REPORT

OF THE

SECOND ANNUAL CONFERENCE

OF

THE ASSOCIATION OF CATHOLIC COLLEGES OF THE UNITED STATES,

HELD IN ST. JAMES' HALL, CHICAGO,

APRIL 18 AND 19, 1900.

WASHINGTON, D. C.
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY PRESS.
1900.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION,

1900-1901.

President: Rt. Rev. Mgr. Thomas J. Conaty, D. D.,
Rector, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

STANDING COMMITTEE.

Rt. Rev. Mgr. Conaty, *ex-officio*, Chairman.

Rev. John A. Conway, S. J.,
Gonzaga College, Washington, D. C., Secretary.

V. Rev. P. Vincent Huber, O. S. B.,
President, St. Bede College, Peru, Ill.

V. Rev. William L. O'Hara, A. M.,
President, Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmittsburg, Md.

Rev. James French, C. S. C.,
Vice-President, Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, Ind.

Rev. L. A. Delurey, O. S. A.,
President, Villanova College, Pa.

Communications may be addressed to the President, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Conaty, D. D., Washington, D. C.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

ASSOCIATION OF CATHOLIC COLLEGES

OF THE

UNITED STATES.

The Second Conference of representatives of the Catholic Colleges of the United States was held in Chicago, Ill., April 18 and 19, 1900. Fifty-two delegates, representing seventy-two colleges, attended. The program of work was as follows:

PROGRAM OF CONFERENCE.

Wednesday, April 18, 1900.

9.30 a. m. Mass, St. James' Church.

10.30 a. m. Conference, in St. James' School Hall.

Discussion: Uniformity of Entrance into Freshman Class.

Paper by Rev. L. A. Delurey, O. S. A., Villanova College.

11.30 a. m. Discussion: The Relative Merits of Courses in Catholic and Non-Catholic Colleges for the Baccalaureate.

Paper by Rev. Timothy Brosnahan, S. J., Woodstock College.

1.00 p. m. Luncheon.

2.30 p. m. Discussion: The Elective System of Studies.
Paper by Rev. James A. Burns, C. S. C., Notre Dame University.

8.00 p. m. In School Hall. Address of President, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Conaty: Plea for the Teacher.

Thursday, April 19, 1900.

10.00 a. m. In School Hall. Discussion: Religious Instruction in College.
Paper by Very Rev. Patrick S. McHale, C. M., Niagara University.

11.00 a. m. Discussion: The Teaching of Modern Languages in College.
Paper by Rev. John P. Carroll, D. D., St. Joseph's College, Dubuque, Iowa.

1.00 p. m. Luncheon.

2.30 p. m. Discussion: Development of Character in College Students.
Paper by Rev. M. P. Dowling, S. J., Creighton University, Omaha.

3.30 p. m. Business Meeting. Articles of Association. Election of Officers.

8.00 p. m. Public Meeting in School Hall. Addresses.

On Wednesday, April 18, at 9.30 A. M., the delegates assembled in St. James' Church, Chicago, to assist at the Mass of the Holy Ghost, which was celebrated by the Very Rev. Wm. L. O'Hara, A. M., President of Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmittsburg, Md. Immediately after Mass the regular sessions of the Conference began in the school hall adjoining the church.

FIRST SESSION.

At 10.30 A. M. the Conference was called to order by the President, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Thomas J. Conaty, D. D., Rector of the Catholic University, and, after prayer, the Very Rev. Vincent Huber, O. S. B., Rector of St. Bede College, Peru, Ill., and the Rev. Francis Cassilly, S. J., Vice-President of St. Ignatius College, Chicago, Ill., were appointed secretaries.

The Rt. Rev. Chairman announced that in the discussions of the various subjects each speaker would be limited to five minutes. He then announced that the formal address of the President had been fixed for the evening session, so that it might not interfere with the discussion of the papers called for by the program. The Conference then sent the following cablegram to His Holiness Leo XIII. :

> The representatives of Catholic Colleges assembled in second annual Conference offer to the Holy Father the homage of their profound veneration. They pray God to preserve him for many years, and they humbly ask his Apostolic Benediction.
>
> MONSIGNOR CONATY, *President.*

The following delegates were present:

Rev. Germain Ball, O. S. B., St. Vincent's College, Beatty, Pa.

Rev. Benedict Boebner, C. PP. S., St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Ind.

Rev. Timothy Brosnahan, S. J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.

Rev. James A. Burns, C. S. C., Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, Ind.

Rev. Alexander J. Burrowes, S. J., Detroit College, Detroit, Mich.

Rev. Joseph Butler, O. F. M., St. Bonaventure's College, Allegheny, N. Y.

Rev. P. V. Byrne, C. M., St. Vincent's College, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. E. L. Carey, C. M., St. John's College, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rev. John P. Carroll, D. D., St. Joseph's College, Dubuque, Iowa.

Rev. Francis Cassilly, S. J., St. Ignatius' College, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. John Cavanaugh, C. S. C., Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, Ind.

Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, D. D., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

Rev. John A. Conway, S. J., Gonzaga College, Washington, D. C.

Rev. J. J. Cregan, C. S. V., St. Viateur's College, Bourbonnais Grove, Ill.

Rev. Daniel Cushing, C. S. B., Assumption College, Sandwich, Ontario.

Rev. Laurence A. Delurey, O. S. A., Villanova College, Villanova, Pa.

Rev. Bruno Doerfler, O. S. B., St. John's College, Collegeville, Minn.

Rev. John F. Dolphin, St. Thomas College. St. Paul, Minn.

Rev. M. P. Dowling, S. J., Creighton University, Omaha, Neb.

Rev. Charles Eichner, S. M., of Paris, St. Mary's Institute, Dayton, Ohio.

Rev. Frowin Epper, O. S. B., St. Joseph's College, Mt. Angel, Ore

Rev. James P. Fagan, S. J., Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

Bro. Fidelis, O. S. F., St. Francis College, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rev. Leo Gariador, O. S. B , Sacred Heart College, Oklahoma.

Rev. Luke A. Grace, C. M., Niagara University, Niagara, N. Y.

Rev. David W. Hearn, S. J., St. Francis Xavier College, New York.

Rev. M. A. Hehir, C. S. Sp., Pittsburg College of the Holy Ghost, Pittsburg, Pa.

Rev. Francis Heiermann, S. J., St. Ignatius College, Cleveland, Ohio.

Rev. Edward A. Higgins, S. J., St. Ignatius College, San Francisco, Cal.

Rev. Vincent Huber, O. S. B., St. Bede College, Peru, Ill.

Rev. Joseph Joos, O. S. B., Sacred Heart College, Oklahoma.

Rev. Michael V. Kelly, Assumption College, Sandwich, Ont.

Rev. John Kosinski, C. R., St. Stanislaus College, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Nicholas Leonard, O. F. M., St. Francis College, Quincy, Ill.

Rev. M. J. Lochemes, Pio Nono College, St. Francis, Wis.

Rev. Anthony A. Malloy, C. M., St. Vincent College, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Henry Maniett, St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa.

Rev. James McCabe, S. J., St. Mary's College, St. Mary's, Kans.

Rev. Francis McDonald, O. S. B., St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kans.

Rev. Patrick McHale, C. M., Niagara University, Niagara, N. Y.

Rev. Michael O'Connor, S. J., St. Xavier's College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Rev. William L. O'Hara, Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md.

Rev. Aloysius Pfeil, S. J., Canisius College, Buffalo, N. Y.

Rev. John N. Poland, S. J., St. Xavier's College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Rev. John F. Quirk, S. J , Boston College, Boston, Mass.

Rev. E. L. Rivard, C. S. V., St. Viateur's College, Bourbonnais Grove, Ill.

Rev. Nicholas Roche, C. S. B., St. Michael's College, Toronto, Canada.

Rev. W. Banks Rogers, S. J., Marquette College, Milwaukee, Wis.

Rev. Michael J. Ryan, S. J., Marquette College, Milwaukee, Wis.

Rev. C. B. Schrantz, S. S., St. Charles College, Ellicott City, Md.

Rev. J. Selinger, D. D., St. Francis de Sales Seminary, Milwaukee, Wis.

Rev. Andrew Spetz, C. R., St. Mary's College, St. Mary's, Ky.

Rev. J. J. Sullivan, C. M., St. John's College, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rev. Antonine Wilmer, O. M. Cap., St. Lawrence College, Mt. Calvary, Wis.

Rev. Cyril Zenisek, O. S. B., St. Procopius College, Chicago, Ill.

The following colleges were also represented by delegates already mentioned in above list:

Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass., by Jesuit Fathers.

Loyola College, Baltimore, Md., by Jesuit Fathers

Sacred Heart College, Watertown, Wis., by Rev. J. Cavanaugh, C. S. C.

St. Leo College, St. Leo, Fla., by Rev. Vincent Huber, O. S. B.

St. John's College, Fordham, N. Y., by Jesuit Fathers.

St. Peter's College, Jersey City, N. J., by Jesuit Fathers.

St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., by Jesuit Fathers.

Santa Clara College, Santa Clara, Cal., by Jesuit Fathers.

St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Pa., by Jesuit Fathers.

The Rt. Rev. Chairman then addressed the Conference as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONFERENCE:

As the regular address of the presiding officer will be given this evening, I have but a word to say at the opening of the Conference.

We meet to-day for our Second Annual Conference. By your kindness I am again honored in being chosen to preside over your deliberations. The initial Conference of a year ago proved to us the advantage of frequent reunions of college representatives, in order to know one another and unify our educational system, to discuss college needs and to suggest such aids to the betterment of collegiate conditions as, in the judgment of the Conference, might be deemed beneficial or expedient. Our Conferences at best can be but suggestive, acting as an advisory board, studying in a special manner, it is true, important questions, reaching indeed certain conclusions which can become

binding on no college until it shall have agreed in its faculties to accept them.

Representing many different systems of colleges, each with its own well-defined plan of instruction, and each independent of the other, we stand, however, together in the unity of brotherhood as Catholic educators, working earnestly and unitedly toward one end, the glory of God and the upbuilding of our people in the truth of Christ as the warp and woof of all knowledge. We have no differences of opinion as to the fundamental truths of education. We are the servants of the great teaching Church of Christ, and from her we have received our commission to go forth and teach. The illustrious Pontiff Leo XIII, who so gloriously rules the Church of God, is our leader, and to him we look for guidance. There are no uncertainties as to our doctrine, there is no mistiness as to our principles of life, thought or conduct. We are not afraid to assert that Christ is the light and the life of our educational system, and the Church of Christ is our teacher. The science of education on which we build our work is the science which has a Christian psychology, in which an immortal soul is recognized, and a Christian moral philosophy in which God appears as the source and strength of all human conduct. Our pedagogy is that which finds its source in Christianity, the great teacher, and which leads to the harmonizing of all parts of our nature for the complete development of man, leaving nothing to chance. In one word, our pedagogy is that which enables us to establish the kingdom of God in the minds and hearts of men. Religion and Science, God and Nature, are to us but two expressions of the one truth. Religion revealed and Science hidden under the folds of nature are two voices speaking the glory of the one God and calling men to His service.

Christian education, brother delegates, bids us gather to consider how we may best utilize methods so as to work out the problems of life as they come to us in collegiate work. I welcome you to this second Conference, and with you I thank God that our efforts of a year ago have made us realize that our college interests may be subserved by our deliberations. As brethren we face the work of this Conference, and in the name of Him whom we love to serve we enter upon our duties.

The Secretary was directed to read the following letters:

CHICAGO, ILL., April 17, 1900.

Rt. Rev. Mgr. CONATY.

RIGHT REV. AND DEAR MONSIGNOR: I must ask you to excuse me this time from attending your Conference. I hope it will be in every way a great success.

Yours truly,

(Signed) P. A. FEEHAN,
Abp. of Chicago.

APOSTOLIC DELEGATION, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
WASHINGTON, D. C., April 12, 1900.

Rt. Rev. THOMAS J. CONATY, D. D.,
President of the Conference of Catholic Colleges.

RT. REV. DEAR SIR: I have received your invitation to assist at the Second Annual Convention of Catholic Colleges, to be held next week in Chicago. The pressure of business prevents me from leaving the city for any length of time just at present, and I am therefore obliged to beg you to excuse me from being present at the meeting of the Convention. I am not, however, prevented from being with you and the other delegates in spirit, nor from participating, by sympathy, in your deliberations and work. As I wrote you last year, I appreciate most highly the purpose of this movement and the importance of its success. I am gratified that the meeting of last year made such an excel-

lent beginning. Three things seem to me to have been clearly demonstrated by that gathering: First, the necessity for united effort for the good of Catholic higher education; secondly, that Catholic educators are aware of and appreciate that necessity; and thirdly, that, with truly apostolic zeal and charity, they are sincerely determined to meet and satisfy that necessity.

May God bless that zeal and charity; may He illumine all your deliberations; may He strengthen all your efforts; and may He crown them with abundant fruits in the greater and more perfect development of Catholic education, to His honor and glory, and to the honor and glory of His holy religion.

Thanking you, and through you all the members of the Conference, for your kind invitation, I remain, with sentiments of highest esteem and fraternal charity,

Most faithfully yours in Christ,

(Signed) SEBASTIAN, Abp. of Ephesus,
Apostolic Delegate.

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE,
BALTIMORE, MD., *April* 11, 1900.

RT. REV. DEAR FRIEND: I learn with much satisfaction that the next annual Conference of Catholic Colleges will take place in Chicago in a few days. I assure you that there are few events affecting Catholic interests which have given me more genuine delight, or that have inspired me with more hope for the Church's future educational progress in the United States than the inauguration of these annual meetings of the heads of our colleges.

