaching high school, 12 in various graduate schools (in the biological sciences, business administration, chemistry, classics, economics, English, history, mathematics, graduate medicine, physics), 1 in pharmacy, 1 in publishing, 1 in insurance, 1 in advertising, 3 in business, 3 scholastics S.J., 1 Trappist, 1 naval officer, 2 army officers. The charge, sometimes voiced by technicians, that liberal arts graduates do not get jobs, appears rather an exaggeration in the face of this evidence.

But were their humanistic studies of any help to them? Not one of the graduates regrets his humanistic studies. One who is doing graduate work in medicine did venture to hope that we have lessened the amount of classics. The rest would change the amount of the humanities little or not at all. Some have expressed the wish that the approach to theology had been different. One blamed Xavier for not working him harder; several regretted they had not worked themselves harder. Here are pertinent excerpts from some of their letters. The first is from a man in

the Department of Defense: "The work I do is classified and I am not permitted to say anything about it; but aside from that, I enjoy it. In my work, I am able to use a variety of things I learned at Xavier—more, I should say, than at any other job I know of. As regards the H.A.B. course in retrospect, I have but one regret, and that I suspect is a common one; it is that I didn't put just a little more into it. It has done well by me though. I have been honored by being appointed to a supervisory position over people who have been at this work since I was a small boy. A good deal of the credit must go to the H.A.B."

A second year student at the Johns Hopkins Medical School writes as follows: "I found no great gulf in my scientific background however, with the exception of biochemistry (which isn't really that practically important anyway) it is practically impossible to become fully prepared for medical school beyond the minimal entrance requirements in science. The work is all brand new and just about everyone starts out on an equal footing regardless of background. But more has been demanded of us than merely a sharp scientific mind. The ability to understand and get along with people, to appreciate the human element in the art of medicine is a quality which practically every professor watchfully looks for and rejoices to find. It is present in a great many of our men, but nine times out of ten these are the men who have majored in liberal arts. My own ability along that line I certainly attribute to my liberal arts undergraduate education, and when asked if I had it to do over again, I would reply, as I did, that I wouldn't change a single thing except perhaps to have taken more English in my senior year when I found I had a lot of time on my hands. It is all very much as you once told us, Father. Certain values, attitudes, and insights can only be gained by a secure foundation in the study and knowledge of MAN. Given such a foundation via a first class liberal arts course such as the H.A.B., and having acquired sound study habits, a certain amount of self confidence and poise in extra-curricular activities, there is really no limit what a man can make of himself in almost any field he chooses. To restate what I have already said in a roundabout way, it has been my personal experience that in studying under and associating with some of the finest medical and scientific minds of our age, I have NEVER had occasion to regret my choice of the H.A.B. as a liberal arts foundation, and have had many occasions to thank God and you, Father, for the opportunity of acquiring it. As you are probably aware, most of the medical schools worth their salt are looking for applicants who have majored in fields other than science . . ."

A 1952 graduate, civil engineer for a city in Ohio, says: "As for com-

ments about the Honors Course, I can only say that the background received there by me has helped me greatly in my chosen profession of engineering. Engineers, for the most part, seem to be sadly lacking when it comes to the humanities. This point has caused great concern among engineering educators."

This from a young man in law school: "The honors course has proved as close to an ideal pre-law course as could be imagined. The incessant concentration on words and ideas and the correlation between them has furnished me with a discipline or an instinct that I believe would have been difficult to acquire in any other course . . . To say exactly what the honors course has given me would be impossible; but I am thankful for the discipline in words and ideas imposed upon me, often against my will."

And from a 1953 graduate successfully practicing law: "I feel it would be pointless for me to trot out many retrospective ideas concerning the Honors Course, inasmuch as a great deal of it has probably changed since 1953. It might be interesting to receive a detailed description of the curriculum as it now exists. As time passes, I become more and more convinced of its value and thankful that I chose it. Its value is not in being able to make a tortured translation of a Latin legal phrase, nor, except in a secondary sense, in the technique of dealing with abstract ideas and expressing them on paper. Rather, I am conscious of a certain confidence in being able to sort out the pieces of things generally and place them according to proper values and relationships."

