Jesuit Educational Quarterly

MARCH, 1964

HIGHER EDUCATION

SECONDARY EDUCATION

SPECIAL STUDIES

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

Vol. XXVI, No. 4

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

March, 1964

CONTENTS

Our Contributors

FATHER MICHAEL P. WALSH, S.J. is the President of Boston College. His paper was delivered at the JEA Conference of Presidents. Both Father Walsh and the editors of the JEQ hope it will stir up some answers.

MR. SEYMOUR O'BRIEN is a practicing attorney in Baltimore. The article was prepared for Loyola College, Baltimore but it was thought it would be of interest to other educational institutions.

MR. JOHN SEIDLER, S.J. is a Third Year Theologian at Alma. The article results from discussion of the educational conferences at Alma. Like Father Walsh's article, we hope it elicits some responses.

FATHER FRANCIS X. QUINN, S.J., still has the oils fresh upon his hands. A Fourth Year Theologian at Woodstock, he is editor of a Newman book, THE ETHICAL AFTERMATH OF AUTOMATION.

FATHER THOMAS C. HENNESSY, S.J., former student counsellor at Fordham Prep, now teaches what he once practiced as professor of counselling at Fordham University. We hope the article satisfies the oft repeated request for "some books on counselling."

Both MR. MCNALLY and MR. FRENCH hope that their articles will help to shed some light on current problems in the Speech class and with the Classics.

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

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR
49 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y. 10028

The Real Meaning of Jesuit Manpower Availability

MICHAEL P. WALSH, S.J.*

The frank and fundamental analysis of the future of Jesuit higher education in the United States initiated by the Committee on the Objectives of the American Jesuit University[1] and by Fr. Robert F. Harvanek's article in the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* deserves a candid response.[2] The dialogue has been begun in a zealous spirit of earnest questioning. We are, it seems, asked whether we American Jesuits should be in the business of higher education at all except to run single-purpose, four-year undergraduate colleges of liberal arts. The dialogue should be pursued in the same spirit in which it has been begun, and this may involve challenging some of the maxims and formulas that apparently are on the way to hardening into not a philosophy but a folklore of Jesuit education.

We sometimes talk as though the liberal arts college is a part of a standardized world-wide Jesuit pattern of education. This, of course, is not true. Outside the United States the great majority of teaching Jesuits are engaged in pre-collegiate education. The Jesuit liberal arts college that emerged from the *Ratio* preparatory school and evolved after the pattern of the American secular college, with gradually less of Renaissance humanism but with more attention to philosophy and theology than called for by the *Ratio*, is a creation of the Jesuits of America. On the world-wide Jesuit educational scene it is an atypical and minority operation. If departure from the norm of the Society's educational practice should be shunned, we must question our right to conduct liberal arts colleges. On the other hand, if we applaud the initiative and ingenuity of American Jesuits in developing a system of higher education that matched the movement of American education generally, then we have grounds for arguing that, where possible, American Jesuits should continue to match the evolution of American higher education instead of arbitrarily fixing its growth at one particular stage of development.

---

*Address delivered at the Conference of Jesuit Presidents, Georgetown University, January 11, 1964.

[1] The Committee of Five, appointed by the President of the JEA and approved by the Board of Governors, has been charged with a continuing discussion of the objectives of Jesuit education at the collegiate and university level.

[2] "The Objectives of the American Jesuit University," JEQ, XXIV, 2 (October 1961), 69-87.

The American educational ladder has never been fixed or static. During every generation since Revolutionary days articles could appropriately be written, and usually were, entitled, "American Education in Transition." But the rate of change and the scope of change seem particularly intense in our day. While we have fidgeted for years about our prolonged pattern of elementary and secondary schooling, it is not the twelve year period of pre-college education that is presently under fire, but the college itself, which at the turn of this century seemed the most secure and stable element of the American academic program. Improved secondary education, with advanced placement courses and Sophomore standing arrangements, are scooping out of the college from below much of what used to be traditional collegiate fare. On the other hand, increasing economic and technological pressures for graduate education, with the concomitant need to gear undergraduate curricula for admission to graduate school, led Earl McGrath recently to publish a monograph entitled: *Are our Liberal Arts Colleges becoming Professional Schools?* A year ago Alvin Eurich predicted that before this century ends the A.B. degree will disappear, since all who go beyond the fourteenth year of school will seek an M.A. as the lowest acceptable terminal degree. Some are predicting a three-year college, no longer devoted to general education, since general education will be provided through intensified and perhaps prolonged secondary schooling. The three-year college will give first-level specialization, culminating in a Master's degree and preparing for graduate work at the doctoral level. With the future of the liberal arts college so fluid and uncertain, it would seem to be shortsighted and even hazardous to decree that the four-year liberal arts college as we have known it is going to be the exclusive or major focus of future Jesuit activity in higher education. By the year 2000 the traditional liberal arts college may be as anachronistic in America as the old-time six-year academy or Latin grammar school.

The Ignatian principle of adaptation in education and the Jesuit tradition of deploying manpower where it will be most influential should lead us to take a long look at the importance of universities in our society. The university is not just a place for the instruction of youth as were America's early colleges. It is much more than a teaching institution. It is a creative center of knowledge, ideas, and opinion. Its audience is not just young people but the community and the world. The ideal of *Ratio* education, as befitted the training of relatively immature students, was for the student to achieve

probitas, eruditio and *officium.* The focus was on the student. Faculty, parents, and the community judged the school by its young products. But in a university the focus is as much on the institution itself as on its graduates. As a creative center of intellectual, aesthetic and moral influence, it is expected to have a *probitas, eruditio* and *officium* of its own. Never in history has there been an educational institution so involved in the life of its time and so powerful to shape its time as the modern American university. Unless there is significant and first-class Catholic participation in top-level university activity, then the Mystical Body of Christ will be deprived of a voice in this most critical area of leadership.

We have grown accustomed to thinking of the term university in connection with a few impressive or giant institutions—in England, Oxford and Cambridge, in this country Harvard, Columbia and California. This perhaps creates in us an inferiority complex, a fear that we are presumptuous to pit our sandlot skills against such big league operation. But the picture is changing. In England the new American-type universities will soon be challenging the dominance of Oxbridge. In the United States, where we probably have twelve to fifteen great universities now, we will undoubtedly have nearly a hundred before a half century has passed. This will simply be a response to the upward thrust of education and to society's increasing dependence upon the universities. A half dozen prestige institutions may still set the pace, but not in all fields; and the gap between the select leaders and their competitors will narrow. If the present rate of births and baptisms holds, over one-third of our population or some seventy million people will be Catholic within the next fifty years. In a predicted context of eighty to one hundred genuine American universities and a Catholic population of seventy million, it would seem as though we should expect adequate support for ten to twelve solid Catholic universities by the twenty-first century.

Considering the importance of the university in our emerging American culture, it would be a very grave matter, and hardly one that Jesuits would settle alone, to decide that henceforth there will be only four or five Catholic universities in America. Because of our strategic role in American Catholic higher education, a decision on our part to curtail university activity in favor of our liberal arts colleges would in effect, at least for years to come, be a decision for the Catholic Church in the United States. In the future we are going to need not only more cooperative Province-wide and Assistancy-

wide planning in higher education, we will also need more cooperative planning and building with the aid of the American bishops.

The Church's educational apostolate in America seems to demand increased university activity in the decades ahead. In terms of experience, prospering institutions, and manpower, American Jesuits seem in the best position to meet this apostolic need. But the question is asked, do we really have the manpower and the talent to meet this challenge; and especially, can we run genuinely Catholic universities? If the measure of the Catholicity or "Jesuit-ness" of an institution is a faculty composed 100% of Jesuits, then we can never mount universities that approach the ideal achieved by the old-time Jesuit high school or college; and for that matter our modern high schools and colleges have receded from that ideal. But at times ideals become merely idealistic. The educational goals and the apostolic goods pursued by a Catholic university are not so dependent upon the pastoral care that is appropriate for more elementary levels of education, and therefore the ideal of a total Jesuit faculty is not so appropriate where the university is under discussion. Besides, I think we American Jesuits should be slow to accept unexamined the maxim that an institution is automatically more Jesuit, is automatically doing superior or more influential Jesuit educational work, if all of its faculty are Jesuits. This seems a slight on the imposing labors and successes of some of our American Jesuit institutions. There are Jesuit collegios, écoles, and gymnasia in various countries of the world that fulfill the ideal of total Jesuit staffing. In their respective settings they are undoubtedly doing stalwart work for the Church and the Society, though their accomplishments do not reach our ears and their names are not known to us. I will not concede that Marquette, St. Louis or Georgetown, with their relatively small percentage of Jesuit faculty members have been engaged in a less genuinely Jesuit enterprise or one that has contributed less to the furtherance of Catholic ideals and interests than have European schools with all-Jesuit faculties. The Church and the Society in America have been handicapped by our acceptance of judgments and generalizations made by our colleagues abroad on the basis of their European experience and in relative ignorance of ours. I think it is incumbent upon us to make vigorous representation concerning the realities of American higher education and a vigorous defense of the truly massive contribution our Jesuit universities are making for the Church and for the nation.

I am not impressed by the thesis that there is a certain minimum

percentage of Jesuits below which a university run by Ours ceases to be Jesuit. It seems to me that in an institution devoted to scholarship, as the university is, if the total faculty is a hundred, then fifteen or twenty Jesuit *scholar*-teachers will be more influential, will be more successful in impregnating the total faculty and student body with a Catholic view of life, than will fifty or sixty Jesuits who are teachers but cannot be called scholars in the university sense. The critical matter is the caliber and training of the Jesuits and their strategic location in the university.

I personally believe that with a few outstanding Jesuit administrators, one very competent, scholarly Jesuit in each department of Arts and Sciences, one in each professional school, and with more, though equally well-trained, Jesuits in Philosophy and Theology, we could have a stronger *Jesuit* university, one that fulfills our objectives of quality education, with academic excellence and adequate moral, spiritual and religious formation of our students to a greater extent than we do at present. Whatever reputation we have for being scholar-educators does not rest upon numbers but upon the accomplishments of particular outstanding Jesuit scholars. Jesuits who command the respect of the academic community because of their scholarly research and writing, their competence in their discipline, and their ability to show the relevance of Catholic thought to the scholarly enterprise will be a leaven among the lay members of the faculty. So far we have acted as if the Catholic purposes of our institutions belong to or at least are to be actively pursued only by Jesuits. Laymen have been our colleagues in the intellectual or purely academic order only. We have not yet tested how much more broadly Catholic or Jesuit a college or university can be when select laymen are welcomed as partners in the pursuit of the total objectives of our education. This will take major reorientation on the part of Ours as well as on the part of our lay colleagues. It is perhaps one of the shames of American Jesuit higher education in the past thirty years that we have often treated our Catholic lay professors like intellectual handymen. It is time we formed a full partnership. In such a partnership one competent Jesuit would not be outnumbered by five lay colleagues but would multiply his influence and effectiveness through them.

Some evidently fear that in a university setting the quality of undergraduate education suffers. The opposite is true. Indeed it is the simple liberal arts college that is going to have trouble offering quality education in the future, unless it has unusual attractions

in salary or in experimental curricula like Amherst or St. John's in Annapolis. Bright and talented students will not come to our colleges unless we have distinguished faculties. It is the reputation of the faculty that makes a college or university, not bricks or mortar. Today it seems impossible or at least extremely difficult to build strong undergraduate departments in Arts and Sciences unless one offers graduate programs and in at least some areas doctoral programs. A Ph.D. today is committed to his discipline, and though he may be willing to teach one elementary or basic course, he wants to teach his specialty and do research. Only a school with a graduate department will allow him to do this. In the sciences, research is done now on a teamwork basis. If a science teacher wants to advance, he must get grants. To do so he needs good doctoral candidates to help him in his research. It is extremely difficult to attract good students even in humanities and social sciences, where only a Master's program is offered.

At an NCEA meeting two years ago, David Riesman spoke to Catholic university presidents about the crisis facing liberal arts colleges. He felt that they would find it almost impossible to get good, promising Ph.D.'s on their faculty in the next ten years because of some of the reasons mentioned above. If their faculty is weak, then superior students will not come to them. Funds from private and public sources will go in greater abundance to the universities.

The university is thus in a better position than the college to attract impressive faculty members; and the faculty attracts talented students to both undergraduate and graduate schools. The recent record of the graduates of our liberal arts colleges associated with Jesuit universities in going on for Ph.D.'s indicates that the intellectual ideals of our education are not compromised in the university setting. To get the number and the quality of faculty needed in a university it will continue to be necessary to add laymen to the staff. Indeed the present paucity of Catholic Ph.D.'s has forced us to employ some non-Catholics. But with larger numbers of graduates from Catholic colleges now pursuing doctoral degrees, it should be easier to recruit lay Catholic scholars for our faculties in the years ahead.

We speak of distinguished university faculties and thereby imply that our universities can have distinguished graduate schools. There are those, however, who feel that because we cannot match the caliber of the Ivy League or State university graduate departments we should not be in graduate work. There is no need for us to

attempt to imitate or compete with these universities, because of our limited financial resources. We do not need 75 to 100 physicists in order to have a strong doctoral program in Physics. Ten to twelve could do it if we concentrate on theoretical physics as one well-known university has done. In other sciences, e.g., Biology and Chemistry, again the development of one or at the most two areas (e.g., Molecular Biology or Physical Chemistry) can make a distinguished and prestigious graduate department. So also for humanities, social sciences, and education. Seed money must be invested by the university to establish a strong research program. But in time Federal grants can carry most of the expenses. Grants come only to a strong faculty.