They eloquently impress on the public that our Catholic educators are actuated by a solidarity of interests, that they look with sympathy and benevolence on the work which is accomplished by other Catholic colleges as well as their own; that they are laboring as a band of brothers in the same sublime cause of Christian education, and are uniting their efforts in making Christ and His mission on earth better known and more loved among the citizens of our common country.

It is difficult to overestimate the advantages resulting from these conferences. Each representative will bring the wealth of

his individual experience to increase the general fund of knowledge. Instead of working apart, and without concerted action, you will cheer and encourage one another, and by your united efforts will broaden the field of education. It behooves the soldiers of Christ to fight with serried ranks when they are confronted by a common foe, and their victory is assured.

I am delighted, Monsignor, with the success of your efforts. By your tact and large-minded zeal you have contributed in no small measure to strengthen the bonds of fellowship and brotherhood among your learned colleagues.

I trust that your next conference will fully realize your most sanguine anticipations. Believe me, Monsignor,

Your faithful friend in Christ,

(Signed) J. CARD. GIBBONS.

Rt. Rev. Mgr. CONATY,
Rector Catholic University.

The Conference proceeded to its proposed work, and Rev. L. A. Delurey, O. S. A., of Villanova College, read the first paper. His subject was:

Uniformity of Conditions for Entrance into Freshman Class.

Man is the wonder of the world. He is its greatest power and its deepest mystery. His study presents the most important theme for the exercise of the intellect. The vast diversity in the degrees of mental ability is a most perplexing problem. The last quarter of the century will be known as a period of remarkable progress in education. Many intricate problems have arisen and only few have been solved. Hence, the dawn of the twentieth century will find many questions awaiting solution. "Uniformity of Entrance into Freshman Class" to be discussed here today and not,

I fear, to be settled, has become a national question and will therefore occupy a place, and a prominent one, among the unsolved questions. In my mind, there is no question as to the advisability of this uniformity. The production of the highest type of man should be the aim, the object of all reforms, of all education and of necessity of all religion. This means the perfection of man and all will admit the logic of unity for strength and perfection. Our colleges are not looking for the purposes of education which are well understood, and are as clear as the bright noonday sun. With us the question is how to impart our instruction to produce the best results.

For success we make every endeavor to have conditions suit the results we have in view. It is, therefore, the goal that sets the work; the end in view that marks the pace, that controls the course that must determine the efforts of the aspirants. The final result, which mainly is to be kept in view, must be the directing matter in all trials of whatsoever kind; in all fields of intellectual skill or craft for entrance and promotion of the aspirants thereto.

Instances of such carefully studied dictation of ways and means are apparent in all manuals of instruction in the different fields of human activity, in the navy and the army; in the trades-work and art; in the pulpit; at the bar. With this rule in view in my discussion of the question in hand, I lay down as preliminary ground for my paper this truism—that the final aim of all college training, call it education, call it instruction, is fitness to enter or start upon a University course, that is the most inspiring goal of all intellectual effort. The University is to fit the man for life and the college is to fit the man for the University.

Entrance into college marks a new era in a young man's life. Why not agree and arrange that all will begin at the same point? Why not have the one entrance for all?

If we are conferring for anything it is for strength. The cry that is heard at every awakening is organization. We cannot escape it, and an organization such as will assist us in producing lasting results we do not wish to escape. We must aim at unity that will form for us a phalanx which will withstand the attacks from all sides. Union has ever meant force and power, and today it is more in evidence than ever before. We must not consider beneath our notice and unworthy of imitation the action of every intelligent and progressive man. Every tradesman or mechanic today, aiming at success, affiliates himself to an organization composed of his fellow-mechanics. These organizations, in turn, to achieve success and to operate for the benefit of their members place certain conditions which the candidate for membership must fulfil before he will be admitted. The candidate must be sufficiently skilled before he will be accepted. Accordingly why should not colleges have a uniformity of conditions for entrance into their courses? The sooner this is realized the better.

The freshman is an aspirant for a degree which will admit him into a university for the study of a profession. He has four years of work before him and he is to be turned out equal at least in mental equipment with his companions, having acquired that mental development which men of knowledge and experience are capable of producing. Thus the freshman will, at the end of his college course, be prepared for university work; the survey of all the varied and distinctly marked fields of human energy, the supplying of the

student with power for some distinctive career in life. Hence, having determined what the student must have at the end of his collegiate course it should be an easy matter to state what he must have at the beginning, and it should follow logically that that should be the same for all. All in college must follow practically the same routine of study ; must use the same manuals and instruments of instruction. All, therefore, I believe, should take the same examinations for entrance into the freshman class.

To secure this uniformity, the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools and the Commission of Colleges of New England have been formed. Progress has been made in adopting uniformity of requirements in Latin, Greek, English and modern languages. In discussing this question we must not lose sight of the value of classic studies, the most powerful source of thoroughness. Because without these no one will dare lay claim to scholarship. Hence, then in the candidate for freshman class ought to be found a good working knowledge of Latin, Greek, general history, geography, mathematics, and physics. You will understand that I mean no simple elementary grasp of the principles that underlie these most charming branches of human lore. The knowledge must be such as will enable the aspirant to think and to do for himself.

This uniformity must embrace unity of length of course, about which there is not much dispute or divergence of opinion, and unity of requirements for entrance and degrees. Regarding the latter there certainly exists at present a remarkable want of uniformity of conditions for entrance into Catholic colleges. This may be seen by reading their catalogues. Now, to bring all the colleges into line and to have them

adopt uniform entrance requirements will be a difficult task. But as it appears to be a necessity it is worthy of every effort, and will be obtained only by concerted action. Many colleges will be obliged to abandon and sacrifice cherished traditions in adopting a new curriculum, but all will be for the common and greater good, for which sacrifices ought to be made and willingly. Such a change will require time and cannot be done so well at any point of the course as at the beginning. Hence, the advisability of uniformity of conditions for entrance into the freshman class. All college graduates should be prepared to enter upon the study of any profession at any one of our many universities. Now, the universities deserving the name have a prescribed standard which must be reached, and how will this be done if the college does not make a like demand! The college prepares the student for any course in life. The university designates his special career. It is advisable, because many finding it necessary to pursue their studies at colleges other than those for which their preparation was originally arranged, are obliged either to lose much time by needless repetition in certain studies or are retarded by not having sufficient preparation in some branches which the selected college may demand. These difficulties can be avoided by having a uniform examination for entrance into all Catholic colleges.

We have the one idea complete—liberal education; why not uniformity of beginning?

The benefits that will follow this uniformity, if adopted, will be many and far exceed any disadvantages that may seem to accompany it. First, this uniformity will serve to dispel the idea entertained by so many that our Catholic colleges, having such a disparity of entrance conditions, are weak and incom-

petent. The consequence is that they place their sons in non-Catholic colleges. The uniformity of admission to freshman class will help largely in answering the question "Drift toward non-Catholic colleges," because we have reason to believe that many enter non-Catholic colleges on account of the uniformity of entrance condition which gives the idea of more thorough instruction. It will compel preparatory schools to be more careful in defining the work for their pupils. If this uniformity could be universal we would have a perfect connection between preparatory schools and colleges. It would prevent specializing among those who are too young to decide for themselves. Specialization belongs to the university or, at least, to the last year or two of the college course. Every effort must be made to oppose this among preparatorians. It would prevent a waste of time caused by individual teachers who have idols—hobbies, pet subjects—which they force upon the pupil to the detriment of his preparation. At present, I believe, certain important branches are neglected because an examination is not demanded in them when the youth presents himself for admission into college. It would be a strong factor in raising the standard of our academies and preparatory schools. Specializing means liberty and freedom which breed reluctance and soon display evidences of disadvantage. Some may argue that many in preparatory schools have no intention of entering college and that following a college-preparatory course they are not getting what will serve them most advantageously. There may be some truth in this, but while the school is for the many the college is for the few, but these few are to be the leaders, and no one will say less interest is to be manifested in the leaders of the community than in the multitude. To admit the

opposite will be to reverse the natural order of things and make the college subservient to the school, the higher to the lower. This uniformity would bring to the college students of equal ability. Students will have to be taught in classes, and the presence in the class of an inferior quality of student must interfere with the quality of the instruction. To obtain this most desirable uniformity we must begin from below. I have said above that it cannot be reached at any point of the college course except at the beginning. Hence, let us fix the course of our preparatory schools to suit such requirements as we may agree upon I would suggest that a committee be appointed to draw up a syllabus of subjects for examinations upon which candidates for the freshman class will be examined and ask each college president to pledge himself that this work be followed within a certain time, also to be determined by the same committee.

Rev. Father Cassilly, S. J., Vice-President of St. Ignatius College, Chicago, called attention to the omission of any reference to the efforts that are being made towards a shortening of the college course so as to graduate men earlier than at present, when twenty-three years is a fair average of a graduating class. He asked Father Delurey for suggestions as to how this difficulty is to be met.

Rev. Father Delurey in answering said that his paper dealt with entrance requirements based upon the present conditions as found in our catalogues, all of which demanded a four years' college course.

Rev. Father Butler, O. F. M., argued for unity of system, and endorsed Father Delurey's views. He said that the Conference met to consider the best means of establishing such unity, and he favored reference to

a committee authorized to draft a plan of entrance conditions, which our colleges will follow.

Rev. Father Fagan, Georgetown University, after referring to the interest with which he listened to Father Delurey, spoke of the difficulties which lie in the way of a settlement. He quoted from the Reports of the Committee of Ten, and of the National Educational Association, and showed that their results were only reached after four years' investigation. The uniformity which, in his judgment, we are after is a uniformity which will bring us on a level not merely among ourselves but with the other colleges of the country. He favored using the mass of data given by these reports, and trying to conform to them as far as we can. He went into detail as to the requirements laid down by the Reports of the National Committees, and said that our catalogues are written oftentimes in a language unknown to the other colleges which are not familiar with our terms, and consequently they cannot appreciate what we do. We need sacrifice nothing of what is called our cherished traditions, but accept the work so well done by others.

Rev. Father Conway, S.J., of Washington, argued for uniformity among Catholic Colleges, and did not favor seeking for uniformity with others. There is so much of experiment among them that we will find ourselves constantly changing to meet their demands for change.

Rev. Father Brosnahan, S. J., Woodstock, Md., discussed the meaning of the word "uniformity," and said that if it meant a prescribed amount of Latin, Greek and Science out of prescribed books it is not to be found in non-Catholic colleges. It is the ability to choose from a certain number of subjects such as please him that commends a college to the average student. He advocated that we read up what is there and find

how much of our existing requirements conform to the number of eight units, required by the National Report, and announce in our catalogues that these are the educational units that we select, not allowing the boy to select his educational units at will. He was opposed to absolute uniformity and believed with Father Fagan in accepting the work practically done.

Rev. Dr. Selinger, St. Francis Seminary, Milwaukee, asked if the uniformity referred to our relations with non-Catholic colleges or among our own colleges. He said that it must naturally refer to our preparatory schools, that they may know what is expected from them as entrance conditions in the pupils whom they send to college. It is not a question of length of course so much as it is a question of the course itself.

Rev. Father Dowling, S. J., Creighton University, favored accepting such conditions for admission into the freshman class of Catholic colleges as would be sufficient for admitting a youth into any of the non-Catholic colleges. He quoted at length from the report of the Committee of Twelve of the American Philological Association and said that he saw no difficulty in taking the course of Latin and Greek suggested by them and adopting it as a condition of entrance.

Rev. Father O'Hearn, S. J., St. Francis Xavier's, New York, endorsed Father Dowling's views and spoke of the special requirements made by the Regents of New York and said that an adjustment might be made without sacrificing any of the essentials.

The Rt. Rev. Chairman suggested that a committee be appointed, on Father Delurey's paper, in order that some practical conclusion be reached.

It was so ordered, and the Chairman appointed Fathers Delurey, Fagan and O'Hara as the committee.

Rev. Timothy Brosnahan, S. J., Woodstock, Md., then read his paper on

The Relative Merit of Courses in Catholic and Non-Catholic Colleges for the Baccalaureate.

I.

The problem which the title of my paper defines seems at first sight so entangled as to be practically insoluble. According to the report of the Commissioner of Education for 1897-98 there are in this country upwards of four hundred and eighty colleges, of which sixty are Catholic. Obviously a detailed comparison of sixty Catholic colleges with four hundred and twenty non-Catholic colleges would result in little beyond a tiresome expenditure of labor and an unmanageable assortment of data. Besides other reasons concur to render the treatment of the subject as defined embarrassing.

Fortunately the recent action of one of our most prominent non-Catholic universities in the East relieves me of all perplexity. In 1898 the authorities of Harvard University published a list of institutions, the graduates of which are admitted without examination to Harvard Law School. From this list were omitted all Catholic colleges except Georgetown University and Notre Dame University. In reply to some criticisms passed on him by a speaker at an alumni meeting of Holy Cross College, President Eliot assigned as a reason for this discrimination the inferior standard of studies in Catholic colleges. In a subsequent interview he predicated this inferiority of Boston College *nominatim*. Requested by the President of Boston College to substantiate this accusation or to make it definite, he cautiously confined himself to reiteration. In law, logic and civility the burden of proving his

accusation lies with him, but he refuses to accept it, presuming no doubt that his position will give sufficient extrinsic weight to his charge. His conduct, therefore, is my apology for giving to my treatment of this subject a character which under other circumstances I should undoubtedly not adopt. He has raised a concrete issue between a particular Catholic college and a particular non-Catholic college. I shall take these two colleges as types of their respective classes; first, because I am familiar with these two institutions, and secondly, because by meeting this issue I may satisfy the requirements of my subject, without, under the circumstances, transgressing the bounds of intercollegiate comity. I must note, however, that I am very far from intending to put all non-Catholic colleges on the same educational level with Harvard. This I think would be an injustice to many excellent institutions in this country.