There is an educated, intelligent man, the kind that humanistic educators are trying to produce. And he seems, to the surprise of many, to be getting enough to eat.

Educational Principles for Jesuit Secondary Schools*

JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.

From Italy comes a well organized, well documented, and readable presentation of the theory and practice of Jesuit secondary education. Although the anonymous author has Jesuit *collegi* of Italy foremost in mind, most of what he has to say will be of equal interest to Jesuits in secondary-school work in the United States. Indeed, in more than one place the author shows that he is well acquainted with Jesuit high-school education in this country. Thus he quotes from the "Instructio pro Assistentia Americae," refers to the *Manual for Jesuit High School Administrators*, and even lists *Practice* in his bibliography, noting too that it no longer published, *sospeso*.

The book has four parts, divided into fourteen chapters. Part One, "Premesse," consists of three short chapters dealing with the broad elements of secondary education; a select, up-to-date bibliography; and a concise, fresh historical account of the development of the Jesuit secondary school.

The broad elements he presents in novel fashion as a mathematical equation (page 11):

$$\frac{\text{Complex of educational activities (means, method)}}{\text{Social structure, and needs of the educand}} \rightarrow \text{educational goal}$$

"It is important, then, to tend toward a fixed goal, by means of educational activities always kept in balance with the social structure of the times and the receptivity of the educand." As the denominator changes, and change it does, the numerator too must change. But, the numerator will not have to change too radically since the principles of Jesuit secondary education, though adaptable, are so fundamentally sound that only adaptation and not radical revision will be called for.

Part Two, "Principi Educativi," discusses in three chapters the goal of Jesuit secondary education, the means, and some principles of method. In treating of the goal, he refers of course to the Constitutions, but he also gives new life to it by quoting the restatement formulated by the Twenty-Eighth General Congregation (page 37): "Iuventutis institutio

* Principi Educativi per i Collegi della Compagnia di Gesù. Rome: Segretariato dei Collegi S. I. per l'Assistenza d'Italia, 1959. Pp. 200.

inter prima ministeria Societatis est retinenda, atque in hunc finem in primis tendere debet ut efformentur viri, non tantum exculti sed in vita sive privata sive civili vere christiani, qui ad hodiernum apostolatum adlaborare possint et velint." In his own way he expresses the goal in a strong phrase that recurs again and again through the book—the preparation of *cristiani di valore*. And as the measure of success in achieving the goal he proposes that we see how many of our graduates are becoming lay apostles or members of the secular and religious clergy (page 38).

As to the means, aside from the essential grace of God, they are five: religious activities, religious instruction, the teaching of the profane subjects, extracurricular activities, and discipline.

The heart of the book is Chapter Six, in which the author lays down fourteen principles of methodology, which we list here.

1. *Always keep in mind a clearly defined statement of the ultimate goal*; otherwise particular goals, which are only means, may become the sole concern of the educator.
2. *The educator is like a sower, in a world that is in constant change*. This means keeping an eye on tomorrow rather than today, on long-term rather than on immediate results.
3. *Educate rather than instruct*. Producing little encyclopedias is not the proper task of the secondary school; producing *cristiani di valore* is.
4. *Prepare students for the use of freedom*. Though they are not yet adults, they are on the way.
5. *Have confidence in the power of abstract thought*. Begin with the concrete, but do not stop there.
6. *Educate to excellence*, in the spirit of St. Ignatius's Kingdom of Christ, excellence in the service of God and one's fellowmen, not to foster egoism.
7. *Have a special care of gifted students*, since they will wield the greatest influence for God and fellowmen.
8. *Provide for unity*, through Provincial norms and directives; otherwise power is dispersed.
9. *Recognize the importance of the psychology of educator and educand alike*; that is, know your faculty and your students. Under this rubric, in discussing the psychology of discipline, the author quotes with approval this reminder from Very Reverend Father Janssens: "The purpose of external discipline is and must ever be this: to develop in the young men an internal discipline that is spontaneous and voluntary."
10. *Consider the personality of each faculty member as a factor of the greatest importance*, since nothing in a school is as important as the teacher.
11. *Stay with humanistic education*. It alone will develop the *cristiani di valore*.
12. *Teachers must be clear and deep in their teaching*. Nothing good comes of confusion and superficiality.