The best solution to our future development as Jesuit universities can come from a long-range program in each university, each Province, each region of the Assistancy and in the entire Assistancy. Each of these areas should study and plan for the strategic use of Jesuit manpower.

Each Province should set up a committee to study the manpower needs from 1964 to 1975 and to establish priorities for the strategic use of our Jesuit manpower for the future. It must be realized that the missions and education are the pre-eminent and co-equal obligations of the Society.

Scholastics should be identified as early as possible for specific works, whether for administration or for academic fields in both the missions and *educational enterprises.* They should be told no later than third year philosophy, how the Province hopes to use them. In regency, they should be sent for a doctorate, if they are destined for our colleges and universities, or at least they should be assigned to colleges and universities. They must be given the best and fullest academic and professional training for their assignments. In their *course of training* every reasonable opportunity should be given them to develop themselves professionally through attendance at conferences, seminars, conventions and institutes.

Scholastics majoring in a given area or in administration should be assigned to one philosophate or to one theologate, where they should be encouraged to undertake common research ventures. In the theologate they should be urged to seek foundation or government support, or Jesuit support should be provided, for such research projects. Whenever feasible, juniorates, philosophates, and theologates should be located on a Jesuit university campus. With the recent division of Provinces, juniorates have been multiplied.

The consolidation of scholasticates would permit the conservation of Jesuit manpower, and location on university campuses would prepare scholastics in a more proficient way.

In-service training centers should be established at two colleges and two universities to enable potential administrators to see and have some internship experience in practical administrative procedures. After tertianship, those who have received doctoral degrees as regents, especially in science, should be allowed to pursue one or two years of post-doctoral studies before they are assigned to a college or university. The scholarly potential of trained Jesuits in our colleges and universities should be maximized by the availability of adequate facilities by way of office space, graduate assistants, secretarial help, recorders, etc. Since these men will be few, provisions should be made to use them most effectively. Greater contact between the Jesuit scholars in the various academic fields should be encouraged, with an aim, among other things, to developing realistic cooperative research projects. The exchange of Jesuit professors on a limited and reasonable basis, for example, for a semester every fourth semester, may provide stimulation to both the professor and the campus visited.

An advisory committee made up of the most experienced and eminent Jesuit college and university administrators should be set up to advise Father General, and the American Provinces, the American university presidents, each Province and institution on the strategic plan for Jesuit higher education in the United States as a whole and for each institution. In the strategic placement of Jesuits, the Position Statement of the Loyola Jesuit Workshop should be followed: "In general, an effort should be made to have at least one well-trained Jesuit in each department, a heavy concentration of Jesuits in theology and philosophy, a substantial percentage in the humanities, social sciences and education, and a smaller percentage in the fields of the natural sciences, business, engineering, and the professional curricula of law, dentistry and medicine."

The Jesuit university as described and defended in this paper is admittedly a far cry, in goals and operation, from the single-purpose Jesuit high school or college staffed entirely by Ours. But it is also a far cry from the secular university, under state or private auspices, at which Jesuits might serve peripherally as chaplains or extra-curricular teachers of theology. Let us pause long and prayerfully before we decide that running universities is not an appropriate enterprise for American Jesuits.

Colleges As Legal Corporations

SEYMOUR O'BRIEN, LL.B.*

Most of us who have contacts with business and industry are currently familiar with corporations as business enterprises. Most businesses and industries today involve such large properties and vast amounts of capital that the firm owned by an individual or a small group of individuals is the exception rather than the rule. We all know that corporations, because of their great resources, are responsible for many of the material developments and improvements which take place around us. Through our many contacts with business corporations most of us are generally aware of the manner in which they operate. They have stockholders, Boards of Directors, officers and employees, or agents through whom they function.

Not as many of us, however, are familiar with the manner in which universities and colleges (for convenience, hereafter collectively called "Colleges") are presently conducted. It is true that a few private schools and even Colleges are still conducted by individuals or by co-operative groups who are not incorporated. However, at the present time most Colleges are incorporated, and frequently under state laws, as are ordinary business corporations. However, there are great differences between the two classes of corporations. As stated above, ordinary business corporations have stockholders who are, in effect, the owners. Colleges, however, are in the class of non-profit corporations which do not have stockholders and are not conducted for the benefit or profit of any individuals. They are variously called "membership," "non-stock," "charitable," "religious," or "educational" corporations.

But the basic purpose which gives rise to the use of the corporate form by business enterprises and Colleges is to some extent the same, and in addition, incorporation allows a College to enjoy the benefits of recognition as a legal entity and protection of its rights and properties under the law. In the present day world it is greatly desired that organizations have such recognition and protection, together with continuity of existence and management so that from year to year, and as the individual persons change, the entity represented by the corporation may continue on and the

---

* Member of the law firm of Miles & Stockbridge, Baltimore, Md.

ownership of property and the carrying out of purposes and policies is not necessarily interrupted.

Until about 1900, almost all College charters were granted by special acts of state legislatures. General laws for the formation of such corporations did not come into existence until about that time. Hence it is that many of our most prominent Colleges were formed by special Act of the legislature of one of the states, and in many instances their charters are extremely brief and give little or no detail as to the conduct of College affairs. However, general corporation laws have been adopted which spell out in reasonable detail the powers and responsibility of corporations, including Colleges, and it is fair to say that within the framework of their intended character as non-profit corporations they have powers sufficiently broad to conduct Colleges and to carry on all business affairs necessary and convenient to that end. They may receive and hold land, limited in amount in some states, they may own personal property, make contracts, employ persons, and they are responsible for debts and obligations.

In the Dartmouth College case, which was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1819, Chief Justice Marshall defined a corporation in these words:[1]

> "A corporation is an artificial being, invisible, intangible, and existing only in contemplation of law. Being a mere creature of law, it possesses only those properties which the charter of its creation confers upon it, either expressly or as incidental to its very existence. These are such as are supposed best calculated to effect the object for which it was created. Among the most important are immortality, and, if that expression may be allowed, individuality; properties, by which a perpetual succession of many persons are considered as the same, and may act as a single individual. They enable a corporation to manage its own affairs, and to hold property without the perplexing intricacies, the hazardous and endless necessity, of perpetual conveyances for the purpose of transmitting it from hand to hand. It is chiefly for the purpose of clothing bodies of men in succession with these qualities and capacities that corporations were invented and are in use. By these means a perpetual succession of individuals are capable of acting for the promotion of the particular object like one immortal being."

In this case, in order that the state might control the College, the legislature of the State of New Hampshire undertook to amend the charter which had been granted to Dartmouth College by George III in 1769. The Supreme Court of the United States held

[1] Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 518 (1819).

that the College was a private institution and its charter, granted by proper authority, constituted a contract between the state and the incorporators and, absent a reservation of authority to change it, the State of New Hampshire had no power to amend the charter against the will of the Board of Trustees of the College.

Today, most, if not all of the states, reserve the right to amend charters by legislative act, but the principle laid down by Chief Justice Marshall is still recognized.

By reference to the definition of Chief Justice Marshall, it will be seen that many of the attributes of the corporation are most desirable for a College. It has a separate entity from its members. It can be (depending upon state law) perpetual in existence and has "individuality." It holds its property in perpetual succession and may act as an individual in relation to such property. It manages its own affairs, always through individuals, but through persons who may change from time to time. All of these things are highly desirable for a College, hence the corporate form has been almost universally adopted in College administration.

Generally, the manner of conducting a College, in the corporate form, is to incorporate under state laws as a non-profit, non-stock, or charitable corporation, as the laws of a particular state may prescribe or permit, generally without any members. Although some Colleges are incorporated with members as well as a Board of Trustees, the membership form of charter is more frequently used by clubs and organizations which sometimes have large memberships where it is desired that the members take part in the operation of the organization. As a general rule College corporations do not have members but are operated entirely by their respective Boards. In an incorporated College which has members, they are a body or group entirely separate from the faculty, and membership on the faculty does not of itself constitute one a member of the corporation or of the Board of Trustees.

As provided in the charter, the affairs of the College are entrusted to the management of a Board of Trustees who may be called "Board of Governors," "Board of Directors," or any other similar term. The law permits such a Board to have perpetual succession, that is, the remaining members may elect other members to the Board upon the occurrence of vacancies due to expiration of terms of office, resignation, death, or other cause. The Board also has the right and is charged with the duty of designating officers, employees and agents who will be the persons to conduct its affairs.

In a College, ordinarily the Trustees are a body designated in the first instance in the charter, and thereafter elected as indicated above, who must be familiar with the affairs of the College and who assume the responsibilities of management. Without at this point spelling out the many duties and responsibilities of the Trustees, one of the most important is to designate a head, who is usually called the President, and other officers, such as the Secretary and Treasurer who are, of course, essential to carrying out the ordinary business affairs. In addition, the Board of Trustees of a College usually adopts By-Laws for the management and conduct of the College, and frequently adopts statutes or rules and regulations for the conduct of the academic department.

Committees are designated by the Board of Trustees, usually from its own number, but always having at least a Trustee as the Chairman, who familiarize themselves with particular aspects of the College affairs such as academic department, finances, buildings and grounds, to name but a few. It is usual that the President is *ex officio* a member of each of the principal committees, because it is his responsibility to know and conduct the affairs of the College and to have responsibility for making decisions on many questions which are encountered in ordinary administration. In practice, the President is usually clothed with full responsibility for carrying on the day-to-day affairs of the College and at the same time is given authority to make the necessary decisions. Obviously, on policy matters and major questions, or in case the College should become involved in litigation, the Board of Trustees has the final right and, in fact, the responsibility to decide the course to be pursued.

The extent to which the faculty of a College, as such, participates in making decisions affecting College affairs is generally governed by the statutes or rules and regulations which have been made by the Board of Trustees. Except to the extent that the authority to make decisions has been delegated to the faculty by the Board of Trustees, recommendations by the faculty could be only advisory and not controlling.

The ideal situation is that of a College having a Board, fully familiar with the affairs of the College, of the community wherein the College is located, and of the conduct of Colleges generally. The Board should have among its members individuals who are familiar with financial problems and who are experienced in handling finances and properties generally. The College should then have a thoroughly competent President who has the complete

confidence of the Board of Trustees; who has been given the responsiiblity of conducting the day-to-day College affairs, and the authority to carry out this responsibility. Then an all important factor—a faculty whose selection in an ordinary case would be one of the principal responsibilities of the President; zealous and capable of carrying out the program of the College and to accomplish its ultimate purpose, which is the dissemination of knowledge through higher education.

The educational program of the College is to a great extent the responsibility of the Board of Trustees. In determining such a program, of course, the Board of Trustees must be mindful of the purpose of the institution as indicated by its founder or founders. That should be their first consideration. In addition, the Board will have the benefit of detailed work done and recommendations by its own committees, particularly the committee on academic affairs. It will also have recommendations of the President, and through him of the faculty, as to the educational program to be pursued. The ultimate decision in this regard, however, is for the Board of Trustees. After the policy has been established, it becomes the duty of the President and the faculty to carry it out. It will be seen that there is a definite "chain of command," and in order to have consistency and harmony in College affairs, such an arrangement is essential. Responsibilities are delegated from the Board of Trustees down, and with such responsibilties must go authority, but the ultimate responsibility and authority to determine policy remains in the Board.

It can be readily seen that, when such a corporate organization has been established, the affairs of the College can continue from year to year without interruption by reason of the death or resignation of individuals. The properties, including endowment funds and other assets of the College, can be kept intact over long periods without interruption. It is not meant to infer, of course, that the individual talents of Trustees, of College President, and members of the faculty, are not important. Because of the delegation of responsibility to those persons, their individual characters are of paramount importance, but the severance of any individual from the group does not put an end to the work, it merely requires that the organization seek until proper replacement can be found.

As to the relationship of faculty members to the corporation, the above may seem to imply a too severe employer-employee relationship between the corporation or its presiding official and the faculty

members. Actually, for the protection of the faculty member, his general conditions of employment as evidenced in part by his contractual rights and insurance and retirement benefits, it would seem that the employer-emplcyee relationship cannot be entirely erased. Nevertheless, his professional scholarly status suggests a relationship that transcends that of a mere employee, and the teacher's formative obligations towards the students suggest that there is being placed in the hands of the teacher a dearly valued trust. Hence, prevailing practice avoids where practicable, employer-employee terminology. For instance, the teacher is said to be appointed to a position; he is promoted to a rank on the faculty; his professional standing not only as a scholar and teacher, but as an associate and advisor in educational matters, is stressed.

The legalities express the corporation's ties to and within the essential framework of civil society. They do not and cannot fully measure the impressive task entrusted to the teacher.

News from the Field

FATHER ROBERT F. MULLAN, S.J., Science teacher at Gonzaga High of Washington, D.C. has made the news with the recent science seminar he conducted at Gonzaga last summer. Some 45 young Gonzagans tested the mettle of some 25 visiting professors over the space of 5 weeks. Some of the topics covered were: Chemotherapy, space biology, experimental psychology, and scientific writing. The idea of the seminar, according to Father Mullan, was to get away from the science-fair approach and into the realm of learning. These boys, Father Mullan said, can get to the why of things faster than adults and they are a lot more curious. Evidently the lecturers agreed with Father Mullan. At least one of the medical lecturers had the same idea. These kids, he said, ask more intelligent questions than a lot of doctors.