II.

Our inquiry, therefore, becomes one regarding the relative merits of the courses of studies that are exacted of a candidate for the Baccalaureate in Boston College and in Harvard College.

This degree had a well-defined meaning twenty-five years ago. It meant the liberal culture and intellectual breadth that came from the general and harmonious education of those faculties that are distinctive of man. If some students were found incapable of development except along special lines, then those students were considered incapable of liberal culture. They might be given every opportunity of becoming mathematicians, scientists, annalists, philologists, or what not, but they did not receive a degree from a reputable college testifying that they were what they were not. The

papers of citizenship in the republic of the liberal arts and sciences were a testimonial to liberal culture, to breadth of intellectual and moral refinement. Nobody then thought that "wood-working, blacksmithing, chipping, filing and fitting," even though they gave "distinct conceptions of precision," were of the same culture value as language, literature and thought. The theory of the equivalence of studies would scarcely have met with the recognition of ridicule. Within the last two decades, however, the meaning of the baccalaureate has notably changed. That degree is possessed to day by men who, a quarter of a century ago, could not have won it,* men of narrow and specialized range of information, of contracted outlooks, without educated facility of expression and wanting in clear logical grasp of thought. I make these remarks to forestall a very natural anticipation on the part of the reader that I should first determine the meaning of the baccalaureate before attempting to determine which institution conforms most fully to that meaning. As we shall see, that degree as at present conferred by Harvard has no fixed meaning. Like Prince Ahmed's pavilion, it is capable of expansion and contraction. It may cover little or it may cover much. It may be a vesture indicative of intellectual wealth, or at least of competence, or it may barely cover intellectual nakedness. Our only resource, therefore, is to prescind from what it should mean, and to endeavor to find out what it does mean. To accomplish this we must examine the respective courses of the two colleges, the completion of which will, after some formalities, entitle the student to call himself thereafter a Bachelor of Arts. An examination of this kind to be exhaustive should comprise four heads: (1) A comparison between the

*Compare Harvard College Catalogue of 1869 and 1898.

contents of two courses; (2) an evaluation of the time employed in their completion and the respective standards of attainments exacted; (3) the relative value of the lecture and tutorial systems for the formation of college students, and (4) the scope or ideal end to the approximate realization of which the two courses are directed. Whether President Eliot has decided that our inferiority falls under one or more or all these heads, I have no means of knowing. He keeps whatever thoughts he has on the subject to himself, and contents himself with enunciating the general thesis that our course of studies *is* defective. I can only assume the worse. This I am justified in doing, because he uses no modifying clauses in his assertion, and though invited to define the specific form of inferiority that we are laboring under, has evaded the task of diagnosis. I shall, therefore, take it for granted that in his judgment our course is defective on all four counts, severally and collectively.

I shall be obliged, however, in this present paper, to confine myself to the first head only, and even under this head to omit from consideration two studies which are of incomparable value in giving breadth and unity to culture, namely, religion and philosophy. Neither of these studies is exacted at Harvard College as a prerequisite for the baccalaureate. A young man may graduate from that institution without any knowledge of general philosophical principles. Logic and the laws of thought may be as unfamiliar to him as the Devanagari alphabet, and the basic doctrines of rational psychology as unknown as the hieroglyphs of an Egyptian scarab. Even if he desired it he could find no course or set of courses among the twenty-three that are open to him to match the senior course in one of our Catholic colleges. Furthermore, he need hear nothing of the truths of Christianity. The courses on

that subject were relegated to the category of electives, with the Birds of Aristophanes, geology, old Irish, and the dynamics of a rigid body, in 1874, five years after Mr. Eliot became president. Men may indeed differ about the dogmas of religion; but to make religion and morality optional studies at an age when they produce their most refining effects and are most urgently needed, is certainly carrying "electivism" to its limit. Yet out of the sixteen hundred and eighty-three undergraduates who attended Harvard's classes last year, only nine were found taking the two courses which have any analogy with the courses on Christian Religion given in Catholic colleges. Is this education? It is certainly a malignant type of electivism. Now apart from any question of religion, putting these two studies on a purely natural basis, the unity and consistency they give to knowledge, the training and culture they give to the mind, as compared with the disjointed and broken pieces of learning from which a Harvard student constitutes his curriculum, might justly be adduced to settle the question under dispute. But this aspect of the subject is very large and very important. I have, therefore, determined to leave the consideration of it to a future paper and to compare a segment of the Boston College curriculum with the full content of a Harvard elective curriculum. In so doing I work no wrong to our critic's cause, while I forego a decisive point in favor of my own.

The candidate for the degree of Bachelor of Arts at Harvard "must have passed in all prescribed studies and the requisite number of elective courses"* Let

*Harvard University Catalogue, 1898-'99, p. 440. A "course" in Harvard's nomenclature means the study of one subject pursued during a year for a prescribed time. For instance, Plane and Solid Analytic Geometry taken for three hours a week during a year would be "a course" in mathematics. English composition would be "a course" in English. A given subject in Harvard is divided into a multitude of such "courses," so that, for instance, a student may take a "course" in Latin composition without any reading of Latin authors.

us examine the contents of these requirements, and contrast them with the studies exacted of a candidate for the baccalaureate at Boston College. Our examination will proceed more satisfactorily if we first compare the prescribed studies of the Harvard program with the parallel studies of Boston College.

In the first place, what are "all prescribed studies" at Harvard?

In the Catalogue of 1898–'99 they were three courses, which denominated: English A for the freshman year, year, English B for the sophomore year, and English C for the junior year. No studies are prescribed for the seniors. Those nondescript individuals whose presence in the college, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences tell us, constitutes a danger, are obliged to choose courses exacting attendance at lectures for twelve hours a week during the year, an average, namely, of two hours a day. English A is described as rhetoric and English composition, comprising lectures, recitations, written exercises and conferences. The value of the course may be estimated by the ground covered in A. S. Hill's Principles of Rhetoric (enlarged and revised edition). A clearer indication of its grade may be had from the privilege of omitting it accorded to a freshman who has passed with distinction the entrance examination in elementary English.* English B is a course in English composition. The student is obliged to write twelve themes during the year. Apparently this course does not differ substantially from the freshman course, as it is not prescribed absolutely for the sophomore student, but only conditionally on his having failed to attain grade B (probably about seventy five per cent.) in the English of the freshman year. English C is designated foren-

* Harvard Catalogue 1898–99, p. 270.

sics. The student is required to make during the year one rhetorical plan of an argumentative composition in imitation of some masterpiece, and to write during the year three argumentative compositions called forensics, with rhetorical plans of the same.

Briefly, then, the only branch of a liberal education prescribed for attaining the degree of bachelor of arts at Harvard College is English prose composition. Of poetics, of elocution, and what is vastly more serious, of logic, the candidate for a degree is obliged to make no study. It is true he may choose as an elective course one of these branches, but it is also true that he may not, and nevertheless obtain his degree. But this is not all. In the annual report of the president of Harvard College for 1898–99 it is proposed to reduce still further the prescribed studies in English. Hereafter the English of the junior year is no longer required; the English of the sophomore year is prescribed for those students only who have failed to attain grade B in the English of the freshman year; and the English of the freshman year itself is not prescribed, if a certain proficiency is shown in the elementary English of the entrance examination. In a word, the English required for graduation at Harvard has been reduced to the level of that possessed by a proficient high-school graduate.

During our recent war we learned that the effective speed of one of our fleets was measured by the speed of the slowest vessel. And the minimum required for graduation measures the educational standard of a college. The intrinsic value of a given graduate's degree is the least for which it can be obtained. If his attainments are in excess of this minimum, they redound to his personal credit. If there are some students—and I should be sorry to believe that there are not—who practically recognize in their election of studies the

need of a broader and more general culture in English than that prescribed for them, this only proves that their standard is higher than that of their Alma Mater, or rather than that of those who have in hand at present the educational destiny of that institution. For Harvard was not always thus; we shall not easily forget some of the dearest names in American literature. Nor shall I believe that this narrow and meagre program is widely approved outside of President Eliot's circle of adherents.*

With this program we shall now contrast the program of Boston College in the same matter. The English requirements run through the freshman, sophomore and junior years. There is no formal teaching of English in the senior year. That year has in Jesuit colleges a special scope, as I shall perhaps have an opportunity of explaining in a future paper. The English requirements for each of the three years named are, following the prescriptions of the *Ratio Studiorum* for language courses, classed under three heads: *instruction* in precepts, principles or laws, study of *models*, and *practice*, i. e., in each year a course of instruction is given on a definite part of rhetoric; this instruction is illustrated by suitable English authors; and finally with authors as models, and precepts as guides, practice in English writing is regularly exacted.

---

*The *Evening Post*, of New York, recently in an editorial gives an extract from a letter of Professor Charles Eliot Norton to the father of a young fellow-countryman who was studying in Europe. "Tell the young man," he says, "to make his chief aim a broad culture of himself as a man. He is interested in Latin, you say, and means to make that language his field of work. Let him perfect himself in Latin, but warn him against the danger of becoming a specialist, who may be a fine Latin scholar, but not a thoroughly cultivated man. Our universities are suffering from too many specialists in their teaching force. What they need most of all is professors who comprehend the whole range of interest which constitutes true culture."

In the freshman year for instance, the subjects of instruction are: in prose the elements of style, the principles of the paragraph, and narrative and descriptive writing; and in poetics, the forms of versification. English writers of narrative and description are studied as models of these precepts.* The practice consists of weekly compositions either in prose or verse. In the sophomore year the subjects for instruction are: in prose, the principles of invention, the amplification of the paragraph, complex description and exposition; in poetics—the development of imagination, and what may be called the humanities of poetic expression. The name Humanitates given to this class in the *Ratio Studiorum*, sufficiently defines its aim. The models are from narrative and lyric poets and prose writers of essays. The practice in this year also is a weekly composition. In the junior year finally the subject for instruction is oratory, the laws of the art, and its divisions, namely, demonstrative, deliberative and forensic. The models are selected from English and American orators and from sources such as Milton's "Paradise Lost." In the first term the practice consists in analyzing masterpieces of oratory, and constructing rhetorical plans in imitation of them; and in the second term of writing orations with their plans on subjects generally assigned by the professor, and dealing usually with some topic of public interest. In poetics the elementary principles of the drama are the subject of study.

* Genung's Practical Rhetoric is the text-book. I find in the Boston College Catalogue of 1898-99, the following models assigned for study in the Freshman year: Macaulay's Essay on Warren Hastings, Carlyle's Essay on Burns, DeQuincey's Joan of Arc, Macaulay's Essay on Boswell's Life of Johnson, Spencer's Philosophy of Style, and Bacon's Civil and Moral Essays. This list is of course directive not obligatory. An individual professor may change it, provided he retains the scope and equivalence.

The difference between these two courses is distinct. The Boston College course is balanced, is progressive, and possesses that completeness which can reasonably be demanded of a college course. The question of its inferiority to the present Harvard College course may, I think, be safely left to the judgment of capable educators.

III.

When we come to compare the other studies in the two colleges, we find ourselves in the plight of a mathematician who is called upon to compare a fixed quantity with an erratic variable, the value of which, in a given case depends on "the sanctity of the individual's gifts and will-power," and probably too on certain unholy proclivities to the venerable vice of backsliding. Whatever be the coördinates of this variable, it is certain that the novice freshman is on the threshold of his college career presented with about fifty studies in nineteen different subjects on which he may regularly exercise his powers of election. Arranging these courses according to their numerical richness, German leads the list with eleven possibilities of choice, and English, history, music, and others, close it with one each. From this collection every freshman is required, supposing him to have passed the entrance examinations, to elect four full courses entailing twelve hours class work a week. But he may not choose more than two courses in the same department.

In Harvard, therefore, a student may as a rule confine himself to two subjects, taking two courses in each subject. He may thus, during his four years, eschew the courses in twenty of the twenty-two departments into which the courses of instruction are divided. If mathematics is a bugbear to him, if the classic lan-

guages of Greece and Rome are to his American spirit foreign anachronisms, he may in virtue "of the sanctity of his individual gifts and will-power" dismiss these subjects into "exterior darkness." Stranger still, when we recall President Eliot's misguided anxiety about the scientific poverty of the curriculum in Jesuit colleges, if the natural sciences do not jump with the humor of the Harvard College student he may ignore them for four consecutive years.

In Boston College the courses that lead to a degree are prescribed in languages, history, mathematics, the natural sciences and philosophy, save some minor exceptions in which alternative options are permitted. The first four of these studies are held to be complementary instruments of education to which the doctrine of equivalence cannot be applied. The specific training, for instance, given by the study of an oration of Demosthenes, Cicero or Burke cannot be supplied by the study of differential calculus or the chemistry of the carbon compounds. A course in philosophy, including by that term logic, epistemology, general metaphysics and rational psychology, is believed to be the necessary crowning of any system of education professing to give culture.