13. *Students must be active participants rather than be passively indoctrinated.* The principle is as basic in education, he notes, as in the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius.
14. *Foresight and system on the part of the educator are important.* Otherwise, a waste of time and effort are inevitable.

Each of these principles is developed at some length, brightened frequently by the author's wise insights or by apt quotations from authorities like that on discipline from Father General Janssens.

In Part Three, eight chapters apply these principles to practical school situations. Throughout, the author considers school problems in the light of the *Ratio Studiorum*, the letters of the Fathers General, especially Fathers Ledochowski and Janssens, and the changed circumstances of modern school life. There is very little that pertains only to Jesuit secondary education in Italy, much that any Jesuit engaged in secondary education will find valuable and provocative.

Part Four, a concluding chapter, summarizes the preceding chapters and reenforces the position of the author that Jesuits have in their educational tradition what he early terms, somewhat cryptically "Te.S.I.," shorthand for "Tesoro educativo della Compagnia di Gesù," the educational treasure of the Society of Jesus. He sees in Te.S.I., and who will contradict him, a splendid and an adaptable instrument for giving the Catholic youth of every age the best type of education, the kind that will produce the *cristiani di valore* the world needs.

Both Noble and Rewarding

JOSEPH D. AYD, S.J.

... *thoughts for beginning teachers**

When a teacher makes his way warily into the classroom for the first time, he must be a man of virtue, else he is doomed to failure. Such a one must have knowledge, if he is to impart anything to his students. But his virtues must surpass mere learning; his strength must be possessed of the physical stamina demanded by hours devoted to instruction and equal stretches of time necessitated by the correction of papers and preparatory planning of subsequent classes. His moral structure must be built of wisdom, understanding, prudence, patience, fortitude and justice. Finally, his house must be roofed with charity. This man who is to teach must be naturally and supernaturally virtuous, possessed of all the common sense and balance that the ancients extolled when they declared: *In medio stat virtus*.

That a man has the requisite academic knowledge for teaching in a secondary school is easily discernible by checking his transcript of credits. But, essential as it may be, knowledge does not make the great teacher. As a matter of fact, great teachers are born, not made. Still, judging by the knowledge owned by most men in the front of a classroom, it is something of a mystery why there are not more good teachers expounding truths before the youth of the United States.

A hint of an explanation may be found in a single word, work. There may be too little of it, with corresponding accomplishment; there may be too much of it, which only fosters the flabbiness of adolescent minds; it may be squandered foolishly. When an educator's work is triflingly small, only such students make progress as are able and willing to learn without a teacher, and their success is no tribute to him. If, on the other hand, a teacher does most of the work for his charges, he leaves them bogged in a morass of intellectual ease where thought cannot survive, memory is helpless and energy is not expended.

To the praise of teachers, it is noted proudly that few of them cast themselves into these pitfalls knowingly. More often than not, the man who throws too much work on the students believes sincerely that too little was demanded of him during the days of his schooling; it is fully

* (A digest of two lectures delivered to Jesuit scholastics at Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, N.Y., in August, 1960.)

his intention to turn out intelligent young men capable of thinking for themselves. His error is in overestimating their capabilities.

Paradoxically, his colleague makes the same mistake. He expects too much of his students in the sense that he wishes to give them all the riches of his own education and he assumes that they can absorb his training passively, if he mines, refines and liquifies everything for them. This man forgets that very much of the value of his own learning arises from the fact that it was acquired by dint of industrious labor.

If a teacher is to travel the *via media* to success, he has to come to the realization that his profession has more than a tinge of the romantic and idyllic about it at the same time that it is shot through with the prosaic and pedestrian. Students have to be instructed, led, inspired, beaten, drilled, exercised, questioned, praised, punished and rewarded. That requires enthusiastic idealism of the highest order as well as drudgery of the dullest sort.