Status of Special Studies 1963-1964

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

This is the twenty-second time we have published an annual report on the status of special studies in the American Assistancy. Sixteen of these reports recorded increases in the total number of special students; six reported decreases. Even though this is the second year in a row that we have had to record a decrease, the general trend over the entire period covered by these annual reports has been in the direction of a gradual fairly constant increase in the total number of Jesuits devoting their full time to special studies:

TABLE I–COMPARATIVE STATISTICS, 1958-1964

	58-59	59-60	60-61	61-62	62-63	63-64
Full Time	260	292	293	314	309	306
Priests	169	177	178	202	210	220
Scholastics	91	115	115	112	99	86
Ph.D.	164	174	183	196	195	185
Other Doctor	22	29	27	39	38	48
M.A.	34	34	43	27	31	24
M.S.	20	33	20	17	10	20
Other Master	9	5	7	10	4	4
Other Degree	6	6	6	6	15	7
No Degree	5	11	7	19	16	18

There are other aspects of the overall picture that are on the encouraging side. This year's decrease in the total number of full-time special students (309 to 306) is actually less than last year's (314 to 309). Moreover, there is a sharp increase (210 to 220) in the number of priests engaged in special studies. This increase in the number of priests assigned to special studies would be a cause for rejoicing were it not counter-balanced by a correspondingly sharp decrease of 13 in the number of scholastic special students. Hence even with an increase of 10 priests, we end up with an over-all decrease of 3. The number of priest special students has been increasing since 1957; the number of scholastic special students has decreased from 115 in 1959 and 1960 to 86 this year.

Last year's report suggested that the decreasing number of scholastics assigned to special studies might be indicative of a desire on the part of those responsible for province special-studies programs to have young Jesuits complete their ecclesiastical studies before entering on a program of special studies. A comparison of this year's priest and scholastic totals are even more markedly indicative of such a desire.

As usual the totals suggest various questions. Is there a clear relationship between the total number entering the Society in the American Assistancy in any given year and the number assigned to special studies when those entering that year have completed philosophy? Is there a relationship between the scholastic record of an entering class and the total assigned to special studies some years later? While we might be inclined to dismiss these questions with the remark that there are so many variables in the picture in any one province, and even more so in the entire Assistancy, that such speculation is hardly worthwhile, I am not at all sure that it is. My lack of assurance makes me hope that only when the irrelevance of such questions has been shown by a scientific study, will we cease to ask such questions.

In the meantime it may be interesting to sharpen the focus on some of the individual tables that accompany this report. Returning again to Table I that has already evoked some observations on this year's totals, we note that while there are 10 fewer candidates for the Ph.D. than there were last year, there are just as many more studying for *Other Doctorates.* Likewise, while there are 7 fewer studying for an M.A., 7 fewer for *Other Degrees,* the same number studying for *Other Masters* degrees as last year, there are 10 more than last year studying for the M.S.

Most readers of this report will be particularly interested in the special studies program of their own province, how it compares with other individual provinces, and with the over-all program of the Assistancy. This legitimate curiosity they can satisfy by carefully examining Table II.

TABLE II–DEGREE SOUGHT

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Or.	Wis.	Totals
Full Time	17	26	24	19	29	24	52	12	49	19	35	306
Priests	13	24	19	13	20	15	35	6	41	13	21	220
Scholastics	4	2	5	6	9	9	17	6	8	6	14	86
Ph. D.	11	19	17	14	19	11	25	9	22	14	24	185
Other Doctor	3	3	3	2	3	4	9	2	11	2	6	48
M.A.	1	0	1	0	3	6	5	0	4	3	1	24
M.S.	1	3	0	1	3	2	1	1	7	0	1	20
Other Master	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Other Degree	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	7
No Degree	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	0	5	0	2	18
New	10	7	7	8	14	16	26	7	24	7	11	137
Continuing	7	19	17	11	15	8	26	5	25	12	24	169
Total, 63-64	17	26	24	19	29	24	52	12	49	19	35	306
62-63	17	30	29	22	35	18	52	9	38	18	41	309
Plus or Minus	=	−4	−5	−3	−6	+6	=	+3	+11	+1	−6	−3

The totals given for this year and last year at the bottom of Table II indicate that 4 out of 11 provinces of the American Assistancy show an increase in the number of special students; 5 show a decrease; and 2 show the same total as last year.

Since these totals become more significant only in terms of the total manpower of each province; it will be useful to rank the provinces according to manpower and according to the total number of special students. According to the figures given in the 1964 province catalogues there are 8,377 Jesuits in the American Assistancy. This is an increase of 120 over last year.

Ranked according to numbers and percentages of manpower the provinces stand thus: New York—1,148 (13.70%), New England 1,129 (13.48%), California 878 (10.48%), Maryland 839, (10.02%), Missouri 788 (9.41%), Wisconsin 779 (9.30%), Oregon 698 (8.33%), Chicago 675 (8.06%), New Orleans 587 (7.01%), Detroit 522 (6.23%), Buffalo 334 (3.98%).

Ranking them according to the total number of special students listed in this year's report the provinces line up as follows: New England (52), New York (49), Wisconsin (35), Maryland (29), California (26), Chicago (24), Missouri (24), Detroit (19), Oregon (19), Buffalo (17), New Orleans (12).

If one is particularly interested in the number of Jesuits studying for a doctorate he can see from the following list how his province ranks: New England with *34;* New York with *33;* Wisconsin with *30;* California and Maryland with *22;* Chicago with *20;* Detroit and Oregon with *16;* Missouri with *15;* Buffalo with *14;* and New Orleans with *11.*

An examination of Table III reveals that this year various provinces have assigned their special students to 35 subject fields. Of these 35 subjects 23 in four general areas total 264 students or 86 percent of the total of 306 special students. The four general areas are *Ecclesiastical* with 81: Theology (45), Philosophy (31), Canon Law (3), and Scripture (2); *Science-Math* with 75: Physics (27), Math (22), Biology (14), Chemistry (9), Anthropology (2), Engineering (1); *Humanities* with 62: English (25), Languages (16), Classics (11), Communication Arts (2), Linguistics (2), Literature (2), Music (2), Drama (1), Fine Arts (1); *Social Sciences* with 46: History (19), Sociology (11), Economics (10), Political Science (6).

(Continued on page 216)

TABLE III–MASTER FIELDS

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Or.	Wis.	TOTALS	
Anthropoloqy	1 MA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 PhD	--	1 PhD	1 MA
Architecture	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 PhD	1 PhD	
Biology	3 PhD	1 PhD	--	--	3 PhD	--	1 PhD	--	2 PhD	--	1 PhD	11 PhD	
	--	1 MS	--	--	1 MS	--	--	--	1 MS	--	--	3 MS	
Business Administration	--	1 PhD	1 MBA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 PhD	
	--	1 MBA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2 MBA	
Canon Law	--	--	--	--	--	1 JCD	2 JCD	--	--	--	--	3 JCD	
Chemistry	1 MS	--	2 PhD	--	1 PhD	--	1 PhD	1 MS	--	--	2 PhD	6 PhD	1 PD
	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 PD	--	--	--	--	2 MS	
Classics	--	1 PhD	1 PhD	2 PhD	--	--	2 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	--	1 PhD	9 PhD	1 ND
	--	--	--	1 ND	--	--	1 MA	--	--	--	--	1 MA	
Communication Arts	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 PhD	--	--	--	1 PhD	2 PhD	
Comparative Literature	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 PhD	--	1 PhD	--	2 PhD	
Drama	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 PhD	1 PhD	
Economics	--	--	--	1 PhD	1 PhD	--	2 PhD	--	2 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	8 PhD	1 ND
	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 ND	--	--	1 MA	--	1 MA	
Education	--	1 PhD	--	--	--	1 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	--	1 PhD	6 PhD	
	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 DEd	--	1 DEd	--	--	2 DEd	
	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 MEd	--	1 MS	--	--	1 MS	1 MEd
Engineering	--	--	--	1 MS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 MS	
English	1 PhD	4 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	2 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	2 PhD	2 PhD	5 PhD	21 PhD	
	--	--	--	--	1 MA	1 MA	--	--	1 MA	--	--	3 MA	
	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 ND	--	--	1 ND	
Fine Arts	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 PhD	--	--	1 PhD	
Guidance	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 ND	1 ND	
History	1 PhD	--	3 PhD	1 PhD	--	2 PhD	2 ND	--	3 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	12 PhD	2 ND
	--	--	--	--	--	3 MA	1 MA	--	--	--	1 MA	5 MA	

	Buf.	Cal:	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Or.	Wis.	TOTALS	
Languages	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	
German	1 PhD	–	–	–	1 MA	–	–	–	–	–	–	1 PhD	1 MA
Modern	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1 PhD	–	1 PhD	
Semitic	–	–	–	–	2 PhD	–	1 PhD	1 PhD	–	–	–	4 PhD	
	–	–	–	–	–	–	7 ND	–	–	–	–	7 ND	
Spanish	–	1 PhD	–	–	–	1 PhD	–	–	–	–	–	2 PhD	
Law	–	–	1 LLB	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1 LLB	2 LLB	
Linguistics	–	–	1 PhD	1 PhD	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2 PhD	
Mathematics	–	1 MS	1 PhD	1 PhD	3 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	–	2 PhD	–	2 Ph	12 PhD	4 MA
	–	–	–	1 MA	–	–	3 MA	–	4 MS	–	1 MS	6 MS	
Medicine	1 MD	–	–	–	–	1 MD	–	–	–	–	–	2 MD	
Music	–	–	–	–	–	1 MA	–	–	–	1 MA	–	2 MA	
Philosophy	2 PhD	3 PhD	3 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	1 MA	6 PhD	1 PhD	5 PhD	3 PhD	1 PhD	27 PhD	1 PD
	–	–	–	–	–	–	1 PD	–	2 MA	–	–	3 MA	
Physics	1 PhD	1 MS	2 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	2 MS	3 PhD	2 PhD	4 PhD	2 PhD	2PhD	19 PhD	
	–	–	–	–	2 MS	–	1 PD	–	1 MS	–	–	1 PD	
	–	–	–	–	–	–	1 MS	–	–	–	–	7 MS	
Political Science	1 PhD	1 PhD	–	1 PhD	2 PhD	–	–	–	–	1 PhD	–	6 PhD	
Psychiatry	–	1 MD	–	–	1 Res	–	–	–	–	–	1 MD	2 MD	1 Res
Psychology	–	2 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	–	1 PhD	1 MA	2 PhD	12 PhD	1 ND
	–	–	1 MA	–	–	1 ND	–	–	1 MA	–	–	3 MA	
Scripture	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2 STD	–	–	2 STD	
Sociology	1 PhD	2 PhD	–	–	2 PhD	–	1 PhD	–	–	2 PhD	2 PhD	10 PhD	
	–	–	–	–	1 MA	–	–	–	–	–	–	1 MA	
Speech	–	1 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3 PhD	
Theology	2 STD	3 STD	3 STD	2 STD	3 STD	2 STD	6 STD	2 STD	6 STD	2 STD	5 STD	36 STD	
	1 ND	–	1 ND	–	–	1 PhD	–	–	3 PhD	–	1 ND	4 PhD	
	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2 ND	–	–	5 ND	

Table IV will appeal to those who are particularly interested in where Jesuits are studying. They will see that this year Jesuit Special Students are in attendance at 74 universities, 21 of them Catholic and 53 secular. One student is continuing his residency at a hospital and another is in private research. Of the 74 universities, 49 are in the United States and 25 are outside the United States. Thirty of the universities have only one Jesuit student; the others have from 2 to 27 Jesuits. The following 10 institutions account for 147 or almost half the 306 special students: Fordham 27; Gregorian 23; St. Louis 21; Harvard 18; Catholic U 11; Columbia 11; Georgetown 10; Institut Catholique 10; Boston College 8; North Carolina 8.

To any who might be inclined to entertain personal doubts about the wisdom of assigning so much of our manpower in secondary and higher education, or about the genuine worth of the apostolate of education; the special studies program of the American Assistancy (even granting that it leaves much to be desired) will indicate what higher superiors think of investing in the ministry of the schools. First of all, it is clearly expected that the great majority of those who are in the program of special studies will later be engaged, in the one way or another, in the work of Jesuit secondary or higher education. It should likewise be remembered that this vast investment of money and manpower in education is made with the knowledge and approval and hearty encouragement of the highest authorities of the Society and the Church.

Another doubt about the apostolate of education and one that should make readers look again at the list of subject matter fields given in the long footnote to Table IV is expressed in the following questions that are heard with growing frequency: Why should priests and religious devote their time to studying and teaching such subjects as Anthropology, Business Administration, Chemistry, Economics, Languages, Mathematics, Physics, etc. etc.? What is apostolic or priestly about these subjects? Why not have laymen teach these subjects; and confine ourselves to teaching theology and to the ministry of the word.