To make our comparison, therefore, I shall, after noticing the entrance examinations of both colleges, take what I have reason to believe are typical cases, what are at any rate legitimate cases of election at Harvard College, and contrast them with the Boston College prescribed course. And in order that this paper be not tiresomely protracted, I shall contrast the prescribed studies of the freshman year at Boston College with similar studies which may be elected by a Harvard freshman, leaving to the reader who has leisure and is not otherwise profitably employed the task of com-

paring other years. I shall then show that this hypothetical case of election is in content far in excess of what a Harvard freshman studying for the baccalaureate is required to choose. Regarding the entrance examinations of the two colleges, little need be said. The candidate for admission to Harvard is presented with two groups of studies, called elementary studies and advanced studies, and is permitted to select the studies in which he will undergo an examination according to one of four plans. The first and second plans are practically the same, and differ from the third and fourth in that these latter plans omit the examination in either Greek or Latin. The Boston College entrance examinations are substantially equivalent to those contained in the first or second plan of Harvard, including, namely, the same elementary studies contained in the first Harvard plan, except elementary physics, and also from the Harvard group of advanced studies, advanced Latin, Latin and Greek composition (Latin F and Greek F of the Harvard Catalogue), besides solid geometry and elementary Latin verse making.*

Assuming two young men, then, to have passed this entrance examination and to have entered the freshman class, one at Boston College and the other at Harvard College, what are their respective burdens and opportunities? I shall tabulate the courses in the following order, premising first that in Boston College, the organic unity of the language classes, as I have already noted, requires that instruction in law and precepts, study of authors as models, and practice in the use of the language studied, coexist in the same course, and secondly, that the Harvard freshman may

* Harvard University Catalogue, 1898–'99, pp. 274–281, and Boston College Catalogue, 1898–'99, pp. 47–53.

not elect more than two courses in the same department:

I. Boston College. *Greek:* (a) Plato's Apology, Phaedo, Herodotus' History (selections); (b) Syntax of moods and tenses; (c) Greek composition once a week.

Harvard College. *Greek:* (a) Homer's Iliad and Odyssey (selections).*

II. Boston College. *Latin:* (a) Cicero's de Senectute et Amicitia, Sallust's Jugurtha or Catilina, Horace's Odes and Epodes; (b) The elements of Latin style, the laws of quantity and versification; (c) Latin composition twice a week.

Harvard College. *Latin:* (a) Horace's Odes and Epodes; Tacitus (selections from the Annals)†

III. Boston College. *Mathematics:* Advanced algebra.

Harvard College. *Mathematics:* Advanced algebra.‡

IV. Boston College. *French:* (a)Racine's Athalie, Bossuet's Henriette d'Angleterre; (b) Syntax; (c) French Composition once a week.

Harvard College. *French:* (a) French Prose, Historical and General; (b) Practice in writing and speaking French.§

If German is substituted instead of French a similar comparison could be made between respective courses in the two colleges. I have taken French, because it seems to be more popular with the Harvard freshman than German.

*Harvard Catalogue 1898–99, p. 321, Greek A. That part of the Boston College Greek course contained under (b) and (c) is omitted from the Harvard Greek course. It is practically equivalent to a half course, called in the Harvard Catalogue Greek E.

†Harvard Catalogue, p. 323, Latin 1. The Boston College's Latin contained under (b) and (c) may possibly be a little more advanced than Latin E of Harvard.

‡Harvard Catalogue, p. 361, Mathematics D.

§Harvard Catalogue, p. 339, French 1 b; and p. 340, French 3.

Now, in instituting this comparison I have been fair to Harvard. I have assigned my hypothetical freshman no course which has not been actually elected by some freshman for the year 1898–99, and have followed the regulation exacting four full courses, or "an equivalent amount of courses and half courses," and not permitting more than two courses to be elected from the same department. Nay more, I have been liberal. English history (important periods) and Christian doctrine, which are prescribed once a week each for a Boston College freshman, have been omitted from our side of the argument. Besides, I have assumed a very conscientious and industrious Harvard freshman, one whose election of studies is not made exclusively from the viewpoint of a lotus eater. For instance, the Latin course I have granted to the Harvard program is primarily not a freshman course. The Harvard Catalogue informs us that it "is open to students who have passed with distinction in Course B or C." And, in fact, of the 471 freshmen that frequented Harvard's classrooms in the year 1898–99 only one was pursuing this course. Nevertheless, even with these indulgences in favor of our censor's position, one who is accustomed to evaluate educational programs will not at the first blush apprehend the grounds of President Eliot's incorrigible certainty that Boston College should improve its course of studies. I have appealed to facts which may be had for the inquiry and to which the attention of the Harvard authorities has already been called.

I shall make one comment on what this comparison reveals. The opportunities afforded a freshman at Harvard of electing his courses, combined with the restrictions imposed on him, frustrate the very object that it was intended to facilitate. It restricts the play of individuality. Let us suppose that a young man.

enters Harvard to get an old-fashioned liberal education, and that by some process of reasoning he determined on a course in the classics similar to that found in the Boston College catalogue. He may have concluded not unreasonably that a knowledge of the Latin tongue and literature is an important acquisition for a liberally educated gentleman; as a result of his studious observation in the high school he may hold with Professor West, of Princeton University, that Latin without Greek "cannot be taught to best advantage;" lastly, he may think that the study of a language in fractional "courses" is an absurdity, and therefore maintain in accordance with the principles of the *Ratio Studiorum* that such study comprises instruction in precepts, study of models and practice in use of language. If these are his ideals he is barred from their realization at Harvard by the letter of the law forbidding him to choose more than two full courses in any one department. He could not carry out his purpose without electing the equivalent of three full courses in the classical department. The sanctity of the individual's gifts must therefore dissipate itself over parcels of studies supposed to widen intellectual interest, but in fact conducing merely to variegated superficiality.

I might close my argument here. I have shown that the content of a Boston College course is in nowise inferior to the course chosen by a Harvard freshman of more than average industry; and I may justly demand of any honest critic publicly asserting its inferiority, either to prove his assertion or to withdraw it. I have presented my side of the case with evidence. If that presentation is fallacious, misleading or erroneous let its defects be pointed out candidly. Though not conscious of any deliberate intention to mislead, I am willing to concede that I may have erred. But I must

respectfully decline to accept mere reiteration as either proof or refutation. Repeating a statement that has been controverted, without giving any indication that the arguments of the other side have filtered into one's consciousness, contributes neither light nor sweetness to a discussion.

Briefly then the state of the question is this: Since Harvard admits electivism and the principle of universal equivalence in studies, has it any logical grounds for declaring that this election should be made by the student rather than by the faculty? If out of the many combinations that may be made, the faculty of Boston College selects two or three which alone in its judgment ought to lead to the degree of B. A., the President of Harvard might disapprove of the exacting standard set up, as being by implication—though certainly not intentionally—a criticism of his standard. But by no known laws of logic can he conclude that it is inferior.

This unreasonable position becomes still more inexplicable and unwarrantable, if the comparison is pushed further, if the Boston College freshman course is contrasted with other combinations of elective studies which suffice for a Harvard freshman. I indicate some of the possible combinations.

History 1, an introductory course on Mediaeval and Modern History. Lectures three hours a week; no compulsory recitations, hence the most popular elective course in the college. In 1898-99 it was elected by over seventy per cent. of the freshmen. This is a full course.

Government 1, an elementary course on Constitutional Government. Lectures two hours a week, and recitations one hour a week. This is also a full course and ranks second in popularity among the freshmen.

English 28, a half course in English Literature, consisting of lectures twice a week on the history and development of English literature in outline.

Geology B, an elementary course in Meteorology, very useful no doubt in New England where the weather is so inconstant. There were nineteen embryonic weather prophets in quest of the baccalaureate in this class last year. It is a half course.

French 1 b, French prose, historical and general. This is a full course, not reputed very onerous, except that it entails recitations.

So far as I can discern, these five courses, which are equivalent to four full courses, present a fair specimen of the work exacted of a Harvard freshman who is a candidate for the baccalaureate. Comment is superfluous.

Retaining History 1 and Government 1, which because of their undoubted popularity could not be dislodged without violating the sanctity of individuality, we might instead of Geology B substitute Geology A, which is a half course in geography, described as elementary physiography. Or instead of English 28 and Geology B, two half courses, a freshman may, if he has some proficiency in piano or organ playing, elect Music 1, which is a course in harmony. Again, if he should have a distate for French prose, historical and general, he may substitute a course in general descriptive physics or an elementary course in experimental chemistry, which is denominated Chemistry B. In this latter case, however, he must also discard Music 1, because harmony and Chemistry B in the examination and class scheme of Harvard, like the Jew and Samaritan of old, *non co-utuntur*. Combinations of this kind might be made indefinitely, varying too indefinitely in educational significance. Such sets of courses may be

elected in accordance with no principles, possess no unity or coherence, look to no purpose outside the possibility of adjusting lecture hours to opportunities for athletic or other "wholesome delights of college life."

Detailed comparisons of school schedules are no doubt sometimes wearisome, yet I know no other way of showing concretely the actual value and practical consequences of what Dr. McCosh called "the large, loose, vague, showy and plausible" fallacies regarding unlimited freedom in choice of studies, which have formed the one monotonous burden of President Eliot's messages to educators for the last twenty or thirty years. Reduced to practice—the ultimate touch-stone of theories—they have made college education at Harvard a thing of shreds and patches, have deprived it of character, and have made the recent Harvard degrees of B. A. symbols to other nations of the little value such degrees have in America.

IV.

The length to which this paper has grown compels me to abstain from any further comparison. But I assure my readers that similar parallels even less corroborative of President Eliot's assumptions could be drawn up between the studies of the other years in the two colleges, and in particular that the studies of the average senior at Harvard are little less than trivial as compared with those of a senior at Boston College.

President Eliot says in his annual report for 1898–99: "Thus far Harvard has maintained the relative numerical importance of this traditional degree better than any other American institution." He attributes Harvard's success or prëeminence in this to its elective system. "It has been long the belief of the president,"

he says, "that to maintain the Harvard degree of A. B. in full vigor it is desirable to broaden the range of well-taught subjects which will admit to Harvard College." There is something pathetically naive in the last assertion. No dim suspicion seems to have entered even the outer vestibule of the president's mind that his method has resulted in retaining the degree of A. B. in full vigor only nominally, while he has wholly changed the content of the name; that he has kept the shell and bestows it at the end of three or four years filled with foreign matter. Yet he calls on the world to recognize the number of shells he produces annually, fancying that the world will be induced to believe the new stuffing is the same as the old kernel. If conferring degrees were a mercantile pursuit, this would be an indictable offense. It is paralleled by the trade transaction of selling oleomargarine for butter. The merchant may claim that his oleomargarine is better than butter, at least than some butters, yet the law obliges him to call his product by its right name. The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard, in an article published in the *Atlantic Monthly* of February, 1900, complains of the confusion in the meaning of "liberal culture," due to the fact that technical schools "invaded the domain of the college" and "masquerade as institutions of liberal education." He says: "The visible traces of the struggle are with us yet in the curious assortment of degrees . . . bachelor of arts, of letters, of philosophy, of literature, of science, of what not, which decorate our college graduates, standing ostensibly for so many supposed varieties of liberal culture, and giving currency and countenance to false and pernicious views of what liberal education is; for an education which aims to equip men for particular callings, or to give them a special training

for entering upon these callings, however useful it may be, is not the liberal education which should be the single aim of the college." And yet the main difference between the degree of A. B. conferred under the ægis of "electivism" and the divers degrees conferred in other institutions lies in this, that the degrees conferred in other institutions are significant of the studies pursued and the resultant training, while the degree of A. B. of Harvard may mean anything. If "electivism" is finally to characterize and distinguish American college education, would it not conduce to national honesty to acknowledge openly that the day of a liberal culture has passed and that in America a college is a place where there are "a number of unconnected and independent educations going on at the same time?" What advantage is there in attempting to hoodwink ourselves and others by verbalisms, by telling us that a college is "a place where, though there are many paths, they all lead to a single goal," when the singleness of that goal is merely nominal? It is nothing less than verbalism surely to fancy that you have the thing because you retain the name. Would it not be more scientific, less confusing, more in keeping with the purpose of an educational institution, which ought certainly to aim at fostering exactness of thought, to give new names to new things rather than retain an old name, and surreptitiously introduce a new, indefinite and indefinable meaning? Confusing issues have never helped intellectual or moral progress.

"It is clearly impossible that the American university should be constructed on the top of the old-fashioned American college," President Eliot declared some years ago. Thereupon, having proclaimed the clear impossibility, he set to work to destroy the old-fashioned American college and on the débris to build his

type of an American university. In place of the old-fashioned college, by gradual disintegration he substituted a miscellaneous assortment of studies called "courses," invited young men to come and patch together, as it seemed good in their eyes, each his own curriculum, to pursue that curriculum with more or less devotion for three or four years, then to depart with the benison of his Alma Mater and an old-fashioned degree. If the defenders of all this, while fostering for purposes of their own the educational superstitions of the educated masses, do not in their more cheerful moments, like the Roman augurs, laugh among themselves or in the inner recesses of their offices, they are sadly wanting in that saving quality of the American temperament—a sense of humor. And yet we must improve our studies according to the model that is shown us. What we want in view of the partial exposition I have made of the Boston College curriculum is a little less "must" and a little more "why." We cannot accept an "ex cathedra" decision on the matter. Former assertions of the president of Harvard regarding Jesuit schools have raised no presumption in favor of his accuracy. An hour or so spent in comparing the catalogues of Boston College and Harvard College, adding thereto some information which is the common property of anyone about Boston, leads us to call in question the accuracy of his latest pronouncement regarding Boston College. While willing to admit that the course of Boston College—or of any other college—could be improved, we see no reason whatsoever for suspecting that it is in any way inferior to the collegiate course or courses at Harvard; and, furthermore, we have solid reasons for believing that it is superior—that it gives a true mental training. "At Harvard," Dr. McCosh said fifteen years ago,

"a young man has two hundred courses from which he may choose, and many of these courses I am compelled to call *dilettante*. I should prefer a young man who has been trained in an old-fashioned college in rhetoric, philosophy, Latin, Greek and mathematics, to one who had frittered away four years in studying the French drama of the eighteenth century, a little music and similar branches."*

To conclude, then, we have been informed that a course in which philosophy, logic and religion form a necessary part of the curriculum is inferior to one in which these fundamental studies of a collegiate education must compete for the favor of a student with a course in music or with a course on the life of the ancient Athenians when illustrated with stereopticon views;† that an impoverished course in English with a young man's patchwork of some three or four other studies is superior to a planned and symmetrical course in languages, history, sciences and mathematics; and that this young man, after nibbling for four years at eighteen morsels of information on unmatched subjects, is by some cunning sorcery a better educated man than one who has been submitted during the same period to the discipline of a rounded formation. To ask us to believe this is to put too great a strain on our credulity. The categorical imperative: Let them improve their studies—loses all its Kantian vigor to compel obedience, when we reflect on the paltry character of the fragmentary parts of a subject that are dignified by the name of "courses" at Harvard, and attempt to compare four of these *disjecta membra* with the organic com-

*See a life of Dr. McCosh by William M. Sloane, just published by Scribner's Sons, p. 291. The whole of Chapter XIII is worth reading by any one interested in the views of a man combining philosophic grasp and practical ability.