It is by overlooking the latter type of human endeavor that efforts are so frequently dissipated on the more glamorous and not unimportant undertakings of guidance and extracurricular activities, both of which hold places of honor in the realm of education, but neither of which ranks with planned preparation of class work in the hierarchy of values. In this the picayune problem of surveying the matter to be imparted and parcelling it out by the semester, week and day takes precedence.

Infinite attention to minute details must be devoted to mapping out a successful class in which there is to be effective recitation, repetition and prelection. And if these activities are to produce the desired results, it is quite obvious that work is to be demanded of students. When it is not, the young men do not exercise and develop their intellectual muscles. However, their work must be motivated, organized and directed by the teacher who in many respects is like a coach leading a team through a series of calisthenics; only in this case his objective is not a co-ordinated body but a gracefully organized mind capable of communicating itself felicitously in written and spoken words.

Attaining the goal of effective self-communication necessitates a program; mapping out and accomplishing such a plan demands drudgery like driving nails, but the house of the intellect is built by it. Look in on the class of a good teacher. As soon as he enters the room, the assignment written the previous night is passed forward by the students who immediately thereafter ready paper and pen for the daily quiz or written exercise. Following that, memory work is listened to, or recitation is had in another fashion.

Up to this point, the teacher's work has been minimal, because it had

all been done antecedently when he determined what he expected to accomplish by the study and the written-oral assignments. Even now, when he begins his prelection or preview of the matter to be prepared for the next class, he understands that it is not time for student passivity. Rather he attempts to establish a dialogue in which details are elicited from the learners whenever possible by means of skillful questioning or the partial unveiling of the answers. Teacher's toil at this time is to prevent passivity by fostering participation by forcing his pupils to be alert. While he is presenting his preview, he is conscious of the amount of direction needed; his is the task of highlighting, or shading, simplifying and organizing. But since he has already done his preparation of the matter at hand, he is aware that the present occasion is no opportunity for a student to rest in blissful ignorance. He keeps every member of the class awake by letting the boys know that any of them may be called on for a contribution. No one can permit himself the luxury of relaxation. All remain alert because off balance, and everyone who is off balance is always afraid of landing on his head. Or to put it another way, in this class the nodder will be nailed by a question.

By means of his planning and organization, the effective pedagogue has avoided the worst of educational animal traps. He has not talked too much. Human beings of all ages resist being talked at continuously, since there is in all men an innate desire to respond. Prolonged talking by a teacher, however well prepared, is an invitation to distraction; unprepared, it induces drowsiness.

Essentially, an instructor paves the way of good teaching by his own labor. But if the road is to be a smooth one, it must be straight and level and uncluttered. This means that the matter must be organized and directed to an end; it means, further, that the actual class work is not a dramatic monologue, but a co-operative dialogue.

Once this environment has been established, a class can move forward with pleasure and profit. When pupils benefit by the efforts of the teacher as well as by their own reluctant exertions, they begin to apply themselves in class and at home with greater assiduity. When they recognize their progress through reviews and repetitions, their interest soars.

For the attainment of learning and the arousal of interest repetition is of primary importance. Written or oral, one should be had every day. And on the day before the weekly test, a major portion of the teaching period should be devoted to it; in this case it constitutes both a review of the week's matter and a preview of what is contained in the next day's examination. Finally, if a subject is to be grasped with some permanency, there should be an extensive reprise before semester and final examina-

tions. By repeating thus frequently, the teacher makes it difficult for his students not to learn. But these review sessions ought not to be instances of parroting what has been retained by rote. Rather each of these occasions offers the opportunity for class discussion, for a more penetrating analysis by the professor, for an approach from another angle, for the expansion of a topic and the correlation of it with other subjects.

Such repetition has been referred to as the *mater studiorum*. With equal justification, it might be termed the mother of motivation. For, if rightly handled, such a procedure should make learning a relatively easy and pleasant task. When such is the case, moderate scholastic success is practically assured to the students. And since nothing succeeds like success, there is nothing of greater motivational moment in spurring students on to more serious application than the manifestation of successful achievement by good grades. In the practical order, marks *are* motivation.