This is not the place to answer such objections—except to say that the major superiors of the Society have given a very effective answer to them by their approval and encouragement of the special studies program with which this report deals. But having referred to the objections I may be permitted to express the hope that those who are assigned to special studies will while they strive to become productive scholars in the various fields of learning, through a

prayerful, priestly life, realize themselves and bring others to realize that education means the search for truth by man, and that the search for truth in any field and in all fields if followed long enough and high enough, leads ultimately to the source of all truth—God Himself. What vocation more religious, more priestly, than to help to lead man to God through the paths of His own revelation—be it revelation through the word of a prophet, the word of God's Son, or a revelation through God's own creation?

IV SCHOOLS

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Or.	Wis.	Totals
Al Hikma*	----	----	----	----	----	----	7	----	----	----	----	7
Biblical*	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	2	----	1	4
Bonn*	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	2
Boston College	----	----	1	1	----	1	2	----	3	----	----	8
Brandeis	----	----	----	----	2	----	2	1	----	----	----	5
California	----	4	----	1	----	1	----	----	1	1	----	8
Cambridge*	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
Case	----	----	1	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2
Catholic U.	1	----	----	----	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	11
Chicago	----	1	2	1	----	----	----	1	----	1	1	7
Colorado	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Columbia	2	1	----	1	----	1	2	----	4	----	----	11
Cornell	1	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	1	----	1	4
Detroit	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	2
Duke	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Duquesne	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Fordham	1	1	2	2	3	----	8	----	9	----	1	27
Freiburg*	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	1
Georgetown	----	----	3	1	4	----	----	----	----	1	1	10
Gonzaga	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	1
Gottingen*	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
Gregorian*	1	----	2	1	1	1	5	3	3	3	3	23
Harvard	2	----	----	2	4	2	4	----	1	----	3	18
Heidelberg*	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	1
Holy Cross	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2	----	----	----	2
Illinois	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1	2
Innsbruck*	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Institut Cath.*	1	2	1	----	----	1	2	----	3	----	----	10
Johns Hopkins	1	----	----	----	3	----	1	----	1	----	1	7
Kansas	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	1
Laval*	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
London*	----	1	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2
Louvain*	1	----	1	----	----	----	----	1	1	----	----	4
Loyola, Chicago	----	----	3	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	2	6
Madrid*	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Mainz*	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Marquette	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	1	----	1	3
Maryland	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	1

* Non-United States Schools.

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Or.	Wis.	Totals
Massachusetts	----	----	----	----	1	----	1	----	----	----	----	2
M.I.T.	----	----	----	----	----	----	2	----	1	----	----	3
Michigan	----	2	1	----	1	----	1	----	----	1	1	7
Michigan State	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
Minnesota	----	----	----	----	----	2	----	1	----	----	----	3
Montana State	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	1
Munich*	----	2	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	3
N.Y.U	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
N.Y. State	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
North Carolina	1	2	----	1	1	1	----	----	----	1	1	8
Northwestern	1	1	1	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	2	6
Notre Dame	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	1	2
Nymegen*	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
Oriental Inst.*	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
Ottawa*	----	2	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	3
Oxford*	----	----	----	1	1	----	----	----	2	----	1	5
Paderborn*	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Paris*	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	1
Pennsylvania	----	1	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2	4
Princeton	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	1
Priv. Research	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	1
Sacred Heart	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
San Francisco	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	1
St. Louis	1	2	----	2	1	5	2	----	1	4	3	21
So. Calif.	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	1
Stanford	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	1	3
Strasbourg*	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2	----	----	3
Syracuse	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Temple	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	1
Toronto*	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	1	----	2
Vienna*	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	1
Washington	----	----	----	----	----	2	----	----	----	1	----	3
Wayne	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
Western Reserve	----	----	1	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	2
Wisconsin	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2	----	2
Woodstock	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	1	1	----	----	3
Yale	----	----	----	----	----	1	1	----	1	----	----	3
Yeshiva	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	2

* Non-United States Schools.

Anthropology (2) Catholic U. (1), Wisconsin (1); *Architecture* (1) Princeton (1); Biology (14), Boston College (1), Brandeis (2), California (1), Colorado (1), Columbia (1), Fordham (4), Johns Hopkins (1), Munich (1), State University of New York (1); *Business Administration* (3) California L.A. (1), Michigan (1), Pennsylvania (1); *Canon Law* (3) Gregorian (2), Oriental Institute (1); *Chemistry* (9) Brandeis (1), Case (1), Johns Hopkins (2), Gottingen (1), Holy Cross (1), Massachusetts (1), Pennsylvania (1); *Classics* (11) Chicago (1), Cornell (1), Fordham (2), Johns

Hopkins (1), Harvard (1), Louvain (1), Nymegen (1), Oxford (2), Stanford (1); *Communication Arts* (2) Michigan State (1), Stanford (1); *Comparative Literature* (2) Michigan (1), Southern California (1); *Drama* (1) Northwestern (1); *Economics* (10) Boston College (8), Columbia (1), Georgetown (1), Maryland (1), Massachusetts (1), M.I.T. (1), Michigan (1), New York U. (1), St. Louis (1); *Education* (10) Boston College (1), Catholic U. (1), Chicago (1), Fordham (1), Harvard (2), Michigan (2), Minnesota (2); *Engineering* (1) St. Louis (1); *English* (25) Brandeis (1), Columbia (3), Duquesne (1), Fordham (1), Harvard (2), Kansas (1), London (1), Loyola Chicago (1), Michigan (1), North Carolina (7), Oxford (3), Pennsylvania (1), Toronto (1), Wisconsin (1), Yale (1); *Fine Arts* (1) Paris (1); *Guidance* (1) Gonzaga (1); *History* (19) Bonn (1), Cambridge (1), Duke (1), Fordham (1), Georgetown (1), Gregorian (1), Harvard (3), London (1), Loyola Chicago (1), North Carolina (1), Notre Dame (1), Private Research (1), St. Louis (5); *Languages:* German (2) Mainz (1), Northwestern (1); *Modern* (1) Washington (1); *Semitic* (11) Al-Hikma (7), Chicago (1), Harvard (3); *Spanish* (2) California L.A. (1), Madrid (1); *Law* (2) Georgetown (1), St. Louis (1); *Linguistics* (2) Georgetown (2); *Mathematics* (22) Boston College (1), Catholic U. (3), Chicago (2), Detroit (2), Johns Hopkins (1), Fordham (4), Harvard (1), Illinois (1), Marquette (1), Michigan (1), Notre Dame (1), Washington (1), Wayne (1), Yeshiva (2); *Medicine* (2) Harvard (1), Western Reserve (1); *Music* (2) Montana State (1), Washington (1); *Philosophy* (31) Bonn (1), California Berkeley (1), Innsbruck (1), Fordham (2), Freiburg (1), Georgetown (1), Gregorian (2), Laval (1), Louvain (3), Munich (2), St. Louis (7), Toronto (1), Yale (2); *Physics* (27) Boston College (3), Case (1), Catholic U. (1), Columbia (2), Cornell (1), Fordham (2), Harvard (1), Johns Hopkins (2), Georgetown (1), Holy Cross (1), M.I.T. (2), Northwestern (1), Pennsylvania (1), St. Louis (5), Stanford (1), Syracuse (1), Temple (1); *Political Science* (6) California L.A. (1), Chicago (1), Columbia (1), Cornell (1), Georgetown (2); *Psychiatry* (3) Sacred Heart Hospital (1); Georgetown (1), Harvard (1); *Psychology* (16) California (1), Catholic U. (2), Fordham (3), Harvard (2), Illinois (1) Loyola Chicago (3), Minnesota (1), Northwestern (1), Ottawa (2); *Scripture* (2) Gregorian (2); *Sociology* (11) Brandeis (1), California (1), California L.A. (1), Columbia (3), Cornell (1), Gregorian (1), Harvard (1), Loyola

Chicago (1), St. Louis (1); *Speech* (3) Northwestern (2), Western Reserve (1); *Theology* (45) Biblical (2), Catholic U. (2), Chicago (1), Gregorian (17), Heidelberg (1), Institut Catholique Paris (10), Marquette (2), Ottawa (1), Paderborn (1), San Francisco (1), Strasbourg (3), Vienna (1), Woodstock (3).

News from the Field

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY has received a $400,000 contract from the U.S. Agency for International Development to conduct a cooperative assistance program with the Catholic University of Ecuador at Quito.

The two-year program is one of three co-operative ventures being initiated between universities in the U.S. and Ecuador under the Alliance for Progress.

Studies of possible collaboration between St. Louis University and the Catholic University of Ecuador have been in progress for nearly two years. The contract will provide for development of the Ecuadorean university's library; for organization of "institutes" similar to American university "departments" in the basic sciences, mathematics, languages, and the social sciences; for establishment of a nursing center; and for development of the university's School of Social Service which is the only university-level program of its kind in Ecuador.

A number of educational experts will serve as a visiting staff for the program in Quito under the terms of the contract with St. Louis University. Included among the positions to be created are those of library consultant; an educational expert and administrative coordinator; an expert in English to become director of the language laboratory; a teacher of English and American studies; two teachers of basic sciences; a teacher-consultant in nursing education; a teacher-consultant in social service; and a social scientist.

Basic laboratories are to be planned and equipped under the contract. Training for a staff of Ecuadoreans will be provided at St. Louis University.

Catholic High Schools and the Water Repellent

JOHN SEIDLER, S.J.

On December 4, 1961, the Carnegie Corporation announced a $350,000 grant for a committee headed by Father Theodore Hesburgh of Notre Dame to study Catholic primary and secondary education. What will this study do? Will it present to the public, as other studies have done, a sheaf of statistics that count the minutest details of the schools? Or will it dig inside the statistics and uncover the broad problems that explain details? With a penetrating analysis in mind, Oscar Handlin cried out in *The Atlantic Monthly* for September, 1961, ("Live Students and Dead Education") for a radical revision of our educational philosophy with regard to high schools. Many who have taught in a Jesuit high school, as I have, or in some other Catholic secondary school for boys, realize how necessary a revision is. We are failing in our primary obligation of imparting a strong intellectual training. We are also failing to induce moral and religious values in the students. In a word, we are failing to bring our students to the point of assimilating our education and afterwards leading a life charged with our values. Somehow, somewhere, the boys put on a kind of water repellent coat that keeps the force of the education from coming too close to them. The values simply slide off. They may just as well attend a non-Catholic school.

Within the Catholic schools, students wear a repellent coat, not so much because of bad books or a bad religion class, but principally because of three very basic sicknesses in our educational policy: 1) academic mediocrity, 2) overstrict discipline, and 3) the traditional college preparatory curriculum. Each of these brings a serious disorder to students.

1. *Academic mediocrity.* Many Catholic high schools, living on past reputation, pretend to excel academically; but, if they are seen acting on the stage with certain other schools, they look like supporting actors. For true excellence is lacking, and intellectual indifference reveals itself in attitudes and practice everywhere. Many believe that we still produce, as we always have, "fine Catholic gentlemen," who, by the very fact that they pass through our schools and sit in our desks, are mature men. They have been

molded into loyal friends of the school, leaders, and gracious gentlemen, but they have not become trained scholars. In this, they frequently do not measure up to their friends who attend the best public schools. The friends travel the freeway while the Catholic boys take the old scenic route.

In practice, examples of this attitude which submerges the primary end of education—intellectual development—pop up and take over like spring weeds. For instance, many teachers have not specialized in their subject. Frequently over a third of the instructors in a school have had very little teaching experience. All feel the burden of too many extracurricular activities. Hence the average teacher, unable to correct properly or to prepare class matter with vitality, staggers into a shoulder-shrugging mediocrity. In other ways, too, the academic tone is lowered by such things as overemphasis on athletics, a plethora of activities and contests, frequent classroom interruptions, the short length of time that is actually spent in the classroom in comparison with public schools or European schools, and college recommendations given to boys who should not be promoted that far. Although we applaud academic excellence, our actions proclaim that we are sacrificing academic excellence to lesser goals. We are coaches who so bring our teams to play for sportsmanship and exercise that they stop trying to win.

When students see academic lackluster, they psychologically draw back whether consciously or unconsciously. Because they see no challenge to their intellect, they cannot take pride in the school's academic stand. They may take pride in some secondary aspect of the school, such as its football team or its dances, but not in the one thing that counts, intellectual leadership. Since the teachers and administrators, as individuals, have failed to provide living academic ideals, boys do not dream of imitating the teachers. Instead, they mentally identify themselves with another type—a Mickey Mantle or a Marlon Brando.

2. *Overstrict discipline.* Some educators picture discipline as an end in itself. This attitude displays excessive strictness, inflexibility, and unreasonableness. Many times a disciplinarian abrogates student rights of self-defense by using uncertain evidence or pressuring him into confessing something he has no obligation to confess. Other times he may assign a punishment without apparent reason. Or he may yell at boys who are behaving well. Worse yet, the school curriculum may be built around the disciplinary

system, so that, to maintain perfect order, a given student, for example, must remain in the same classroom all day with the same group, even though he does not belong there for every subject. As a further humiliation, students often are herded like recalcitrant goats through the halls.