†Greek 10. Annual Report of the President of Harvard College, 1898–99, p. 60.

pleteness of the Boston College course. Highly, therefore, as we regard President Eliot, we cannot seriously believe that his convictions are the result of personal investigation, without discrediting his intelligence. Nor can we entertain the thought that he deliberately intended to vilify Jesuit colleges. We shall await his proofs or retractations.

There was not much discussion upon this question, as it was felt that it was written for the definite purpose of showing that the course of studies in our best Catholic colleges was not inferior to that given at Harvard. Several questions were asked, which Father Brosnahan answered at considerable length. Rev. Father Rogers, S. J., asked if, in searching the catalogues and examining the requirements of Harvard, attention was also paid to universities such as Yale, Princeton and Columbia, and whether their requirements are as low as the lowest requirements of Harvard; and also whether it is at all possible to obtain the number of pupils who make use of the minimum requirements in institutions like Harvard? He stated that as many of our colleges take boys from the parish schools after the sixth grade, and put them through a preparatory course of three or four years before entering the freshman class, whether the comparison in this basis would be as favorable to Catholic colleges as would appear from the paper read. Father Brosnahan answered that he had looked at the catalogues of the different non-Catholic colleges, and was quite sure that the entrance requirements in Yale and Johns Hopkins are not as low as the requirements at Harvard. He thought the entrance requirements at Harvard sufficiently high for any college, and asserted that the requirements in Catholic colleges, in his judgment, are

not inferior to the entrance requirements of Harvard or the other colleges. With regard to the second question, he said that it would be easy to find the answer from the annual reports, but that it would take considerable cataloguing and scheduling. With regard to the third question, he made the comparison between Harvard College and Boston College, because he knew those colleges better than any other. From his investigation he was prepared to believe that there was not a bona fide Catholic college in this country whose course of studies is not superior to the average course chosen by a Harvard student. He detailed his answer at some length by an exemplification of the courses that may be chosen, and that actually are chosen by a large number of students entering Harvard. Father Rogers said that as many of our students come from parochial schools, which have not a high school attachment, the entire course to the degree frequently covers from twelve to thirteen years, whereas in non-Catholic colleges the degree seems to call for about sixteen years of school work. In this he thought that our colleges find their weakness.

Rev. Father Dolphin, President of St. Thomas' College, St. Paul, Minn., thought that President Eliot's action would give an incentive to better effort and more determined work. He thought that there was hardly anyone present who felt that his college is as efficient as might be. He also asserted that in many Catholic colleges men are said to receive degrees to which they are not entitled, and largely because of the financial question. He said that we ought to strive to live up to our requirements, instead of criticising other colleges.

Rev. Father Conway, S. J., of Washington, said that all non-Catholic colleges did not discriminate

against us, but Harvard had attacked our Catholic schools very unjustly. He said it was not correct to say that we were attacking Harvard. Harvard has attacked us. It has denied us rights that it has granted to other colleges inferior to us. It is not a question of theory; it is a question of fact, and the purpose of Father Brosnahan's admirable paper was to show that taking one of the colleges attacked as a type, our courses were not inferior to Harvard.

The Right Rev. Chairman said that he felt that, while we are defending ourselves against charges we feel to be unjust, we are not blind to our own defects, but are prepared to take a step required, not in imitation of Harvard, but in imitation of the best ideals of collegiate institutions, as we understand them. Therefore, this very attack, while stimulating us to better work, gives us also an opportunity to consider the class of work which our colleges already propose to do. We in New England, and graduates of the colleges that have been stricken from the Harvard list, realize that a wrong has been done to us, as well as to our colleges, and that it becomes the duty of those in charge of Boston College and Holy Cross College to show to the world that their courses of study were not inferior.

Remarks were made by Father Kavanaugh, of Notre Dame, and Father Schranz, of St. Charles' College, that it would be well to have further advice on the matter before committing the Conference to any particular approval of the paper read. The Chairman assured the Conference that it was not asked to approve or endorse what has been said on Father Brosnahan's paper, which simply showed the facts as found by him after careful comparison of the catalogues of the two colleges.

Before adjourning for luncheon, the Right Rev. Chairman placed before the Conference the correspondence he had had with Father Norris, of the Oratory, England, Secretary of the Conferences of Catholic Colleges in England, showing the interest which was being taken there in the work done by this Conference at Chicago last year.

At 1 P. M. the Conference adjourned for luncheon.

SECOND SESSION.

At 2.30 P. M. Rev. James Burns, C. S. C., Notre Dame University, read the following paper on

The Elective System of Studies.

It is not easy to determine exactly the extent to which the principle of election of studies has been adopted in American colleges, but there can be no doubt that, in one form or another, it obtains in by far the greater number. Out of a list of 422 colleges, in the last annual report of the Commissioner of Education, I find that 322, or 76 per cent., have an elective system. The number of Catholic colleges in the list is 40, and all but 3 of these have but a single, uniform curriculum. If we omit the 40 Catholic colleges, for the sake of comparison, we find that 84 per cent. of all the rest permit election of studies. Moreover, of the 60 non-Catholic colleges that adhere to the single prescribed system, more than one-half are situated in States where education is notoriously backward, many of them being institutions for the education of the colored race, and in efficiency little better than high schools. We may conclude, then, that the great majority of non-Catholic colleges, and practically all the more reputable ones among them, have accepted and embodied in their curricula the principle of election of studies.

But the elective system is not confined to the college. The past decade has witnessed its extension even to the high school. The tendency in this direction has steadily grown from year to year, and, if we may judge from events, it is likely to continue to grow in the future. It is a significant sign of the times that the principals of the high schools of Chicago, at a recent meeting, unanimously adopted a resolution advocating election

of studies, and that the National Educational Association, last summer, formally declared for "the necessity and the wisdom of the principle of election in secondary schools."*

The famous Report of the Committee of Ten is probably responsible for this movement in the high schools, though it is impossible to tell just what influence may have been exercised by transatlantic educational systems to which we look up with reverence. France and Germany recognize the elective principle in their secondary school programs,. which include the ground usually covered by both our high schools and colleges. In Great Britain it is recognized in the leading collegiate institutions, even conservative Oxford, but does not seem to have gained a firm foothold as yet in the public high schools. In the *Lycées* of France there are two parallel courses of study—one in the classics, and the other in modern languages and science; in the German *gymnasium* system there are the same, with a third course, which is in the nature of a compromise between the other two. All of these courses carry the pupil up to about his eighteenth year, and it is remarkable that this differentiation of educational methods begins at the very beginning of the pupil's secondary instruction, and at the very early age of nine years.

To attempt to account for the dominance of the elective principle in modern collegiate education by the cry of "fad," would be to shut one's eyes to the facts. It is a great mistake to assume that the elective system is of recent origin. As a matter of fact, the *realschulen* of Germany date back to the middle of the eighteenth century; and have grown to present form and power side by side with the classical *gymnasia*. The elective idea took root at Harvard as early as 1825. The elective system, such as it exists to-day, is the result

Educational Review, 19, 1.

of a process of growth from a very small beginning, and at most American colleges its growth has been in the face of the most strenuous and persistent opposition. It is a striking proof of the strength of the elective movement and of the power of the conservative forces within it, that while it is rare to-day to find a non-Catholic educator of prominence who is not an advocate of elective studies, it is not less rare to find one who favors its extreme development as exhibited at Harvard, if we except the faculty of Harvard itself.

Notwithstanding their wide divergence of form and perplexing diversity of detail, I think we can comprise the main characteristics of all elective college systems under three leading types. The first is what may be called the Group System, and consists of two or more parallel courses of study leading to the same degree or to equivalent baccalaureate degrees. This is the prevailing system at Notre Dame, and as I am more familiar with its working there, my remarks upon this point shall have special reference to Notre Dame. Each group, as a rule, comprises three kinds of studies: studies common to all the groups, studies proper to each group, and studies that are elective. At Notre Dame, omitting technical courses, there are five groups of studies that are recognized as leading to equivalent degrees—Latin-Greek, Latin-English, History-Economics, General Science, and Biology. The studies common to all are Christian Doctrine, Philosophy and English. In the Classical or Latin-Greek group, the studies proper are Latin, Greek and history, while in all but its senior year there is one elective. In the General Science Group, the studies proper are the natural and physical sciences, with mathematics; in the third year of this group the work is largely, and in the last year it is almost entirely elective. The Group system is the

prevailing form of the elective system in American colleges to-day, and it is plain that, while offering more or less latitude of choice, depending chiefly on the manner of the groups, it effectively secures coherency in any plan of studies that the student may elect.

Secondly, there is what I may call the Princeton elective system, consisting of a single course of studies, leading to the degree of A. B., the studies of the first two years being mainly prescribed, and those of the last two, elective. At Princeton, the studies of the first two years do not differ very materially from those of the first two years in Catholic colleges. During the last two years, the range of electiveness is very wide, consisting of 47 courses in the third year, 111 in the fourth; yet, these are so skillfully arranged, with reference to class hours, that only about 15 courses are ordinarily open to the student in any one session of the junior or senior years. The chief point of interest, however, lies in the character of the electives themselves. As ordinarily permitted, the electives of the last two years may be regarded as simply extensions of subjects already seen. Under this system, therefore, if strictly adhered to, it would be difficult for the student, in any combination of studies, to fail in preserving a certain coherency of choice; but in practice, both at Princeton and elsewhere, considerable latitude seems to be allowed in the election of studies that have little or no connection with the earlier work of the course. The Princeton system prevails at most of the State Universities, in the course leading to the degree of A. B. It is generally accompanied, however, by a number of other courses, more or less prescribed, leading to equivalent degrees.

Thirdly, there is the Harvard system, representing the extremest development of the principle of election of

studies. The Harvard system, theoretically at least, is very simple. Eighteen full courses of instruction are required for the bachelor's degree, and sixteen of these are elective. The student must make choice of four full electives each year, and there are four hundred or so to choose from. In view of the statement in the catalogue, that "any plan of study, deliberately made and adhered to, is more profitable than studies chosen from year to year, without plan, under the influence of temporary preference," it is natural to inquire, what are the means relied on at Harvard for securing this necessary unity? President Eliot has given us the answer himself. "A well-instructed youth of eighteen," he says, "can select for himself a better course of study than any college faculty or any wise man who does not know him and his ancestors and his previous life can possibly select for him."* In other words, the responsibilities of the situation are to be thrown upon the student himself. Still there are some safeguards. The number of courses regularly open to freshmen is reduced to about thirty, and each freshman is required to submit his choice of studies for approval to a member of the faculty who acts as his adviser. English is prescribed for each of the first three years, though this prescription, I believe, is soon to be abolished. There is a system of class honors which ought to make for concentration of work, but the number of candidates for honors seems to be relatively small. In the year 1897-98 only 19 gained second-year honors, and as many more finals, though the number of honorable mentions amounted to 152.

Under the almost absolute freedom of studies now permitted at Harvard it would be necessary, before passing judgment upon the Harvard system, to examine in detail the electives of students for the whole four

* 'Educational Reform," p. 132.

years of the course. This is not possible to do at present. In a general way, however, we can ascertain the drift of the electives, and it is important for us to note their special trend.

The following table is based on the published report of the dean of the faculty of arts and sciences for the year 1898-99, and exhibits in order the twelve studies most popular that year with the regular candidates for the degree of A. B.* It appears, then, that in the year 1898-99 history had 1,205 choices; English, 1,135; economics, 916; French, 611; German, 583; philosophy, 540; government, 462; chemistry, 338; geology, 298; Greek, 278; Latin, 276; mathematics, 200. The number of regular collegiate students the same year was 1,683.