Since marks are so important in the minds of students, the beginning teacher, especially, should meditate on them, considering their meaning, value and use. If marks are motivation, if in the eyes of school, parents and pupils they are very largely the measure of a teacher's success, it is imperative that an educator ponder the problem they present. One who has not worked out a philosophy of marks will be an effective teacher only by the rarest of accidents. It is one of the postulates of this paper that good teaching is largely a matter of preparation, organization and common sense. It should be clear to the possessor of the last-named quality that the instructor may approach grades in an infinite number of ways.

The sane approach seems to be so organizing, presenting and testing topics that the average student who has done the average amount of studying attains a grade of 80. That this is no simple task becomes apparent to any teacher who attempts it. How it is to be accomplished must be left to the ingenuity of the instructor. The proposal is offered, however, that such attainment is a rational objective, and the suggestion is made that, when the goal is not reached, there is something wrong with the teacher or the pupil or, perhaps, with both.

If it is granted that 80 is the desired and acceptable grade for the monthly report card of an average student, it must be conceded that the average student who has done more than the average amount of work is likely to arrive at a higher grade. So, too, should the good student. The very good pupil should push over 90, and the exceptional scholar should range above 95.

An obvious difficulty presents itself in the form of tests. Since these, supposedly, cover larger amounts of matter and some students find it

difficult to retain massive quantities of factual information, it should not be surprising if the ideal grades are not attained. But there are ways of balancing things out. One of them—and a method which motivates pupils to daily application rather than to letting things go until just before a test—is to plan a program in such a way that the grades for written assignments and daily quizzes are higher than 80 for the average student and proportionately higher for those with more aptitude and greater application. When this method is employed, the teacher is occasionally surprised to discover his charges not only doing their duty daily, but also preparing just as diligently for the weekly test. Sometimes this leads to the happy embarrassment of having a whole class perform better than expected on a weekly test. This, of course, is quite satisfying, but it must not be forgotten that it resulted from the prudent planning of a virtuous, hard-working professor.

At the very beginning of his career, a teacher may have given little thought to grading, but few men enter the teaching profession without some apprehension about discipline. Many a man has faced the problem of class-control in advance and determined how he will take care of various situations, should they arise. The trouble with such considerations, is that the time devoted to them might so much more profitably have been given to the planning of preparations and procedures. Discipline is a minor problem for the good teacher.

Delightful pranks are the distillations of un-occupied minds, which have become bored because of lack of interest, attention or understanding. The real pedagogue keeps his pupils busy at all times, thus preventing rather than controlling disturbances. By means of class participation in the learning process, he holds attention while he makes every effort to present his matter so clearly that lack of understanding becomes almost an impossibility. In such a situation, interest is very nearly inevitable. Add to it the motivation of marks and discipline as a problem dissolves.

To return to the beginning, it may be repeated that the good teacher is the proud possessor of knowledge. But he needs much more. He must be given to hard work in the preparation and presentation of his matter; he must be a virtuous man. Put in other words, he must be a professional educator, full of charity, justice, prudence and wisdom. Probably the most striking thing about any professionally dedicated and competent man is the fact that he lives his work; he talks about it, thinks about it, considers it eminently worthwhile. He gives his life to it. For many people, that is the difference between a job and a profession. A job is something you work at for pay. A profession is something you dedicate a life to. And teaching is a profession, both noble and rewarding.

What is Your Opinion of a Liberal Arts Education?

Excerpts from talks given at Rockhurst College by five national figures on the value of a Liberal Arts education

DAVID SARNOFF, Chairman of the Board, Radio Corporation of America

Honorary Directors Dinner, November 19, 1959

Because the role of science in all departments of life has become so great, it seems to me vital that leaders in government and in the military, as well as leaders in commerce and industry, should have, at least, an understanding of the fundamental principles of science. Such an understanding is indispensable nowadays in making essential decisions and in charting courses for the future.

Having acknowledged this, we still have an obligation to keep abreast of the humanities. What is called for is a rational balance of disciplines—not a blind imitation of the Russians, but an open-eyed adjustment to our own needs.