The psychological result of this upon the student is fear and insecurity. If we believed in some kind of Puritanical morality, perhaps it would be all right. But even a continually beaten dog, cowering before his master, eventually comes to hate him. Similarly, students resent overbearing discipline, especially if they already possess high motivation, which many do. When a boy gives his mother a Christmas present, he expects both acknowledgment and gratitude. But if she not only neglects a "thank you," but accuses him of forgetting her, the boy will want to find another mother. Similarly, when the student constantly confronts force as the motivation to study, he will feel victimized and baffled. He will turn against the school because he cannot reconcile this attitude with his own common sense.

3. *The traditional college preparatory curriculum.* Many Catholic high schools, preserving the fiction that their schools draw only future liberal arts honor students, still force the whole orchestra to play a single instrument. This obviously cramps the talents of the students and disfigures their growth in education. In the first place, many students take subjects for which they clearly are not qualified. In the second place, other students, though qualified for the courses they study, should be mastering the prerequisites, for example, for engineering, and thus should be stressing electives of their future field of concentration. Yet we continue to favor an educational railway that runs only to one destination. Distinct college demands in distinct fields, as well as the leadership of good public high schools, urge us to make changes.

One problem of our frozen educational structure is psychological. The system chokes initiative and brings the student to frustration. Boys who are less talented in languages lose confidence in themselves, fail to develop their real talents, and become exasperated because they cannot succeed in the courses that steamroll over them. More intellectually talented boys are frustrated because they cannot properly prepare for college or because they feel their merits are not recognized. A student in an honor-class works twice as hard as a student in another, although less intelligent, class taking the same matter. At the end of the year, the college recommending

"B" goes to the boy who has studied less, while the other boy, tagged with a "C," cries for justice.

One-line education also leads to discipline problems. If boys do not fit properly into the curriculum, they will rebel against studies in their frustration. This causes the teacher to apply more force to motivate them. The teacher in the college preparatory school is like a prosecuting attorney. He has to prove positively that he can prepare all students for college, whether the students cooperate or not. The teacher has to pressure the students to study, thereby precipitating the conflict between teacher and students. As a result, boys who realize that the school is in a Humpty-Dumpty shape laugh in defiance.

Two other factors psychologically aid the student readily to reject the educational values offered by the Catholic high school. The first is the culture in which the student lives. This culture is a materialistic, independence-loving octopus which holds the student while offering him the values of money, status, and business success. Conflicting with educational ideals—intellectual and moral—these values easily will lead students to spurn the deep personal attitudes carried by Catholic education. The second factor is pressure from the peer group. A person who finds himself maladjusted in the school situation easily adjusts himself to the milieu of his age group by accepting its values. He will pooh-pooh studying, bluff his way around teachers, and entertain his friends with school ridicule. The educational system must vie for the loyalty of the students. At some point they make a choice, and the Catholic secondary school must insure that that choice is for it.

How to do this? The school must be run on the following three principles: 1) academic professionalism, 2) discipline that weighs firmness with reasonableness and subordinates itself to education, 3) a core curriculum with flexibility. The core should be built on English, history, literature, and mathematics, saturating the students with communicating and being communicated with. Then this core should be completed by fields of emphasis extending in various directions to fit the talents and interests of the boys. Fewer students need to take Latin. More students should profit from modern languages, social science, and scientific projects. Next, this flexible program, in addition to a new contract, also must get a new set of tools for achieving academic excellence, such as educational TV, vocational guidance within the system, new approaches to religion, and a new concept in classroom teaching such as the

Trump Plan offers. Why not plan for individual study, group discussion, and large group lectures if they push intelligence a little faster?

A new curriculum will also greatly help discipline by reversing the burden of educating. The student will be forced to motivate himself. He will also have to work hard to maintain his standing in the honors program or to receive a college recommendation. Or if he finds himself in a more general program, he will be more suited to the studies and will have less occasion to conflict with the teacher or the school. In this way, he will be less a cause of disciplinary action.

But before revising, we must rethink the whole system of Catholic secondary education. We must realize that education is a process in which the psychological identification and assimilation of values thrive on academic excellence. We must also realize that education is primarily intellectual education. Jacques Barzun has said, in *The Place and the Price of Excellence* (an address before the third convocation of the graduate school of Cornell University, December 2, 1958):

> For what does excellence in education or learning really refer to? It refers to Intellect. To talk of excellence in education means to talk of the place of Intellect in the national life. And this is almost unheard of. Education with us has been for every good purpose, I will not say, *except* an intellectual purpose, but every good purpose *ahead* of an intellectual purpose. It has been for character, citizenship, health, social and individual adjustment, cultural assimilation, vocational aid, profitable friendships, marriage opportunities, and hobbies of distinction. The desire to raise the Intellect to new heights has not existed or been avowed.

When we earnestly begin raising Intellect to new heights in Catholic secondary schools, our students will begin to take off their repellent coats.

News from the Field

The UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT is instituting a new Masters Degree program in Pastoral and Marital Counselling. The course, limited to priests, is believed to be the first of its kind in the United States. The two year program will combine academic work in the University Graduate School along with a practicum at the Diocesan Catholic Social Service Center. The staff will include professors with Doctorates in Sociology, Psychology, Psychiatry, and Marriage Counselling.

Programmed Prelection

FRANCIS X. QUINN, S.J.

Even in the age of automation, our schools are only as good as our teachers. But modern technology is presenting a host of teaching aids whereby poorer students can obtain more beneficial tutoring. Machines and programmed instruction do not supplant teachers, but they can free them to function on a higher level. In many of our schools, machines have already relieved teachers from much of the consuming work of report cards, I.Q. reading, testing, etc., and in return have offered a chance for time to help poorer students. Many of the new classroom machines, programmed texts, can be further aids to our teachers and students. Remedial work can be done and checked more accurately; classes can proceed on their own while teachers spend more time with slower students—the possibilities multiply. The purpose of this article is to describe the trend and to suggest further avenues to the interested.

Although programmed instruction represents the most recent advance in educational technology, its technique of instruction goes back to the earliest days of education. The method is essentially tutorial, the program serving as tutor to one student at a time. This individual pupil concentration contrasts with another trend in education: giving televised or filmed courses to ever larger numbers of students in the traditional lecture form.

Programmed instruction requires the continuing participation of the student. He is never a passive receiver of information. The program challenges him to make a response to every step on the way. If the questions are properly phrased, they will not only impart information but also make the student supply the connections with knowledge already possessed; this procedure will lead him to a fuller understanding of the subject.

Another principle employed by the programmed instructor is "reinforcement." This principle simply means that newly acquired knowledge is more firmly fixed in a student's mind when he is immediately informed whether his answer is right or wrong, and when, if the answer is wrong, he can quickly learn the correct information. The immediate satisfaction of acquiring new knowledge may be lost when a student takes a test after weeks of soaking up facts, and then has to wait days or weeks to learn the results.

The reinforcements feature in teaching by programmed instruc-

tion has the additional advantage of stopping a student from moving ahead until he has mastered a subject up to a given point. The program affords no opportunity to carry misconceptions into an advanced stage of study—a common occurrence, as most teachers can testify. There can be no gaps in knowledge because of absence from class or because of woolgathering while the teacher is talking. Programmed instruction thus presents itself to educators as the most effective method yet discovered for attaining the long sought goal of individual instruction.

Programmed instruction depends for effectiveness on completely new study material prepared in the form of questions or problems. Programmers have found preparation of such material no easy task. The subject to be covered must be broken down into very small segments, the segments arranged in proper sequence, and carefully framed questions composed to cover each segment.

Immediate feedback (i.e., instant scoring of student's answers) encourages a more careful reading of programmed material than in the case of studying a text where the consequences of attention or inattention are so long deferred that they have little effect on reading skills.

There are two major types of programmed instruction. One is adopted from the machine developed 35 years ago by the psychologist, S. L. Pressey, who is generally regarded as the father of the programmed instruction movement. Pressey's machine was a box about the size of a portable typewriter. It had a small window through which appeared a succession of mimeographed questions, each presenting a choice of four answers. If the student answered correctly, the mimeographed sheet moved on to the next question; it would not move until the exposed question had been answered correctly.

Some objections have been raised to the Pressey type of machine because it uses multiple-answer questions, requiring the student to recognize the correct response but not requiring him to compose his own answers. Programming which forces a pupil to give his own answers has now been developed. This type, Skinner programming, forces students to compose a written response with printed material exposed by the machine. One machine presents instructional material with questions to be read through a window; the student writes his answer to each question in turn on an exposed piece of paper, then lifts a lever which causes the correct answer to appear and puts a transparent cover over the written response.

Another type of teaching machine has been developed by adapting electronic data processors to perform an instructional function. Unlike other teaching machines which can be used by only one person at a time, the computer-teacher is capable of flashing multiple-choice questions on 100 or more small desk screens. Students simultaneously using the device need not be assembled in the same room or even in the same building. Each selects his answers to questions on his screen by pressing a button on the electronic keyboard. If the answer is correct, the next question appears on the screen; if the answer is wrong, the computer presents a series of simpler questions which lead the learner step by step to the missed question. Each student moves ahead at his own pace. This versatile machine can present study material in the form of slides, film strips or segments of printed pages, or it can project closed-circuit educational TV material. The machine is so sensitive that it can grade students not only for right and wrong answers, but also for partially correct answers. This computer-instructor now costs $50,000, but many other machines are already less expensive. A battery operated device is available for $39.50. On the market there is now a $20.00 teaching machine for home use in the study of mathematics.

The prelection method is an area where programmed instruction might be applied with great benefit. Teachers might well improve their prelection method by studying how a progammer would operate. The psychological principles on which a programmed prelection would be based have long been known: active student participation, immediate confirmation of correct responses. Programming can take some of the guesswork and some of the teacher's drudgery out of prelection; it can enrich the curriculum and broaden the student's knowledge; but it can never replace that interchange of ideas between student and teacher which lies at the heart of education.

Programs on the market include spelling, algebra, physics, French, Spanish, Russian. The Russian Program offers all the basic grammar to an English speaking person in 12 to 18 hours of learning time without the aid of an instructor.

The aims of the prelection are (1) to awaken interest in the assignment; (2) to set precise and attainable objectives for the assignment; (3) to point out more important or complicated phases. Thus a programmed prelection can give the student a start on private study and make it possible for a teacher to demand more

thorough private study. The self-activity, interest, motivation and appropriate study habits requisite for effective learning can be stimulated by a well planned, programmed preparatory study of the assignment. An investigation into programming will offer many suggestions for more effective prelection.

News from the Field

MRS. MABEL L. CRISS received the title of Foundress of the University and of the Wisconsin Province of the Jesuit Order, as a result of her benefactions to Creighton University.

She is believed to be the first person in the U.S. to receive the double honor. Five other Americans, including two Cardinals and an Archbishop, share the title of Founder of a Jesuit institution.

The honor is reserved for individuals who played a major role in the creation of a Jesuit institution or an important element thereof. Two years ago, Mrs. Criss contributed in excess of $4 million to Creighton for construction of a medical center, which is scheduled to be built by 1968.

She is the widow of Dr. C. C. Criss, a Creighton alumnus, who founded Mutual of Omaha and United of Omaha.

A "Do It Yourself" Course in Counseling

THOMAS C. HENNESSY, S.J.

In spite of the above title, the original purpose of the content of this paper was and is to encourage priests and seminarians to embark on a regular university course in guidance and counseling. However, there will always be some who find it impossible to take the time required for such a course, or having the time, they may not have the opportunity. For the sake of those who cannot attend classes, I have drawn up a list of subject matter (which may also indicate the title of courses in university catalogues) which seems essential to a rounded background in this field. While I particularly have in mind the school counselor, it seems obvious that spiritual fathers and those engaged in parish and retreat work would also profit from the suggested study of topics and the related readings. Perhaps it is fair to say that only the school counselors would really need to investigate the topics listed under #3, 4, and 9 below.

The books which are listed with the topics are meant to be the best choices after sifting through other titles with this norm in mind: they should be authoritative, recent, clearly written, and attractive rather than the last word in scholarship. The attempt was also made to limit the list to one book wherever possible.

The main areas of study are divided into the general background knowledge and the specific guidance and counseling courses. And at the end some further observations are made for those who would wish to have the satisfaction of doing the work which certified counselors would have done. Of course, it is quite possible to cavil at the courses and readings chosen. Admittedly, one's own biases and teaching activities show in this sort of compilation. For instance, the objection may be made that Experimental Psychology is not stressed. The reason for this is twofold, that most priests do study this subject at some time, and that it is not as necessary for the counselor as are other subjects listed.

A word of warning seems essential. The value of the listing of subject areas and books consists primarily in showing the field as a whole. It would be a serious error to feel that one should be considered a professionally adequate counselor after completing this reading. Far more reading is necessary, as well as academic course work and particularly supervision in counseling.

BACKGROUND

1. *Personality Theory.* The counselor should know of some of the leading attempts by psychologists to explain "what makes men tick." The counselor should either accept (perhaps with reservations) one of the leading theories (e.g., that of Freud, Allport, Adler, Murray, Ausubel may be considered) or work out a personal eclectic integration of what he finds best in the theories. An excellent summary of the major theories is available in *Theories of Personality* by C. S. Hall & G. Lindzey (New York: Wiley, 1957).

2. *Developmental Psychology.* This is a rather recent stress in psychology. It offers a study in depth of each of the periods of human growth, and indicates major hazards at each stage, as well as the developmental tasks, the dynamics and motivation, and personality problems which must be faced. Perhaps the classic book in this subject is Robert J. Havighurst's *Human Development and Education* (New York: D. McKay, 1953).