It will be observed that three of the four staples of Catholic collegiate education are at the very bottom of the list and that economics, French and German, which have scarcely found a footing with us as yet, are well up towards the top. History, with its cognates, economics and government, received 2,583 choices, or about 33 per cent of the total number made. The position of Latin and Greek, at almost the bottom of the list, is especially remarkable. The combined total of choices in these amount to no more than 7 per cent of the whole. It appears that only about one-fourth of the students take Latin and Greek. The greater number of choices in Greek than Latin is easily explained. A largely attended course of lectures on the life of the ancient classical peoples is given in alternate years to students of Latin and Greek, and the superior popu-

*At Harvard each student is required to choose four full elective courses each year, or eight half courses, and the basis upon which I have sought to estimate the relative popularity of studies is the number of actual electives chosen in that study during the year. The term "choice," therefore, as used above means one full elective course chosen by a student, or its equivalent of two half-courses.

larity of Greek during the year in question was due to this course. It is remarkable that more than one-half of all the choices in Greek made by seniors and juniors appertained to two courses, one of which advertises stereopticon illustration, and the other the rather peculiar recommendation that it requires no knowledge of Greek. In view of the fact that not less than 90 per cent of the candidates for the freshman class have studied both Latin and Greek in the preparatory schools, it is strange that so small a proportion continues these studies in college. After spending three or four years in the high school in mastering the elements of the classics, to break off study just about the time that the higher educative influence of classical literature should begin must involve an enormous waste of intellectual effort and reflect back a baneful influence upon the spirit of high-school work. The scant respect paid the ancient classics by the average high-school pupil after entering Harvard College is a grave impeachment, to my mind, of the soundness of President Eliot's contention—upon which the Harvard system is built—that "it is only the individual youth who can select that course of study which will most profit him."*

This rapid and necessarily imperfect sketch of representative types of the elective system brings me to the main topic of my paper—the desirability of that system in Catholic colleges; or, the respective merit of the elective as compared with the single prescribed system at present prevailing with us. The question is broad and complicated, and in the limited time at my disposal I can do no more than to elucidate its main features, or at least bring them within the arena of wholesome discussion. It would be absurd to deny

* Educational Reform, p. 135.

that each of these systems has its points of excellence; and the one-sided claims so often set up may be largely conceded, I think, without affecting very much the sum total of the respective merit of either. I am firmly persuaded that the discussion, as usually carried on, fails to bring out sufficiently the vital point of the difference between the two systems. The questions of the respective merits of the classics and various other branches; of respective student scholarship and character; of lecture and tutorial systems, and so on, are highly important, it is true, but they are only ancillary. They amount to no more than the question of means, and the question of means must ever, in the nature of things, be subordinate to that of end. What is the good of disputing about the means to be used, if we are totally and hopelessly at variance respecting the end to be reached? I should like to impress upon the members of this Conference that the vital question to-day between these two systems is the question of end or ideal.

It was a fundamental change of conviction respecting the ideal of college training that produced the elective system. The growth of knowledge, the multiplication of arts and sciences, the increasing differentiation of intellectual life, were reflected back upon the college, and resulted in an increasing differentiation of youthful minds. The influences of heredity and early environment reproduced themselves in special aptitudes in the mind of the boy. In an intellectual way, it was only the operation of a familiar law of animal and vegetable life—the law of the tendency of species towards the perpetuation of the type. Accordingly, among educators the belief grew up that the function of the college ought to include, not only the training of the general powers of the mind, but the unfolding, fostering, and perfecting of special individual capacities as well.

A new ideal of college training arose in this way, and it was from this ideal that the new or elective system sprang. The educational unit became the college student, instead of the college class, and the old ideal—the ideal of the "rounded and harmonious mental development" of all, gave place to the new ideal of the development of the individual capacities, tastes, and powers of each.

In my opinion, the question of the respective merit of the two systems resolves itself into the simpler question of the merit of the two ideals. With the view now of throwing some light upon this problem, and of provoking fruitful thought and discussion, I suggest for consideration the following facts.

1. It is undeniable that special mental aptitudes occur in youth, even from the very beginning of the college course. It is equally true, no doubt, that all boys have minds that are essentially the same; but I think it is within every teacher's experience that certain boys possess or develop extraordinary taste or ability along special lines.

2. It is to the interest of society, as well as to the interest of the student himself, that such aptitudes should be fostered and developed, for upon their development must depend, very largely, the further progress of knowledge and civilization.

3. The cultivation of special aptitudes of the kind, if right and desirable at all, should not be neglected in the college. The college cannot shift the responsibility onto the university, on the ground that the latter is the place for specialization. The reason is that only a very small proportion of college graduates ever go to universities; and, moreover, the university courses themselves presuppose, on the part of the college student, some degree of concentration of studies. I have been

informed, on very trustworthy authority, that no graduate of a college in which the uniform curriculum obtains may hope for admittance to most of the courses in Johns Hopkins University, without an extra year or so for preparation; and this, not from prejudice, or any desire of discrimination, but simply from the student's unfitness for the highly specialized work of the university, through lack of necessary preliminary concentration.

4. In determining the ideal, the life-purpose of the student must be given consideration. This is a practical age, and the college of to-day must not only turn out cultured gentlemen, but must enable a young man to fit himself, if need be, for some useful career in life. Since the great majority of college graduates never go to a university or professional school, it is plain that, in their case, at least, the college must do this work, if it is to be done at all. With the onward march of civilization, and the increasing diversity of intellectual occupations, the demands upon the college in this way will also be likely to increase. It is to the merit of the elective system that it lends itself readily to any preparation of the kind that may be desired.

5. The values commonly assigned to educational subjects are not fixed and invariable, but may and do vary with the nature of the mind that is to be educated. Given, for instance, a boy with a strong taste for letters. Some educators say you must develop all the powers of his mind harmoniously; and, accordingly, they give him the classics and English for expression, history for reflection, the sciences for observation, mathematics for ratiocination, and so on. The question is, however, might not such a boy find better and more easily assimilated food for the same faculties in matters more cognate and congenial? Might he not find better exercise

for his reason in Goethe and Descartes, or Dante, than in differential calculus or mechanics? Might not a study of the growth and formation of a language—the study of Anglo-Saxon, for example,—prove a better training in observation for him than chemical analysis and higher physics? It is a matter of educational values—of values in the estimation of which, it seems to me, we cannot safely, in the present state of our knowledge, lose sight of the personal equation.

In view of these facts, I should give an affirmative answer to the question: "Is election of studies in the curricula of our colleges desirable?"

The adoption of the elective principle would involve absolutely no change, necessarily, in that which constitutes the distinctive and essential prerogative of Catholic education—the Christian atmosphere. It would involve no abandonment of the principle of unity of studies, which Catholic educators have rightly clung to so tenaciously; for by either the "Group" or the "Princeton" elective system, as I have shown, whatever the details of practical operation the essentials of unity may be preserved. It would mean little practical difficulty in the way of increase of teaching staff or expense, inasmuch as many of our colleges already have advanced classes in the sciences and mathematics. Add to these the modern languages and philosophy, and you have at once a good outline for a course in general science. Indeed, it was shown in a paper read here last year that not far from one-half as much time is given at present to mathematics and science, in a large number of Catholic colleges as is given in leading non-Catholic colleges to all the studies of the general science course.

The adoption of the elective principle will relieve our colleges from the pressure of a curriculum which

is already overcrowded and to which a steadily increasing number of new subjects, such as modern languages, the political and social sciences, are clamoring for admittance. It will tend to raise the standard of scholarship, both in professors and pupils, by making possible enthusiasm for congenial work. "A crowded curriculum," it has been well said, "is a curriculum of superficialities, where men are forever occupied with alphabets and multiplication tables."* It will go far, I believe, towards checking the terrible drain of our best blood and brains to non-Catholic institutions. It was shown here very clearly last year that this tendency is in the nature of a drift—a strong and steady drift from the public high schools, where most Catholic lads get their preparatory training, into the non-Catholic colleges and State universities. Can we reasonably hope to check this drift until we remove from our colleges the barrier of broader demands with narrower opportunities? The adoption of the principle of election of studies will bring our college system into harmony with those of the most enlightened and progressive nations of the Old World, as well as with the best and most conservative non-Catholic educational opinion here at home. The policy of "splendid isolation" is fraught with grave embarrassments and dangers.

Catholic educators have kept alive the spirit of the ancient culture in an age in which the ruthless excesses of modern tendencies threatened its extinction. The world will yet be grateful for the service. In an educational way, it may be said, they have done what the old religious copyists did in the days of barbarism. But to-day the work is done. The lesson has had its effect. There are no stronger advocates of classical culture now than the descendants of the men who would

* Palmer, *Andover Review*, 5, 396.

have destroyed it. To continue to cling to the old system in face of the new conditions would be just as unreasonable, in my opinion, as for the men of olden time to have continued to copy after the invention of printing.

A very spirited discussion followed the reading of this paper.

Rev. Father Fagan, S. J., of Georgetown University, said: There is no doubt that the arguments presented for the elective system of studies was a very strong one, in theory at least. He referred to the address delivered in Chicago some six weeks before by the President of the University of California, who said that we are going on entirely wrong lines. University men desiring to give fictitious values sometimes to their own branches have made strenuous efforts to force upon the mind of the public the value of their particular branches, and to do that they try to force them down into the lower schools. This, he said, was the origin or the explanation of the Elective System. Dr. Wheeler asserted that this was entirely wrong in principle, and productive of great evils. He did not use the word "Electivism" or "Elective" once, and this was remarkable, because at that same meeting President Eliot in the opening address said that one of the three great achievements in education was the principle of Electivism, which the world has been forced to believe is right. Dr. Wheeler opposed election in a high school course, and did not believe even in groups. He favored one course to be continued right through, even till the students got into the university, and would allow no election, except, perhaps, at the top. He also said that he did not want specialists, as specialists are one-sided men. What we want is men of power, who after their college course are able to take up anything and achieve success.

Father Fagan dwelt at some length upon the importance of classics. He said that we have always recognized the necessity of having commercial courses, classical courses, and, perhaps, something in the nature of mechanical courses. We have all recognized electivism that far, but he was opposed to the principle of electivism which asserts that every branch of knowledge has in given circumstances the same educational power. It is wrong for the sake of the special boy to throw our whole course into confusion. Electivism as a principle results in half educated, superficial men. On many sides to-day we find men raising their voices against electivism, and giving their opinion of the evils that result from it. He referred to the meeting of principals in New York four years ago, when all of them denounced the elective system.

Rev. Father Schrantz commended the paper of Father Burns in some respects, but agreed very fully with what Father Fagan had said. He stated that the Prussian School of Permission some years ago drew up a report after examination of the various systems in vogue in Germany, and after taking the testimony of university professors regarding the proficiency of gymnasium candidates who had come to the universities, and decided that it would be wise to abolish the course in Germany, that is, the real gymnasia course, which was a compromise between the strictly classical and the strictly scientifical.

Rev. Father Kavanaugh, Notre Dame, said that the argument of Father Fagan was largely that of authority. It seems strange that if the body of American educators have finally discovered the principle of electivism as false, they have succeeded remarkably well in concealing that fact in their catalogues. No one questions the extreme advantages of Latin and

Greek as absolute essentials in education, but their essential character as evidenced in liberal education is not a self-evident proposition, and no attempt has been made to prove it. Father Burns condemns as heartily as any one present the structural principle of electivism prevalent in Harvard and fostered by that institution, but Father Burns' argument was for a very restricted principle of electivism controlled and managed by the faculty of the institution, permitting the student a reasonable freedom of choice, while yet maintaining the necessary adherence to the curriculum.

Rev. Father Dowling, of Creighton University, said that if there is a great demand for elective studies, he is at a loss to explain the fact brought out by the Commissioner of Education, in a report published in 1898, from which it appears that within the last nine years there has been an increase of 194 per cent. of those who are studying Latin, or twice as great an increase as the entire enrollment of students. In 1888–90 21 per cent. of the students that were enrolled studied physics, and in 1897–98, 20 per cent., showing a falling off in these elective studies. In chemistry, 9 per cent. of the total number of students studied that branch; in 1889–90, and nine years later, 8 per cent. and a fraction; in 1889–90, 4.32 per cent. selected Greek, and in 1897–98, 45, showing an increase. The rate of increase in the number of students pursuing such subjects as Latin, Greek, history, German, and French far exceeds the rate of increase of the total enrollment. This would indicate that there is not so great a demand for elective studies as we would think.

Rev. Father Burns said that Father Dowling's arguments would make for the opposite. It would seem in secondary schools that there has been a large increase

in Latin, German, French, and history. The question is, how can these subjects, as well as the more mod-modern requirements, be got into the prescribed curriculum? There is an increased demand for German, French, and other modern subjects, as Father Dowling shows. With our curriculum overcrowded, it seems difficult to give due recognition to these subjects under the old conditions.

Rev. Father Conway, of Washington, said he thought this did not show either for or against electivism. There has been an increase in the number of colleges which demand Latin and Greek, as also in French and German, because these colleges prescribe these studies.

Rev. Father Butler, O. F. M., of Allegheny, said he thought it was necessary to be very careful in allowing young men to choose their own studies, because they are at an age when it is difficult for them to determine what will be their future course in life. We must place before them the plain fact that they come to the college to get an education, and that education calls for more than they would be likely to choose. Students are very apt to make it easy for themselves, and thereby render their education deficient.

Rev. Father Delurey, O.S.A., of Villanova, reminded the Conference that in his paper he pleaded that specialization be restricted to the university, which is the only place for elective studies. The college is for the full or perfect development of man. If we introduce electivism into the college, it will introduce itself into the preparatory school. He contended for the election of studies, only when a young man has entirely finished, or nearly finished, his college course.

Rev. Father Burns said that Father Delurey was giving a new ideal to the colleges, namely, that of a preparatory school to the university. The college is a

distinct department of study. It existed long before there was any university. The Commissioner of Education, in one of his recent reports, showed that only about one college graduate out of seventeen goes to the university for university work proper. A considerable number go to professional schools. Not more than one fifth to one eighth of college graduates go to either university or professional schools. The college should stand by itself with its own ideals, and should work for the great body of the students who appertain to it.

Rev. Father Cassily, S. J., of Chicago, said the question was one of principle. There was danger of getting the work mixed up—the college doing part of the university work and the university doing part of the college work. We all admit optional studies, at least a number of them, and in all colleges there is a certain form of electivism.

Rev. Father Burns referred to Father Schrantz's allusions to the Prussian School Commission, and said that the Real Gymnasia course in Germany has two chief characteristics—it is, first, in the nature of a compromise, and second, it is superficial. It is an attempt to combine the classical with the scientifical. The consequence is that it is a crowded curriculum, and requires a larger number of hours of study per week than any other system in Germany. It resembles that of our Catholic colleges, which contain Latin and Greek as the essentials of the old curriculum, and mathematics and science as representative of the scientifical. The consequence is that our course is overcrowded. These two points will establish a very marked resemblance between the Catholic college curriculum and the curriculum condemned in Germany as inefficient.