A many-sided humanism has been the hallmark of education in our free society. It provides the very foundation of our way of life. Cardinal Newman defined the good education as one that “brings the mind into form.” Ours has aimed, rightly, to develop “the whole man,” rather than the robot with bulging technological muscles envisioned by Soviet education.

Today education must provide a prominent place for the physical sciences. But it must also embrace a study of history to illuminate the past, a study of literature and philosophy, the creative arts, and the science of thinking.

Each generation’s specialized skills and techniques are soon outmoded, but the search for wisdom is never-ending. All of man’s material triumphs cannot satisfy his need for that larger wisdom which values freedom and justice, insight and understanding, virtue and love. After all, these attributes are the chief source of our real strength.

In the swiftly changing world of the twentieth century no one can foresee what future problems will have to be resolved. But this we know: that whatever they may be, they will call for qualities of intelligence, resourcefulness, and judgment. These, too, are never outdated. Our best hope, therefore, lies in the well-trained mind and the well-rounded personality,

and these, it seems to me, should be the goals of our education. It is not enough to be capable of defending our civilization against the new barbarians. We must maintain a civilization worthy of defense—one to live for and, if necessary, die for.

STUART SYMINGTON, United States Senator from Missouri

Rockhurst Day, April 16, 1959

Ours is an era that challenges the intellect. To a greater degree than ever before in history, our very existence depends on our ability to produce highly trained individuals.

At the same time the challenge facing us makes it vitally important that the future leaders of our nation be aware of the moral and ethical values that form the foundation of what we consider our way of life.

It has always seemed to me that the teaching here at Rockhurst epitomizes the finest aspects of this dual role—the training of our youth in specialized techniques required by our atomic age society and the imparting of an awareness and appreciation of the heritage of our civilization.

JOHN A. McCONE, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission

Rockhurst Day, April 16, 1959

Specialization makes for a successful career, but hardly makes for a successful life.

Today the ever expanding regions of knowledge make it impossible, except for the most brilliant man, to grasp even a part of it. A cultured man or woman is marked by an appreciation of the humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, and technical matters, and to that we add a belief in God and our Christian heritage.

CHARLES H. KELLSTADT, Chairman of the Board, Sears, Roebuck and Company

Honorary Directors Dinner, November 15, 1960

There seems to be two different viewpoints on the purposes of education. These viewpoints are not opposed to one another in any real sense, but they are interesting because each seems to spring from a practical evaluation.

First, I find educators stating the purpose of education as preparation for "final destiny." Others speak of the purpose of college preparation as being education of the whole man. Still others see the purpose as life adjustment; and some speak in terms of preparation for a profession.

On the other hand, in my observation, students generally think of their college work as preparation for a job. Their emphasis seems to be on how they will use what they learn. They generally expect to be hired in the field of their major study or in a field which will use their major.

Even if the student is successful in placing himself in the area of his major interest, he may not always be happy with the reality of starting at the bottom, even though, for his own success this is his most important venture. There is a reasonably good chance he won't stay in the field for which he has prepared himself.

It is astonishing to see the great numbers of young people in their late twenties who may at that point be on the verge of making their final career decision. There appears to be a rather lengthy period of postgraduate work in industry before they make their decision.

On the basis of these observations, it seems that the college graduate defines the purpose of education then as a method of gaining leverage for the first job. He expects it to provide him with information so that he can be successful on the first job; and he expects to have some degree of background so that he can make a final decision on his career at some later point.

This process that I have described is by no means universal; and yet, I believe that it is general enough to be valid. I also believe that it indicates that a liberal arts college is an excellent avenue for the student to take. The general approach of the liberal arts college certainly favors this process and may well prepare the student more adequately for the process that actually takes place than would highly specialized training.

ROY A. ROBERTS, President, The Kansas City Star Company

Commencement, May 31, 1959

A basic education in the liberal arts such as you have received here at Rockhurst has given you the best possible foundation on which to build. Entirely too much emphasis, I believe, has been put on education to make a living rather than education for living.