3. *Statistics.* To understand the current guidance literature, especially as it pertains to schools, at least an elementary course in statistics is necessary. For instance, an appreciation of the meaning of percentiles, standard error of measurement, and the normal curve is presumed among recently trained educators. There are many excellent statistics texts on the market at present. Perhaps as good as any is H. E. Garrett's *Statistics in Psychology and Education* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1958).

4. *Tests and Measurement.* The counselor should be aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the major standardized tests which are used for appraisal of mental ability, personality and occupational choice. The appropriate ones should be available to him, and he himself should have taken the tests which he administers. An excellent summary of this subject can be found in the final chapters of W. Cottle and N. Downie's *Procedures and Preparation for Counseling* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960).

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

5. *Principles and Procedures of Guidance.* A general introduction to guidance and counseling will stress a philosophy of guidance and attitudes which are regarded as typical of the guidance worker. Furthermore, certain key concepts of guidance literature, such as the "self concept," are stressed, and a general survey of the complete training in guidance and counseling is outlined. A good,

standard volume for this subject is A. Jones' *Principles of Guidance* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963).

6. *Techniques of Guidance and Counseling.* Herein many methods of getting information about the counselee are investigated; these methods include reports from the individual student and from teachers, and an examination of the methods of counseling. A. Traxler's *Techniques of Guidance* (New York: Harper, 1957) is a good volume for this study.

7. *Group Procedures.* Most school counselors must face up to the fact that they must be economical of their time. Hence, if certain problems can be adequately dealt with in groups, a great saving of time is effected. The counselor himself should be able to deal effectively with groups and he should be able to impart the basic procedures and techniques to "home-room" teachers, or those who are to meet with groups on a regular basis for the group procedures. A good introduction to this subject can be found in Margaret Bennet's *Guidance in Groups* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955).

8. *Theories of Vocational Choice.* The priest-counselor should know the controversies which flourished in the church concerning the nature of religious vocation, such as during the Reformation and more recently about Lahitton's doctrine. And in addition, he should know the work of such as Carter, Roe, Super, and Hoppoch relative to the origin and development of all vocations, not only the religious vocation. Two books could be mentioned as sources for general vocational theories: Ann Roe's *The Psychology of Occupations* (New York: Wiley, 1956) and R. Hoppock's *Occupational Information* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963).

9. *Theories of Counseling.* A great deal of work has been done since the 1940's on the dynamics of the interview, and the theoretical framework of counseling. The counseling process depends in large measure on the counselor's view of his role and of the counselee's role. Furthermore, the expectation of the outcomes of counseling will be important, as the process will be influenced by the expectation. Is the major aim of counseling directed to decision making, or to self-understanding, or to adjustment, or to facing reality factors? For different viewpoints, counselors should read one of C. Rogers' works, e.g., *Client-Centered Therapy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951), one of E. G. Williamson's works, e.g., *Counseling Adolescents* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950), and J. W. Loughary's slim volume, *Counseling in Secondary Schools* (New York: Harper, 1961).

Those whose studies bring them to the university will find a course which they will be likely to regard as invaluable: the Practicum or Practice in Counseling. Herein the counselor-in-training is presented with a live client, and his work with the client is supervised by members of the university staff. Tape recordings of the sessions and observation of the interviews through the one-way vision screen are utilized to assure personal supervision of the process. Of course, the recordings and the observation are done with the previous consent of all parties involved. Furthermore, the university will typically allow into this course only those counselors-in-training who have completed a major segment of their studies.

An additional course for priest counselors would be a seminar-type research and discussion of the problems which are special to Catholic schools. To this seminar many practicing counselors may be invited, regardless of their formal training in counseling. Their experience and their willingness to learn and to teach should be exploited by the universities. Experts in different fields, regardless of their guidance background, should also be regularly invited to this seminar.

Many counselors in schools are desirous of state certification as guidance counselors. The necessary academic training, as well as other requirements such as teaching and non-teaching paid experience, will differ from state to state. Those interested in this problem should consult D. Camp's *Guidance Workers Certification Requirements* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963). Many states would obligate the counselor to take a course on the organization and conduct of the guidance program. A good book on this topic is F. Zeran and A. Riccio's *Organization and Administration of Guidance Services* (Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1962).

The Relation of Courses in Speech to the Objectives of the Jesuit High School

Richard McNally, S.J.

One course that every scholastic-teacher is considered competent to teach, should circumstances require it, is Speech. And yet it seems safe to say that about no other course is there more indefiniteness in the first-year regent's mind as to its objectives and best approach than about the Speech course he is assigned to teach. He is more or less aware of the importance of speech-skills in the future careers of his students; he has heard and delivered both excellent and mediocre speeches as long as he has been in school; and he has perhaps taken a course in "Principles of Speech Education," or belonged to a circle of scholastics who try their hand regularly at preaching or acting. And yet, exactly what he is to do with the two or three groups of forty high school students who meet three times a week for "Speech Class" is most likely but a worried question in his mind. Furthermore, in courses like Geometry or Greek, he knows that a definite content must be communicated and tested; and that, regardless of his personal abilities as a teacher, the class's "felt need" for the subject and their desire for a good grade will serve as powerful motives for attention and effort: this at least will contribute to behavior. A Speech course, however, at first sight seems to preclude any content for communication and testing; and this presumed lack of content poses a motivational and disciplinary problem to the new teacher's wary mind. The first-grade regent, in short, though variously prepared for, and considered by administrators competent to teach the Speech courses in our Jesuit high schools, is as a rule both vague and somewhat worried about actually teaching the subject. Nor is his predicament a rare one; for Speech is being taught by scholastics in most Midwest Jesuit schools, and will be taught progressively by more of them as the directives for Speech of the Board of Governors of the Jesuit Educational Association are more perfectly implemented.[1]

The Jesuit scholastic-teacher is not entirely without assistance in his quandary, of course. He has the experience of older faculty

---

[1] This Board, comprising the Provincials of the American Assistancy, has stipulated a minimum of four semesters of Speech, two hours a week. Cf. *Speaking—A Teacher's Handbook* (New York: Jesuit Educational Association, 1954), p. 19.

members at his school, as well as his own scholasticate Speech background to call upon, and has a set of Speech texts and a teacher's handbook available for consultation.[2]

Normally, these should be sufficient help for him in preparing to teach Speech; for they—faculty experience, academic preparation, texts and handbook—are as much help as he has in any course he should be asked to teach.

But, as he will see shortly after the assignment is actually given him, the problems of the teacher of Speech are not completely solved by recourse to these aids. For neither his own nor his fellow teachers' experience will readily supply him with answers about the proper objectives and content of Speech; and he will discover that he has much adapting to do in fitting those basic skills which exist scattered throughout the four-book *Speaking* series within the narrow limits that present curricular arrangements allow for the course. He may find that in his school Speech is taught only one semester but three days a week; or for four semesters once a week; or for one quarter five days a week—whereas the series was set up to be taught twice a week for four semesters.

Adapting a textbook, of course, is normally inconvenient rather than difficult. One knows what is to be taught and arranges accordingly. But one cannot very well ask the student to purchase four texts, only to excerpt a few pages from each. And even if he could, the question would remain: what should I include and what omit? What is important, what might I overlook in fitting the *Speaking* series to my curricular context?

The ordinary method of deciding such questions, it must be admitted, is a recourse either to what was done previously or to one's personal preferences. But the result of such a procedure will be anything from reading sports magazines aloud to studying styles of acting. It becomes a question of filling out class time with a minimum of teacher boredom and class resentment.

A better way of settling the problem is to spend a few minutes considering what Speech is and why it is taught. For once we know these things, it is comparatively simple to make the necessary adaptations to time and place. Once we know what the Speech course is supposed to do and how it fits into the academic picture within the Jesuit high school, we are as able to adapt the *Speaking* series as any other course we are to teach. Furthermore, from such an examination we may perhaps remove any negative attitudes we

[2] John H. Williams, S.J. (ed.), *Speaking* (Chicago; Loyola University Press, 1958).

have acquired about Speech—"a waste of time," "a content-less discipline," "an unteachable skill," and the like.

This is the purpose of the present paper, to discuss the proper goals and fundamental approaches to the Speech course within the Jesuit high school.

OBJECTIVES OF THE JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS

The first topic about which the beginning Speech teacher ought to be completely clear concerns the objective of the Speech course: what sort of final product is he expected to produce by semester's end? and how do his and his students' efforts in the Speech course contribute to their over-all educational objective?

In attempting to answer these questions, let us begin by reviewing our purposes as religious in secondary education. These purposes have been variously expressed, but for us the most authoritative statement, from Father General's 1948 *Instructio,* speaks as follows:

> The goal established for our work in education is to lead our charges to the knowledge and love of God. Accordingly, our first concern must be that our students in the very process of learning also develop a truly Christian character. Hence in every one of our schools the moral and religious formation of our students according to the principles and directives of the Church must hold the place of first importance. By this means we shall prepare outstanding men for the family, for our country, and for the Church: men who in their individual spheres of action will be conspicuous both for right thinking and for right living, and who will be effective for the skillful promotion of Catholic Action under the direction of the hierarchy.
>
> The distinctive means conducive to the realization of this aim are: religious instruction faithfully and carefully imparted, and adapted to the age and maturity of our students; scholastic philosophy, which in conjunction with the principles of the Faith is to be applied to all the conditions and problems of modern life; our method of teaching the secular subjects, which aims not alone at imparting knowledge, but primarily at the complete formation and development of all the human powers; a personal interest in our students, so that . . . we strive to direct and assist our students by advice and encouragement.[3]

This statement, after discussing the Society's *finis operantis* or motive in conducting schools, and several immediate corollaries, says something very pertinent and authoritative about the *finis operis* or object of our schools themselves. For education is an ac-

[3] Cited from: *Teaching in Jesuit High Schools,* Jesuit Educational Association (New York, 1957), p. 1.

tivity, and as such it has a proper object; a man may exercise that activity for some more ultimate intention—to make money, for instance, or to aid the Church in her mission—but his intention must accord with the natural object of the activity that is education: otherwise he is not an educator. This Father General recognizes in presuming that we shall teach the "secular subjects," and teach them according to a method and an objective differing only in quality from the normal methodology and objectives of every educational process: we engage in the activity that is education employing "a method of teaching which aims not alone at imparting knowledge, but primarily at the complete formation and development of all the human powers."

The objective of the Jesuit school then, according to the authoritative statement of Father General, is the complete formation and development of all the human powers; it is towards this end that we teach religion, applied scholastic philosophy, and the "secular subjects" in an atmosphere of personal interest in our students; and in fulfilling this objective, the *finis operis* of the activity of education, we shall be furthering likewise our *finis operantis* or purpose in becoming educators.

The powers of man we are setting out to form and develop may be considered as three: theoretical (the senses and speculative intellect as ordered to scientific knowledge), tendential (the emotions and will as partial determinants of behavior), and practical (the senses and practical intellect as ordered to arts and skills). And our educational activities in consequence are threefold: we discipline, stimulate and inform the theoretical powers of the intellect; we point out proper goals and encourage suitable habits for the appetites; and we supply training in the use of methods to the practical intellect in such fundamental areas as grammar, mathematical and scientific methodology, and the expression of ideas.

THE ROLE OF THE SPEECH COURSE

It is in the last-mentioned area of "practical education"—the expression of ideas—that the contribution of the Speech course is to be found; for, like the "Writing" side of the English course, Speech teaches self-expression. As correct grammar is the foundation for intelligent writing, the mechanics of speech underlie effective speaking; as the study of English literature is intended,, among other things, to supply neophyte writers with models and standards for composition, the oral interpretation of literature has for one of its

functions the cultivation of acceptable canons of oral expression in the beginning speaker; and as exercise in the types of discourse and qualities of style tends to develop the correct, adult, effective, planned writer, exercise in the types and steps of Speech encourages the development of correct, adult, effective, planned speakers.[4]

The objective therefore of the Jesuit school is the formation and development of all the human powers; and Speech exists within the Jesuit school to develop the power of self-expression. It shares this function with the English course, from which it differs as speaking differs from writing.

It must be admitted, of course, that this difference is not a commonly recognized one among Jesuits, at least in the sense of recognizing the two as of equal importance. For, arguing from the premise that "Writing maketh an exact man" (Bacon) and ignoring its counterpart that "A speech is not an essay on its hind legs" (Emerson), Jesuit educators have until recently concentrated upon English at the expense of curricular Speech. Their reasoning seems to have been that self-expression is a univocal reality, that it is best taught and drilled in English class, that a good speech is an essay of one of the four types on its hind legs, and that Speech is so to speak the hind-quarters of expression, similar to typing or penmanship in being concerned only with producing or delivering the *communicandum.*

A pair of contrasting examples will best illustrate the basic difference between speaking and writing, and the consequent invalidity of our traditional attitudes towards Speech as a curricular course.