The Right Rev. Chairman said that it was well to bear in mind that our Catholic colleges have a double class of students—one preparing for the seminary life

and the priesthood and the other for professional and business life. Yet the work of our Catholic colleges until recent years has been largely called for by the first class. An examination of seminary conditions will show us that more Latin and Greek, rather than less, are needed in our curriculum. The demands of professional schools, until recently, have been largely on the same lines, while the theory that underlies our entire curriculum bases itself upon the classics as necessary to the best ideals of a liberal education, no matter what duties in life a man may afterwards enter. The demands of business or of specialized study are strong demands upon our college work, and it is certain that oftentimes the question of finance enters largely into the ability of a college to put up different courses, according to the demands of the student. While standing for the essentials, as we regard them, of a liberal education, I am sure our colleges are prepared to adapt themselves to modern conditions. We must be unwilling to do anything to lessen the foundations of the future structure of ecclesiastical and professional education, which it is our duty to protect. He suggested that some practical result might be obtained through a committee, who might prepare a resolution for the Conference to consider. This suggestion was adopted by the Conference, and the Chairman appointed as a committee Father Brosnahan, Father Burns and Doctor Carroll to make such suggestions as it might deem wise, before adjournment.

Remarks were made by Father Dowling with regard to a certain freedom which should be allowed to institutions to follow electivism, if they thought it would be wise.

Rev. Father Higgins, representing St. Ignatius' College, San Francisco, thought it would be well to express

the opinion that the fundamental mistake in the extreme system of electivism is in thinking that there is a perfect equivalent in the educational value of the studies which may be adopted, recommended or allowed, and the studies which have been followed in the old Catholic system.

Rev. Father Schrantz suggested that two things be adopted. First, that the aim of the college be to prepare students for higher university studies, for the professions, for everything that requires the full college course ; and second, that the old so-called Catholic system answers that end best, or, at least, it is the best means we know to attain that end.

Rev. Father Conway said that he thought it was not the duty of a committee to build up any system, or propose any system, but rather that they should approve this system of election. The duty of the committee is to give its view of electivism.

The Right Rev. Chairman then proposed to the Conference the recommendation of the Standing Committee with regard to the articles of association, which the Secretary read. Consideration of the articles was laid over until the next day, the only remark made being that of Father Kavanaugh, who said that he thought the Association should be broad enough to admit of Monsignor Conaty's membership. If confined strictly to an association of colleges it might deprive them of his services as Chairman, which would be regretted by all. The word "universities" was then added. The Right Rev. Chairman explained at length the bearing of the different articles, and thought it would be well to have copies printed, so that the members might be able to carefully consider each article. This was ordered by the Conference. At 5 p. m. the Conference adjourned.

EVENING SESSION.

In the evening, at 8 o'clock, the delegates and friends assembled in the school hall to hear the annual address of the Right Rev. President. The hall was filled. Among the audience were many of the clergy and teachers of the schools of Chicago. Monsignor Conaty spoke on the Teacher. He said:

In this second Conference we meet one another again to consider in greater detail the demands of collegiate instruction, to weigh the relative importance of studies to be followed, to discuss methods of teaching, so that matter and method may combine in furnishing that education which will best fit our students to enter successfully the field of life and bear themselves creditably as men and Christians. But while we consider the improvement of our school methods, and a more careful grouping of studies, it is proper that we should not lose sight of the most important element in our educational work—the teacher. It is trite to say, and yet it cannot be emphasized too strongly, that the teacher makes the school; in fact, the teacher is the school. The best methods are but accessories, the most elegant buildings are but shelters, the most finely equipped laboratories are but tool rooms; language itself is but an instrument of expression—the storing strength, the radiating light, the motive power are centered in the teacher. The first requisite for success in school or college is a corps of teachers, well trained and qualified to teach, so that the students may see in each a true master.

The whole question of our collegiate life may be said to hinge upon the college teacher. His vocation to the work,

his ability, his preparation, devotedness, earnestness in improving himself—all these are vital elements in any teacher, but particularly in one consecrated to secondary instruction. In presence of so many able teachers, men of ability, whose vocation presupposes a special preparation, I might be excused from pleading the cause of the teacher. On the other hand, the peculiar conditions of the youthful mind as it passes from the preparatory school training to the broader fields of collegiate opportunities; the scholarship necessary to lead up to the heights of classical and scientific learning, the familiarity with the historical relations existing between the past and the present of collegiate education, the intimate acquaintance henceforth necessary, with the beginnings of the principal literatures, the kind of knowledge needed to unfold in a healthy manner the mind and heart of our beloved students, the sense that the college is now, as ever, a training ground for the grave duties of life—all these reasons, and many more, urge us to dwell a little while on the theme of the collegiate teacher, if only to refresh our own minds and hearts in considerations that have not waited for us to press themselves on the attention of Catholic teachers.

The call and the choice of a man to the office of teacher do not of themselves ensure his success. The best dispositions in the world, even that high symbol, the religious habit, are not guarantees of success in teaching. The teacher must possess sufficient knowledge; still more, he must possess the power of imparting that knowledge. There must be matter and method, or, better still, instruction and personality. Alcuin, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas had vocations acknowledged by all; but they had also knowledge, and this knowledge they loved intensely, and lived only to scatter it broadcast in the lives of their fellows. They had explored all the known realms of thought and were competent guides for the provinces of learning through which they were to lead. Sunshine, and not shadow; hope, and not despair; encourage-

ment, helpfulness, instruction, skill came in abundance to their pupils. God gave them vocation; but by hard and persistent study, in the spirit of that vocation, they acquired the knowledge which they taught to others, so that to have sat at their feet became the highest and surest token of intellectual nobility.

Knowledge does not come by intuition, nor does a vocation to the higher life of the Spirit of itself imply aptness to teach in college. A life imbued with aspirations to spiritual perfection is indeed a suitable background for the development of knowledge. For one who wishes, for the common good, to exhaust the natural abilities with which God has gifted him, it is also a permanent inspiration Acquired knowledge is a most essential requisite for the teacher, and this can only come through special training, which in turn demands years of preparation that are indeed amply repaid by results as they appear in a conscientious and enlightened mankind.

To lose no time, let us say that in the college-world of to-day there is a general and just demand for teachers trained according to the methods and temper of the University. As a matter of fact the number of teachers thus trained is constantly increasing. Usually they are doctors of philosophy; sometimes they are specialists constantly working upward to higher grades of erudition. Students are thus assured of getting the actual best; the university which gave these teachers their degrees follows them with interest, and is morally certain that the students who may be sent up to her from college are prepared according to the ideals of the university itself. To-day the teacher who has only the preparation of a collegiate course, or who feels that as a college graduate he is entitled to take up the tasks of a college teacher, will find himself everywhere handicapped by comparison with the work of men who have had the advantage of a special university instruction for the teacher's chair. As now the great majority of our Catholic college graduates enter the learned

professions, they have a moral right, on the part of the teachers, to the best in educational progress enjoyed by their fellow-men in the same callings, in order that they may be fitted to take up professional studies on an equal level, and enter the arena of life with equal academic advantages. The general advance in the demand for specially trained teachers in elementary and preparatory schools, compels the conclusion that every college teacher should be equipped with the erudition, practical skill, and powers of self-help that ordinarily are bestowed only by the men who are the highest in their special sciences, and who from time immemorial have usually been found in the chairs of the university.

I am not unmindful of the debt of gratitude we owe to those college teachers of the past, the self-sacrificing, simple-minded, scholarly men who trained whole generations without the advantages of modern methods, or the opportunities of university preparation; who gave up their lives in poorly equipped schools and colleges, working as it were, between dawn and daylight, the pioneers and engineers of the modern scholastic world. They did splendid work in educating; they laid the foundations of our recent successes; they sent forth men of heart who yet lead in Church and State. Their names in many instances are known only to God, but they had a genuine love for learning coupled with sincere devotion to the interests of religion. They lived not for the praises of men, but to do their plain duty. A holy consecration has fallen upon their labors. Though they were men for the times in which they lived, they would be the first to recognize the new conditions of Catholic pedagogy, and to confess that if we would maintain our historic reputation we must be well equipped along all approved modern lines, in order to meet the just demands of a Catholic people constantly progressing in comfort and culture.

The age is constantly clamoring for ideals, and we seek the ideal in the teacher, mindful that the reality will fall far short of what the work of teaching demands.

The ideal teacher is one who has vocation to teach, and this implies aptitude. Teachers, like poets, may surely be said to be born and not made. They have a mission to teach—they are sent with a message to intellect and heart. They are the bearers of truths that are to fructify in the lives of men. Their duty is to preserve and embellish life, not to repress or extinguish it. Fitted to teach by a thorough mastery of the science they love, their one desire should be to have others love it. The teacher is not merely a listener to lessons learned by rote; he is not a slave to the text-book as a finality in instruction; he is also a developer of intellect as well as character, a spur to the student's activity, an awakening, a light-bearer, a guide; he is one to teach the mind how to recognize and to use its faculties; he is one capable of crediting to the student what he has taught him to find. The teacher is one who forces us to realize the possessions hidden within us, showing how to make use of them. He must be on fire himself, if he would stir up a consuming fire in the lives of others.

Then, too, the teacher himself should be forever a scholar, for the sake of his youthful disciples, as well as for his own enjoyment. The finished mechanic must know every part of his machinery, the models to be followed in its creation, the use of all needed or helpful tools, so that his work may be regarded as the product of a master. We often realize the absence of art-skill in the work done by an amateur with a pencil, brush, chisel, or tool. We see a gross and unartistic product, and we turn from it with pity, regret, perhaps disgust. We sit, however, for hours before a master's canvas, finding new beauties each moment. No less than the master-mechanic or the perfect artist, the college teacher should stand for system, time, method, labor, and pains in education. He ought to be always the finished product of other men in his own line, who while clinging to the best that the experience of the past furnishes, yet have eyes and hearts ever open to the gains and advances of each succeeding generation.

The first requisite for a college teacher should be a thorough modern and critical knowledge of the subjects to be taught. If, for example, he be a teacher of languages, ancient or modern, he ought to possess more than the ability to translate an author or to construe a text grammatically—he ought to have an intimate acquaintance with the subject-matter taught. Let the same stand for the natural sciences, philosophy, or literature. One of the first requisites of a good teacher, then, is accurate scholarship. But to-day any scholarship worthy of the name implies some acquaintance with the science of education, readiness to learn from the experience of others, to profit by their successes or failures. In order to develop this full and accurate scholarship nothing should be left undone to prepare the teacher thoroughly for his great work. Teachers of recognized abilities in touch with the best methods of teaching and familiar with the accepted results of scientific research, each in his own department, should be his masters.

A second requisite is ability to impart knowledge—otherwise the accurate scholarship is like a mine of precious metal, hidden in the bowels of the earth. It is trite to say that a man may be very learned, yet a very indifferent teacher. Aptness for teaching implies the power of awakening interest. If there be no personal interest, on the part of the disciple, the seed of learning will be like that thrown upon land through which no plow has passed. Hence, the teacher-candidate should be well tested beforehand ; he ought not to be allowed to experiment, at the expense of the student.

After all, it was not mere knowledge, nor perfections of method that made the great teachers. It was their personality, in which was symbolized love for knowledge and ability to impart it. It was the fact that realizing the dignity and nobility of their calling they had thoroughly possessed the truth for themselves and were anxious that the whole world should know it in its fullness and beauty. It is

personality that educates. Personality is the very soul of the teacher. It is a subtle influence, like the joy or sorrow that are communicated from face to face, from heart to heart. From the soul of such a teacher, there shines a living flame that enters into us, vivifies, fashions, and transforms us into one with him. Even as the disciples at Emmaus found their hearts burn as Christ spoke, so, in a measure, should the student feel the influence of the true teacher. We never forget that it is the living voice one loves to hear, the living hand one loves to touch; the master who has really lived for us is the one teacher we never cease to love. Ability, willingness, are not enough. The successful teacher must have enthusiasm. There must be, in himself, a love for his work, a passion, as it were, to have all who come in contact with him love his work as well as he loves it himself. This enthusiasm must be permanent, for when it dies out in a teacher, his usefulness is at an end; it is time for retirement. Such an enthusiasm must have its roots in a passionate love for the truth confided to us, for only truth can stimulate this extraordinary communicative passion of action which we call enthusiasm. "This enthusiasm," said Dr. Schaepman, the eloquent Dutch orator, in the Catholic Congress at Brussels (1894), "is a peculiar state of the soul which impels man to more than ordinary activity and which is accompanied by a joy whose intensity springs from the very passion of doing. Even when intermittent, such enthusiasm can create great things, but when it passes into habit, it is the true well-spring of those forceful natures who accomplish marvels for the cause of God and humanity."

As Francis Bacon says, in his Essay on Truth, "Truth, which only doth judge itself, teacheth that the inquiry of truth, which is the lovemaking or wooing of it, the knowledge of truth, which is the presence of it, and the belief of truth, which is the enjoying of it, is the sovereign good of human nature." Again he tells us that "certainly it is heaven upon

earth to have a man's mind move in charity, rest in providence, and turn upon the poles of truth."

We cannot insist sufficiently upon the importance of the spirit of religion in our teacher, that he may be a fitting instrument in the work of Christian education. He should be a religious man, thoroughly impregnated with correct principles of Christianity, a man of example as well as precept, a man of faith, a man of virtuous life. Example is needed even more for youth than for childhood. He should be thoroughly grounded not only in the habits of religious conduct, but also in the great basic principles of religion. The war is now between the natural and the supernatural, between paganism and Christianity. This world, even in the sense condemned by Jesus Christ, is being regarded as all sufficient. Too often commercialism rather than conscience rules. Men are growing to care very little for God, judgment, immortality,—yet these are the eternal principles which underlie Christianity. The Christian teacher must, therefore, not only know but believe, not only believe in the principles of his religion, but live accordingly if he would bring out the native religious tendencies in students. He must be reverent of God and holy things, an habitually devout man, if he would lead pupils to admire and follow the life inculcated by the Gospel. The teacher who has ceased to recognize the God of Christian revelation and the traditional principles of the Christian religion, cannot be accepted as the ideal teacher of Christian youth. The teacher's office is *per se* endowed with sanctity. It is a ministry of God exercised in the class-room. Justinian calls even the legal profession a priesthood of truth, inasmuch as laws rest on justice and equity and inculcate the same. For that matter, all mankind has recognized that there is no social calling more sacred than that of moulding souls to higher and better things.