Whatever your career, you will find, as I did, your basic liberal arts education playing a rewarding part.

News from the Field

• **NEW PROVINCIAL RESIDENCE.** The MARYLAND Province has opened its new Provincial Residence. *The new address is:* PROVINCIAL RESIDENCE, 5704 ROLAND AVENUE, BALTIMORE 10, MARYLAND, HOPKINS 7-1833.

• The UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT'S three-day Convocation (April 4-6, 1961) on *Creative Minds in the Crisis of Freedom* attracted an audience of over 20,000 persons. Extensively reported by the press, radio, and television, the Proceedings will be available later on in the year in a bound volume obtainable from the University of Detroit.

Philosophers, artists, business men, educators, scientists, theologians, writers from all over the country convened on Detroit to discuss the general topics of the Convocation: *The Interplay of Philosophy and Science in Freeing the Mind, Freedom and Economic Security, Creative Leadership in a Free and Prosperous Society, and Freedom and Creativity in the Arts.*

Among those taking part on the various panels were: Francis Cardinal Spellman (who received an honorary degree), Archbishop Dearden, General David Sarnoff, President of the Board of RCA, the Honorable Frederick Mueller, former U.S. Secretary of Commerce, Mrs. Henry Ford II, Clare Boothe Luce, Father James Keller, Founder of the Christophers, General David Shoup, Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, Dr. Anton Pegis, President of the Institute of Medieval Studies, Dr. William Thaler, Father Robert Henle, S.J., Dr. Vincent E. Smith, and Leonard Read, President of the Foundation for Economic Education.

• BUILDINGS

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY has selected the name GALLAGHER HALL as the official name for the women's residence hall nearing completion on the Creighton campus. A gift in excess of a hundred thousand dollars was contributed by the son of Ben Gallagher, Sr., for the completion of the building. The building will house 214 coeds, plus rooms for directors and proctors. Creighton at present has an enrollment of some seven hundred coeds in a total enrollment of 2,900 students.

LOYOLA OF BALTIMORE broke ground for a new Engineering-Physics building. The five-story building, with 17 classrooms and 9 laboratories, and a lecture hall wing will relieve overcrowded conditions in the present Science Hall. An alumnus, Dr. F. Frederick Ruzicka, contributed a gift of one hundred thousand dollars for the separate-winged lecture hall in the new building.

LOYOLA OF CHICAGO has started work on a new \$2,600,000 Student Center for its downtown campus. The five-story building is scheduled for completion in August of 1962. An enclosed glass bridge, spanning 71 feet across Rush Street, will link the new Student Center with the Lewis Towers building.

The first unit of the University Center will contain dining, recreational, service and classroom facilities for more than 6,000 downtown students. Eventually, five additional classroom floors will be added, providing for 12,000 students in the downtown campus area. The entire building will be air-conditioned and provision has been made for future closed circuit television facilities.

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY'S off-campus Parks College of Aeronautical Technology has started construction on a new dining hall. Work will be started soon on dormitory facilities for 228 men students on the Parks campus.

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY received a gift of \$50,000 from the Hanna Fund of Cleveland towards the completion costs of the new library. The new library is scheduled for a June completion. The Carroll library houses a fine collection of Chestertoniana, a collection referred to by Maisie Ward as the finest collection of first editions and manuscripts of Chesterton in existence.

LOYOLA HIGH SCHOOL OF LOS ANGELES has three buildings under construction at the present time. The construction, costing over \$700,000, has been helped by two \$100,000 contributions: one from the Von's Foundation, the other from the father of an alumnus, Mr. W. R. Hayden.

• GRANTS AND GIFTS

ROCKHURST COLLEGE received a gift in excess of \$300,000 from the estate of Miss Grace Corcoran. The bequest is the largest gift received in the 51 years of the college's existence.

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY announces the receipt of two gifts of \$110,000 and \$50,000. The \$110,000 gift from Joseph Desloge will be applied towards the purchase of a seven and a half acre plot adjoining the South Grand Campus. The \$50,000 gift from several St. Louis banking firms will be applied to increased faculty salaries.