A student is running for presidency of his class. Since the heart of his campaign will be his speech at assembly, let us study him there. His task is to influence the school's behavior in the direction of voting for him. To do this, he must inform them favorably about himself, his personality and qualifications; he must argue for and against certain proposals convincingly; he must offer the students things they want, and assurance that he can achieve them more surely than his competitors. Other things being equal, his influence on the students' voting behavior will be in proportion to his proficiency in these areas. *This* is public speaking; and, though the student will progress to speaking situations more advanced than a high school election, ninety per cent of the communication he will employ will be oral, in situations more or less formal than this.[5]

---

[4] Cf. the titles of our *Writing* and *Speaking* series (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1958).

[5] *Speaking—A Teacher's Handbook,* p. 13.

What is writing? Let us take another example. A student is competing in an essay contest on the subject "Employ the Handicapped." He decides to proceed argumentatively from the thesis that on many jobs a handicapped person is more efficient. This he establishes by example, testimony, analysis, comparison, contrast, and statistics. In the composition he watches against flaws in grammar, choice of words, phrasing, paragraphing, and the qualities of style—unity, coherence, and emphasis.

Are the two activities the same? No, they differ in circumstances: though both are competing, one is directly struggling for votes on the basis of his personality, qualifications and desire with respect to future pragmatic success as a leader; the other is struggling for approval for the artifact he has produced. They differ in methods: the one must attempt in a "live" situation to project those aspects of his person and platform that are most influential and persuasive; the other strives to establish in the mind of someone he does not see the objective truth and appeal of a proposition. And they differ in purpose: the speaker's focus is upon influencing his audience, while the writer concentrates upon producing an *opus* that will be rated superior. This is the difference, in short: the writer as writer is a "fine art-ist" creating a work of art that will be admired, despite the fact that some forms of writing (correspondence, journalism, etc.) are basically pragmatic. But the speaker is a "practical artist" who creates an artifact which, though it may some day be considered literarily excellent, is intended to affect behavior.

What then is public speaking? As an activity it is the process of communicating facts, opinion, argumentation or motivation by word of mouth for influence. As an art, or intellectual habit productive of effective oral communication, it might be defined nominally as "the practical art of oral communication." And as a curricular subject it is the course wherein the practical art of oral communication is developed.

So far we have established the objective of the Jesuit high school, the communicative-arts aspect of that objective and the function of the Speech course as a training for a distinct and important practical (as distinguished from theoretical or tendential) activity. It remains to outline more specifically the objectives of the Speech course, which we will do by proceeding backwards through the terms of the definition given above.

A course in Public Speaking is first of all a course in *communication.* That is, like the "Writing" side of the English course, Speech

develops the student's ability to convey or express what he knows to others. In this it differs radically from what may be called "acquisition-courses"—history, mathematics, religion, and the like. For in these courses, students aim to acquire facts, the relationships between facts, and the reasons for doing things a certain way. This is not what is to be learned in writing or speaking courses: here the student rather learns how to convey to others the facts, relationships, reasons for things he has acquired somewhere else.

Secondly, the Speech course teaches *oral* communication. That is, for all its similarity to English Writing, another distinct type of communicative ability is fostered here. The speaker is still a communicator, but the circumstances and methods and object are all somewhat different and will affect the act. He must practice himself in the mechanics of Speech and in the basics of delivery, or he will not communicate well in the speaker's circumstances. And he must become proficient in the methods most appropriate to speech—the more general dynamics of speech which will guide him in interpreting and organizing words for effectiveness,[6] and in the application of these principles to the various types of oral-communication situations. He may well in his capacity as a communicator of information or argumentation employ one or more of the rhetorical methods of development common to all verbal communication; hence a well-taught writing-course will prove an asset to him as a speaker. But he will need to apply, alter, and augment these methods, or he will be ineffective as an oral communicator and fail in his object—communication for influence.

Finally, the Speech course is one in which a *practical art* is cultivated. An art, as we said, is a habit—that is, a modification of one's mental and physical powers like learning to pitch. It is composed of an acquired insight into the principles involved—e.g., the curve, the slider, stance, strategy—and of an acquired skill in the application of insight—as we speak of "green" and "experienced" pitchers. It is most efficiently acquired through pin-pointed instruction and extensive practice. And when acquired it results in a consistent production of (for a practical art) artifacts which work well—e.g., strikes, double-plays, "pop-ups." The Speech course being a course in developing the art of oral communication, some instruction will be given; but the major proportion of time will be used in preparing and practising speech-making.

What objective then should the Speech course have attained by

---

[6] Cf. *infra*, pp. 11-16.

semester's end if it is to contribute to the objective of the Jesuit high school? It should have achieved some "formation and development of all the human powers" which bear upon the art of oral communication. Specifically, it should have practised the student in the mechanics of speech—speaking loudly, clearly, with appropriate pace, pitch, and inflection—so that the message is easily audible. It should have schooled him in the basics of delivery—physical, facial, vocal expressiveness—so that the message is orally effective. It should have instructed and practised the student in harnessing by means of speech the "dynamics" of audience psychology, so that he knows how to secure attention for, interest in, and acceptance of his message. And it should have developed in him some ability to apply these principles in as many of the common communication-situations as possible—correct reading, oral interpretation, discussion, information-giving, argumentation, persuasion. Surely there should be no shortage of subject-matter in such a course, even though it be skills rather than facts, equations, declensions, or literary selections that are under study.

Would such an objective contribute anything to the purpose of our school or our motivation for being educators? Or would it be better to leave such matters to Carnegie and Associates, as being illiberal and uneducational?

In the first place, speech education is liberalizing and educational. The oral interpretation of literature educates the student literarily. The speeches that inform, prove, and motivate train him in organizing and expressing his knowledge. And the experience of speaking in public develops poise, self-confidence, and interest in others, all worthy ambitions of educational institutions.

Secondly, we cannot afford to ignore the social purposes of our schools, so insistently delineated by our Father General: we are supposed to be preparing "outstanding men for the family, for our country, and for the Church, men who in their individual spheres of action will be conspicuous both for right thinking and for right living, and who will be effective for the skilful promotion of Catholic Action under the direction of the hierarchy."

Education, from this point of view, is not intended to be a selfish cultivation of one's individual talents for their own sake. One does not learn languages, mathematics, natural science as the ancients did, simply to be a "liberally educated" man. Rather, he learns such things in order to become an effective apostle for Christ in the modern world. Now this is where communication courses, oral and writ-

ten, make a really significant contribution. For it is, from the social viewpoint, not enough merely to know facts, relations, and reasons; one must be able to communicate such things to others. And if ninety per cent of all communication is oral, then the contribution to the over-all social objective of our schools of the course that develops this art is nothing small or insignificant. In fact, a realization of the worth of such a contribution should give the teacher a genuine "sense of mission" towards his work in Speech. "In other courses," he will say to himself and his students, "we acquire facts, relationships, and reasons for things. Here we learn how to communicate our acquisitions to others. In proportion, not to our acquisitions, but to our communicable acquisitions, will be the fulness of our personality development, the degree of our sucess in the business or professional world, and the measure of our effectiveness as Christ-bearers in the modern world." Presuming a sense of balance and proportion, one can claim both a legitimate objective and an exalted contribution for our schools' courses in oral communication.

PEDAGOGICAL PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE SPEECH COURSE

On the supposition then that the prospective teacher of Speech sees a bit more clearly now what he should be aiming at in Speech class and why the course is offered, we turn to the second of his questions: by what methods should the objectives be approached?

In answering this question, we should recall that speech and speech-education have been the subject of discussion for thousands of years. Precepts on public speaking have been found in the tombs of Egypt; Corax the Sicilian Greek wrote an " Art of Rhetoric" in 400 B.C.; Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Augustine, the Jesuit fathers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, DeQuincey, Whately, Emerson, Eliot are among the distinguished authors of works on Speech objectives and methodology. Without attempting a detailed analysis of their statements on the subject, we would be wise to acquaint ourselves at least in general with their advice in regard to Speech methods. Furthermore, in the last thirty years a great deal of research has been invested in psychology, particularly in dynamic psychology, which deals with the awakening and channeling of human appetites. The applicable conclusions of these studies should likewise be heeded.

The following are, in the author's opinion, among the more sig-

nificant conclusions arrived at from ancient and modern studies on general Speech-teaching methodology.

1. Speech is the practical art of oral communication for influence. It is *not* therefore dramatics, nor elocution (artistic delivery), nor a course in English style, nor in research, nor in the organization of words to achieve mechanical responses. Speech has been taught as though it were one or another of these at different moments in history, and in different classrooms in this decade. But so to identify it is to distort Speech education from its obvious purpose of preparing effective oral communicators.

2. As Cicero taught, the five divisions which combine to form acceptable Speech education are these: *inventio,* or training in scholarly and creative speech-preparation; *dispositio,* or training in the effective logical-psychological arrangement of the speech, *elocutio,* or training in artistic literary expression of ideas; *memoria,* or training in so mastering one's development of his subject as to communicate it effectively; and *pronuntiatio,* or training in the effective delivery of one's message. Just as a Speech-course which over-emphasizes one of the elements listed above results in a distortion, a course which omits any of the latter divisions is to that extent incomplete.

3. In other words, a Speech course, to be an adequate preparation for oral communication for influence, must divide its time among mechanics, research, composition or style, speech psychology and logic, and delivery.

4. Because Speech is an art, the course which cultivates it must approach it as such. Art, as an intellectual productive habit, is developed by practice under direction; for without practice no habit can be acquired, and without direction the insight that distinguishes an intellectual habit from instinctive or mechanical activity is less likely to occur. There must consequently be instruction; but instruction must not encroach unduly upon the time necessary for practice.

5. Because Speech is communication, the psychological requisites for good communication must be inculcated. Among the more important of these are: that man's acts are the result of his appetites; that appetites are aroused either by objects or by phantasms of them; that neutralizing or repressive images must be reduced or replaced if there is to be action; and that the degree of the response is proportioned to the concreteness and psychological "proximity" of the object.

6. Because the art of speech is being learned, and learned in the face of adolescent (or perhaps simply human) fears and lack of

confidence, assignments must be graduated in difficulty, the easier aspects of the art taken first.

If these historically or scientifically established principles are followed, the common objection that speech ability is an endowment and cannot be taught should prove to be inaccurate.

Finally, there are several principles from general pedagogy which ought to be included with the directives enumerated above, because they are especially important in a course so commonly taken lightly as is Speech.

1. The teacher must insist upon a serious approach to the course. Students (like teachers) tend to identify education with "acquisition-courses," and homework with written work. Hence, to counterbalance the circumstance that a skill is being learned and an oral medium employed, the class must absorb from its teacher a "sense of mission," a seriousness of purpose regarding Speech. Christian education is self-development for Christian social influence; Speech is eminently self-developing and potentially of great influence. It need not be apologized for. This might be termed ultimate motivation for the course.

2. The teacher should be enthusiastic about and "sell" Speech in terms of present and future profit. Have facts, and use them, that show how important speech and social skills are—people that pay for them (e.g., to Carnegie), people who are better for having them (school, civic, national leaders), people who are worse for lacking them. This is proximate motivation.

3. The teacher should work hard at the course, and make his class work even harder. The pace of the class should be fast as it moves from step to step and from unit to unit. A detailed plan should be followed closely, with a heavy penalty for lack of preparation or for any form of disorder. The student above all must feel that he simply cannot miss an assignment—there are too few and the sanctions too severe. This is immediate motivation, and is indispensable.

5. But the teacher must, for all his speed, enthusiasm, and earnestness, retain a sense of humor, an adaptability, and a fund of patience. He will have to allow—in all firmness—for individual difficulties, and must remember that his students are learning something quite new for the most part. Their first book reports were not too brilliant either, although no one had to *listen* to them!

5. The one thing that the teacher must raise his voice about (assuming student-preparation and behavior) is the abominably disruptive practice of "going through the motions," i.e., of half-hearted prepara-

tion and delivery. It ruins the spirit of the class, makes Speech-teaching unbearably dull, and utterly wastes two or three valuable and expensive minutes wherever it occurs.

Such are the general methods by which the objectives of the Speech course should be implemented. It is hoped that they make the temporarily unavoidable task of adaptation easier and more satisfying.

News from the Field

REGIS HIGH SCHOOL, NEW YORK CITY received a real pat on the back in the announcement from Dr. Hans Rosenhaupt, National Director of the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Foundation, that graduates of Regis had won 27 Woodrow Wilson Fellowships since the inception of the awards in 1958. The Fellowships cannot be applied for but are nominated by a college professor and are judged by regional committees. Secondly Fellowships are awarded on a regional basis so that no area can get more awards than another area.

Twenty-four schools are listed in the announcement as outstanding schools as indicated by their graduates. Regis, with its 27 Fellowships, on a per capita basis of the number of its graduates, is not only top school in the New York State area but is also one of the top schools in the national scene.

The Classics Today: A Relic or a Tradition?

GILBERT G. FRENCH, S.J.

For too long now, the classics have been in the general disreputable state they presently face in today's high schools and liberal arts colleges. They have slowly disintegrated into a mere formality tagged as a "tradition we must have faith in." The number of students taking the courses in the universities across the nation has today diminished to a mere handful, barely enough to keep the classics departments alive. And as a result of this commonly known fact, the students of the United States, in seeing the present sham under which the classics now suffocate have come to look upon them with a scornful and fun-filled smirk. This, then, is the classics today.

Of course, there are many reasons for the difficulties that this body of knowledge now faces. And naturally, it is entirely beyond the scope of this article to discuss the problem as a whole. Rather, it will deal with one theory and one possible source of this dilemma, namely, that the root of the problem lies in the high schools of America and not in the universities. It lies in an incorrect conception of the classics by the majority of high school teachers themselves, and thus in a poor presentation of classical subjects. And if this is what has happened in the secondary classrooms, it seems only natural that the classics have degenerated in the colleges. For what student would volunteer to torture himself for one or two or three more years of agony by enrolling in them in a university, when his high school background makes it totally impossible for him to gain any profit by these studies even from the best of college professors.

Now this all is very general and as yet rests as more of an accusation than as a well-developed theory. Therefore, it shall be developed.

One common problem that arises is one presented by Father George E. Ganss, S.J., in his book, *St. Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University*. In this work part of the discussion centers around the gradual uselessness or lack of practicality that has enveloped the classics during their evolution from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century, resulting partly from the growth of the various romance languages in Europe, which completely replace any usefulness that Latin once had. As a result, Father Ganss believes (and this present author agrees with him) that a *purely practical-minded* student loses

much of the motivation he formerly had, since now he lacks a *use* for the language (for example, to make money). Father Ganss continues by saying that, with a practical motive given to a study as well as a liberalizing one, a practical student will naturally tend to pursue that study with an increased vigor. And this seems reasonable and logical.

But perhaps here enters the true villain, the misconception that plagues the teachers of the classics today. The high schools (and universities) of America are faced with a stampede of practical-minded, utilitarian students who constantly want a *use* for all they learn. And understandably so. They simply find it difficult to accept a "useless" liberal education. And to these practical-minded students of today, the high school teachers are concerned with only the old cliché answers to the question, "Why must I study Latin," if any answer is made at all. The retort is inevitably that we study Latin because it is a mind-trainer or because it is part of our tradition or because it has an historical or sociological importance. In other words, the answers all tend toward reasons that are utilitarian. And as Father Ganss has pointed out so well, the days of utilitarian Latin are over—they are dead and gone and most likely will never more return. And thus Latin remains only *liberal* in its benefits to mankind.

Perhaps if the classics teachers of today, as a whole rather than just as a few sparse individuals, would themselves begin to take on the liberal viewpoint toward education and then strive to indoctrinate their students in the necessities and values of a liberal (as well as useful) education, perhaps then the problem of providing reasons as to "Why I must take Latin" would be partly answered. The other part, it would seem, would be then to present a strong case as to the value of the classics, in fact, their utter necessity, in a full liberal arts education. The classics are to literature as Bach is to music. Neither have the least utilitarian value in life, that is, neither help a man bring home the bread and butter. No professional musician would ever be what he is without having studied the drawing room music of the old classic master. In other words, no utilitarian answer can be given to the student's simple question, for, if it is, it is given in vain.

Indeed, perhaps one of the basic difficulties stems from the very classics teachers themselves—perhaps not enough of them have a liberal viewpoint of education. And if they do not, then how can the study of a purely liberal subject, such as the classics, possibly sur-

vive? No, one of the difficulties is not so much, "Why must I study Latin?" It is, rather, "Why must I study subjects that won't help me take home the bread and butter?"

Now all this seems rather pat and dry—an obvious solution to a simply stated problem. But may I repeat, simply *stated.* What has been said above is only part of the present difficulty. Another important matter to discuss is the actual teaching *method* by which the classics are today being conveyed. For, I maintain, even if instructors did succeed in giving their students a liberal as well as useful view of life, still, the classics, as they are taught today, would do no such thing. In fact, they are doing no such thing. As taught today, the classics have no part whatsoever in even the most liberally minded high school and colleges of today, for they do not contribute toward a liberal education.

(Lest I stand chastised, may I here make a most appropriate distinction? What is meant when I say that the classics do no such thing as contribute toward a liberal education? Do I mean that the classics *in their very essence* are incapable of doing this, and thus have no rightful place in the liberal arts section of any educational system? No, I do not mean that. Any person who has gone beyond a mere tactile encounter with them and has intellectually struggled with them for any period of time would not say that the classics are valueless in themselves. Rather, I mean that the classics, *as they are taught today,* do no such thing as contribute toward the end of a liberal arts education. Let us join battle once again. . . .)

True enough, the method of teaching languages via the memorization of extensive lists of vocabulary and grammar rules, the technique by which the classics are most frequently taught today, is now proven not as efficient as newer methods of learning languages. Not only is this method less successful in the twentieth century than it was in the sixteenth (since nowadays a student uses this method for only four years, in contrast to the twelve years that a normal sixteenth century student would encounter it), but also students are very likely to rebel against it when they behold the newer methods employed in the modern language classrooms next door. They detest the system that has existed since time immemorial (so it seems): memorize vocabulary, memorize grammar, and repeat until it is part of you. They behold this; they behold the classroom next door; and they say, "Humbug! Ha! Why take Latin? Give me French any day!"

However, I think this point is minor. A more serious source of

method problems lies in the line-up of classics courses themselves. A sophomore in high school with a text of Caesar or Cicero is like the second year piano student with Bach's *Well-Tempered Clavicord:* the student simply lacks the ability to cope with his subject. Even after receiving his running vocabulary (the size of a medium paperback book), the hopeless maze of the Latin word order is still as difficult as ever. And even if after a number of years a student does learn to unjumble the order, he still must rely upon the use of a running vocabulary. The student just simply does not know enough about the words, their connotations, their meanings, and usages to develop any sense of beauty about them.

It seems a bit ironic that matters such as these are not second nature to a student after four years of studying them in high school. But upon reflection, as things stand today, there is nothing ironic about it at all. Just as the student of piano does not study Bach until much time has passed, so the student of the classics does not study Caesar and Cicero until many days have gone by. If the classics were taught with a "bit" more thought for a gradual progressing of the student, perhaps there would then be results. If he could learn Latin piecemeal, a part at a time, with a progression of material *from* easy *to* difficult (and Caesar rates "difficult"), perhaps then results would be seen; perhaps then the high-schooler-turned-senior could take the *Aeneid* and actually find it a liberalizing, aesthetical, and beautiful experience; maybe then he would follow through in our universities with further classical studies and therein pursue that Caesar and Cicero that were rightfully passed by in high school.

Perhaps then we would have classics students within the walls of our universities. Perhaps then we would see a long-needed renaissance. Perhaps then this would happen because at last the classics are able to offer their own unique, liberalizing, aesthetical, and literary part in a liberal education.

And yet, despite the abundant discussion of method in the United States today, and despite the abundant discussion of method within this very article, nonetheless I agree with Father George Ganss and with two instructors of Latin in one of our mid-western Jesuit high schools that method is not the root of the problem. As Father Ganss said in an informal discussion with a group of Jesuit College students almost all of the thought concerning the reformation of Latin today revolves around the question, "How shall we reform the method of teaching Latin?" Whereas Father firmly believes that, though this discussion is necessary and that without it Latin will never

reform, yet there exist more crucial, basic, important questions that are at the present time being forgotten, such as, "What is the objective of teaching Latin to today's high school students," "What motivation can be given to students to study the classics today," and, "How can a purely liberal subject be presented to the utilitarian mind?" By discussing method but at the same time avoiding these even more elementary questions, we are merely polishing the outside of a shiny, red McIntosh apple—that is rotting inside. Rather, here lies the crux of the problem, in such essential questions as these, and in such simple questions as, "*Why* must I study Latin," and, "Why must I study subjects that won't help me bring home the bread and butter?" Here lies the crux of the problem. And unfortunately, to this day, such pertinent questions are not being discussed. And thus the apple still remains ever rotting.

And so, in conclusion, may I continue along the path made by Father Ganss in his book, *St. Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University.* Though he admits that he does not have a solution to this now critical problem, though I too admit that I do not have a solution, may neither of us be said to be against Latin, and then have the matter dismissed as simply as that. Rather, I join with Father Ganss and say, "As Latin stands today, let us bury it—and the sooner the better." But we are quick to continue on, "Let us bury the Latin of today, but let us begin our search for a better Latin of tomorrow. May someone search more successfully than we."

May I join with Father Ganss and a handful of other alert and well-meaning (not to say, brave) people and take the initiative of bringing this problem out into the open, of laying the cards on the table, and of asking our classics enthusiasts and instructors to behold this problem squarely and realistically, to see the situation their courses are in, to shake the classics from their moldering roosts, and to encourage their promoters to begin *now* to retaliate and to save their subject, while there is still time, while Latin and Greek are still a tradition, while there are still enough who believe that they have a unique and intrinsic value of their own. For if reform is not done soon, within the next few generations the multitude of disparagers will conquer, will convert the faithful, those rational creatures who dangle only on a thin thread of faith in the classics which they now can only "adore but cannot fathom," and will win them over into their camp of scorn. And then the cry of "Teacher, enthusiast, and lover of the classics, *re*form the classics and save them" will have changed into a resounding and revengeful shout of "*Con-*

form yourselves to the overwhelming majority and forsake your submerging ship. We have tired of wasting our time with you, and we shall waste it no more—let us get on with it." And, sad to say, it seems most likely that in another generation or two that day of reckoning may be at hand.

The classics of Greece and Rome are part of our tradition yet. But will they be so for long? Igor Stravinsky in his book *Poetics of Music* has said the following about tradition:

> . . . A real tradition is not the relic of a past irretrievably gone; it is a living force that animates and informs the present . . . Far from implying the repetition of what has been, tradition presupposes the reality of what endures. It appears as an heirloom, a heritage that one receives on condition of making it bear fruit before passing it on to one's descendants.

The classics are yet a tradition, but are so less and less. The decendants of this present generation are more and more not bearing fruits of this tradition, thus making impossible the task of passing this tradition on to their future descendants. May this author unite with Father Ganss and his associates-in-spirit by encouraging all the classics teachers who are dedicated to their profession, all professors and deans who believe in the curriculum they have made, and all students who have been fortunate enough to encounter the classics as a liberal and aesthetical experience and who are inspired to save this beauty which they love, to rise up, to hold on to, and to fight for the beauty and culture which the classics *do* have. May they do so before this well-loved tradition becomes a tradition no more but only a relic of the past.

News from the Field

A SURVEY OF SCIENCE education in Jesuit colleges and universities was published in the Bulletin of the American Association of Jesuit Scientists, June, 1963. Copies of this are available for a cost of $1.00 from the Editor, Bulletin of the American Association of Jesuit Scientists, Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md. 21163. This ninety page report gives a list of faculty and their research interests, current research, available research equipment, special programs, available financial assistance and numbers of undergraduate and graduate students for the science departments of each of the twenty-eight Jesuit colleges and universities in this country. To those who place orders for the above publication, a limited number of copies of a survey of pre-engineering and engineering education in Jesuit colleges and universities and a survey of doctorates in the natural sciences in American theologates are available *gratis*.

GONZAGA UNIVERSITY celebrated "Moving Day" on March 14th when they moved into their new Faculty Residence. It was the first time in the 77 years of the University's existence that the faculty could say they had a home of their own. The three story reinforced concrete building includes living accommodations for 75. The chapel, in an attached building, has facilities for 14 side chapels. The interior of the building is furnished in antique Spanish and Mexican Modern.

The interesting story about the new Faculty Residence is that it was almost entirely financed as a result of an Alumni drive. The total cost will probably be about $920,000.00.

SPRING HILL COLLEGE is well under way in the construction of its Student Center. The $800,000 building will be a two-story, air conditioned structure. The structure will be ready for the September 1964 session.

MANDARIN, PLEASE! The sounds of Mandarin Chinese will soon be sounding through the halls of ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY HIGH. This high school is one of the three in the St. Louis area to be chosen by a committee from Washington University as a pilot school in the teaching of a two year course in the Chinese language.

The project will be financed by the Carnegie Foundation. Funds will be available for the hiring of a teacher, for books, and other teaching materials. St. Louis University High will select applicants from the sophomore and junior honor courses.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY has awarded contracts for over $500,-000.00 for the construction of a new Chemistry building. The new Chemistry building is the last of three buildings to be erected for the University's new Science-Engineering complex in the recently purchased Mill Creek Valley campus addition. The structure will be divided into three wings, all with one level below ground. A lobby entrance to be constructed will lead to underground lecture halls designed to serve all three buildings of the complex: the Institute for Technology, the Physics building, and the Chemistry building.

A group of friends of GONZAGA UNIVERSITY are purchasing a 23 room mansion and a ten acre site as the spot for the new Retreat House for the students of Gonzaga. The house is ideally situated in that it is close to Spokane and yet secluded enough to furnish the privacy necessary for a retreat house.

Construction is well under way on the new $2 million infirmary and faculty Residence for HOLY CROSS COLLEGE. The building will consist of a five story residence section and a three story wing. Accommodations will be provided for 72 faculty members. The infirmary section will provide out patient clinic facilities and bed facilities for some 30 patients. Physio-therapy, X-Ray, and other rooms are also provided.

Friends of LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES are contributing $100,000.00 for a moot court and auditorium to be named in honor of the late President, John F. Kennedy. The court and auditorium will be part of the new School of Law which is about to be constructed. The new building will provide for 550 students.

The Institute of Technology of ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY is the recipient of $100,000.00 which will be used as an endowment for scholarships for the Institute. The bequest is from the estate of Mr. Victor W. Bergenthal, a former member of the University's Board of Directors.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

Index to Volume XXVI

June 1963 to March 1964