The teacher enters upon his task with that measure of influence and power which come to him from his age, his acquirements, his years of preparation, his knowledge, all of which

entitle him to respect. To this there correspond on the part of the pupil an absolute devotedness to truth, an unbounded confidence in the teacher, and an ardent desire for knowledge. Needless to say that in return for this absolute devotion the teacher should have a well-developed mind, that a personal magnetism should be visible in his relations with his students, that his own life should express and confirm the morality which he teaches,—in a word, that he should be a living influence, a speaking inspiration, an ingenious helpfulness to all who come in contact with him. The true teacher ought never to part from a pupil without feeling that the best in his life has gone out from him and has entered the heart of another. It was this that made Plato the worthy disciple of Socrates, that gave St. John the insight into the Divine Master's heart, that creates in every age historians, poets, philosophers. It is the distinctive individual element in the teacher more than any system that in all ages of scholarship has made the master live in his pupil. As Newman so well says: "An academical system without the personal influence of teachers upon pupils is an Arctic winter. It will create an icebound, petrified, cast-iron university, and nothing else. Influence precedes law, personality precedes system. With influence there is life, without there is none." The general history of education shows us clearly that great teachers, coming as they did from distant countries to centers of learning, depended not on kings and great men for their support, but on the enthusiasm they created.

Had all our college teachers enthusiasm, ability to produce, success in development, power to instill love for study, we would not have to deplore so many half finished, half educated men, who have really wasted valuable years, and yet among whom you find some who think an A. B. degree entitles them to the everlasting gratitude of the world of scholarship. They will always be at a disadvantage, in the outside and broader world, in which they aspire to posts of honor and emolument, and for which they think they have been fully prepared. They

had every right to expect that preparation; and when it has not been imparted, the whole system of their training is made to bear the blame, while the agents and not the system are responsible.

The teacher has always been held in honor among men. All nations, all peoples, at all times have loved and respected him. What a chapter might be written on the teachers who have influenced mankind, from Nineveh to Jerusalem, from Athens to Rome, from Iona to St. Gall, from Paris to Oxford, from Leipsic to Louvain. From academic groves to synagogues, from cathedral schools to monasteries, and universities and colleges, there is a long unbroken line of philosophers, doctors, monks and nuns, men of religious communities and members of the diocesan clergy, all teachers who have contributed to the education of mankind. They are indeed the "Immortals," belonging to no one race, no one country, but kinsmen of all in the kingdom of intellect and truth. Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, stand even now in the streets of Athens to teach mankind their ideas of philosophy. Galen, Archimedes, Euclid still give luster to the Alexandrine Museum; Pantaenus, Clement and Origen still appear in the School of St. Mark. The great Cappadocians transferred to Christianity the noble inheritance which they received from the City of the Violet Crown. Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, are the central figures of the University of Paris, fit successors of Augustine, Columbanus, Benedict, Alcuin and Bernard. After the Reformation, St. Cajetan, founder of the Theatines; St. Ignatius, founder of the Jesuits, and Blessed de la Salle keep alive the traditions of that teaching power by which the world has preserved its civilization. Nor can we overlook the superior work done for education in the fifteenth century by the Brothers of the Common Life in the Netherlands. Under the ægis of Christianity men and women in every age have consecrated their lives in the classroom for the education of youth. The story of university, college and

school is generally the story of an individual teacher founding the institution and of a corps of teachers taking up with enthusiasm the work begun by one in faith and hope and charity. Many such have an enduring niche in the world's great Hall of Fame—an Aquinas, a Copernicus, a Bernard of Chartres, a Canisius, a Newton, a Fénélon, a La Place, an Arnold, a Humboldt, an Agassiz, a Secchi, a Pasteur, an Edison, these and their similars were teachers with living messages to humanity; they have burned these lessons deep into the daily life of some portion of mankind. Like Socrates, every one of them would rather write upon the hearts of living men than upon the skins of dead sheep.

Great teachers never die; their influence lasts forever; their very names are an inspiration. The annals of the universities that stand for the scholarship of the world are bright with the names of the teachers whose influence made students flock from all quarters. They knew men's nature, they understood child-character, as well as they knew their lexicons. They were not those pedants of whom Carlyle writes: "Who could give no kindling, because in their own inward man there is no live coal, but all is burned out to a dead grammatical cinder." The teacher has revolutionized the world with the mission of truth, he has educated mankind.

Yet we cannot be blind to the fact that not all teachers reach to this ideal. Certain results lead us to realize that our actual collegiate instruction has defects. To recognize and correct them is the reason for this gathering.

You are all aware of the constant references of the Presidents of many of our best universities to the deficiencies of collegiate and preparatory training. Something, therefore, must be wrong; and we do not wholly err in thinking that often these deficiencies may be traced to inefficient, unprepared, unscholarly teachers, whose life in the class room is an offence and a burden, not an inspiration; men without enthusiasm, personality or fitness; men out of place, a stumbling-block to

education; men remembered by students only to be pitied or despised. There is nothing sadder or more depressing than an incompetent teacher, especially when he is a man who, if placed in a position suitable to his gifts, might render admirable service. Right here, however, it may be well to say that often enough the blame laid upon teachers as incompetent should be visited upon the student who frequently pursues in an aimless, half-hearted way, courses for which he has no taste, when he is sent to college for social reasons or kept there against his will.

There is sometimes a danger that even well-trained teachers may be exposed to lack of opportunity for subsequent development. The training that prepares for admission to the teacher's office is, after all, but the first stage in this noble career. There must be a constant anxiety in the teacher to improve himself, to make himself daily more familiar with the progress of his science. There is danger in over-crowding the teacher with class-work. The cry comes more and more steadily from the capable ones that there is too little opportunity for private study and self-improvement, because of the multiplicity and diversity of tasks placed upon the teacher. For instance, he is obliged to handle a number of classes or grades in the same subject. This is not so bad in itself, except inasmuch as it absorbs the teacher's time and leaves him few spare hours for study. But this difficulty is aggravated when the same teacher is obliged to handle several different subjects, usually uncorrelated. We can easily recall good teachers, who were obliged in the same week, and sometimes in the same day, to teach Latin, Greek, Arithmetic, not to speak of other absorbing and time-robbing cares. The time spent in correcting themes, in surveillance, or in doing special work outside his class proper, may advance the general welfare of the college,—but it is depressing, and, to a certain extent, damaging to the teacher's ability to do that thorough work the student has a right to expect.

In our colleges teachers are often changed from one subject to another, as though the very fact of belonging to a faculty enabled them to give instruction in any science. Our college authorities should see to it that the teacher be, to some extent, a specialist. He need not be a specialist after the type of the university professor. He does need to possess a more than ordinary acquaintance with the history and actual status of the science which he assumes to teach, he ought to be familiar with the relations that obtain between elementary, undergraduate and graduate instruction in that particular science, and to have a working knowledge of the methods by which research work is pursued, as well as ability to bring the student in regard, both to mental development and to positive knowledge, just to the point where he is ready for the advanced work of the university. If such specialization be accepted as a requisite in every good college teacher, and it seems to me there can be no question about it, the teaching of any one science is enough for any one man. Therefore, the college teacher ought to be allowed, nay, ought to be encouraged to perfect himself after he has entered on his allotted work. If this be neglected, a merited promotion to anything higher, with any probability of successful result, is out of the question. He will become a man of routine, and with an accepted routine life all enthusiasm, all progress must die.

It is too true that the drudgery of the class-room is apt to blot out enthusiasm. From *rosa* to *fecerim* is not a pleasant journey, and the oil burned in correcting themes of embryo Latinists or expressionless compositions is apt to bring such fatigue, mental and physical, as stifles enthusiasm, so little tangible compensation is there for conscientious toil. Yet some one must drudge that Jack may make his class. Nevertheless, system and method often minimize the drudgery, and the dullest matter may be made interesting by a teacher who has the spirit of his vocation.

Let the teacher be provided with the acknowledged means of improving himself. You cannot make bricks without straw; neither can a teacher improve himself without access to the thoughts of men who have added and are daily adding to the science of which he is a teacher. Our Catholic teachers should have at hand all works that contain the ancient traditions of the Church on the work of teaching. She is the oldest teaching force in our civilization. She has had the constant presence of the Holy Ghost with her, to guarantee her public office of teacher of divine truth. Her teaching is the most continuous, self-identical, and cosmopolitan that the world has yet seen. Her teaching traditions are venerable and still capable of inspiring future generations with the love of all knowledge. One may see of her as was said of Solomon: "Magnifice enim tractabat sapientiam."

There should be an intense devotion to Christianity as the perfection not only of religious, but of all social and political endeavor. Christianity is essentially a teaching,—a revealed teaching, it is true,—yet it carries with it a multitude of useful materials assimilated from Greek and Roman culture. It has idealized all human thought and human learning, as Christ Himself has idealized our human nature by assuming it to Himself and cleansing and perfecting it. So, in a measure, did the Church, in her own way, take what was good in paganism and adopt it as her own.

Pedagogics are not of recent discovery. The Church has never neglected to give special training to the teacher to whom youth has been confided. At all times, from the pens of ecclesiastical teachers works have appeared treating of the instruction of those called to government, thus showing her desire to instill correct principles in the leaders of the people. From Cassiodorius and the Irish Sedulius, the famous teacher at Liège and Pavia, down to the De Regimine Principum of Perrault, and the De Magistro of St. Thomas, she has been extremely interested in the theory of instruction as well as in

its practice. The famous Benedictine Mabillon, writing on monastic studies, shows that the spirit of Columbanus and Benedict still actuated the preparation for monastic teaching, while the great Angel of Schools, in the just mentioned treatise, shows the true principles that underlie all teaching and are the source of the teacher's authority and responsibility. The great teaching orders of the Church, so well represented at this Conference, have, in their annals, a rich mine of pedagogic wealth, with which all Catholic teachers should be familiar. Indeed, from the early days of the Monks of the West, teaching has been a prominent feature of religious orders, and the traditions of each order are the combined experience of many experienced and holy men, through the centuries. The education of religious has also been an object of deepest concern to the Church, which has always looked upon the great orders as powerful agents in the work of teaching. Reference need be made here to but one example, that of Cardinal von Fürstenberg, Prince Bishop of Münster, who at the end of the last century issued a very remarkable document containing directions for the academic formation of the religious orders in his diocese. Benedictine, Augustinian, Franciscan, Dominican, and Jesuit annals and codes of discipline bear witness to the constant formation of numerous members to the highest ideals of the teaching office. Their rules often contain the best pedagogic principles of education, and challenge even to-day the admiration of all fair-minded students of that science.

If there is any weakness in our teachers, we are confident it is not inherent, but is often due to external circumstances. If we may say here a word of criticism, it arises from our very desire for progress and perfection. We are never afraid to criticise nor to be criticised,—we learn as much from the conduct of the Church in her synods and councils. Constructive and kindly criticism is a step to improvement, a sign of progress. We have had tremendous disadvantages during

the century just closing, especially in the English-speaking world, and it is to our credit that in spite of penal laws and social ostracism and without State aid, we have built up a magnificent educational system, which to-day is prepared to successfully compete with all others. But new conditions make new demands, and we should be satisfied with nothing short of the best in teaching equipment. Judging from conventions and magazine articles we are not alone in complaint and criticism.

A complaint is heard that sufficient attention is not given to our lay element as a teaching force. The Church has always recognized the splendid work done by laymen. Many of her apologists, at the very dawn of Christianity, were devoted, educated laymen. In our own day, they stand in the front rank and struggle for all the just demands of the Church. De Maistre in France, Donoso Cortes in Spain, De Rossi in Italy, Ambrose Philipps de Lisle and Frederick Lucas in England, Görres, Windhorst, Mallinckrodt and the two Reichenspergers in Germany, Deteux, Malou and Bernaart in Belgium, O'Connell in Ireland, gaining freedom from religious proscription for the Catholics of Great Britain, Brownson in America,—all were teachers of the people, defending in the public arena, before all nations, the best traditions of the Church. What would be left if their lives and works were blotted from the annals of nineteenth century Catholicism? The Church is not a caste, but a living, organic body—"A body," as St. Paul says, "compacted and fitly joined together." The noble office of teacher is ever open to the layman, who may justly wear in society the magisterial pallium, and take his place as a defender and illustrator of Catholic truths. There is now a great, well-educated body of Catholic laymen who seek and deserve a place in our educational work. The experience of the University, where the layman is associated with the ecclesiastic in trusteeship, in the administration and the faculties, as well as in the

student body, may well encourage us in this respect. In all the universities established or controlled by the Church, laymen have ever been welcome, and have been among the most efficient and famous of her teachers.

The schoolmaster has always been the object of special favors and dignity. After the pastor he was the chief man of the parish, freed from taxation and military service. According to the laws of the General Assembly of France, in 1685, he was clothed with surplice, incensed in the church, holding a place of honor above all the laity, even the aristocracy of the parish. One may read in the first volume of Janssen's "History of the German People" how great was the consideration paid him in the course of the fifteenth century. A most interesting chapter is that which tells of the honor paid to him among all nations. Lack of means has been our principal excuse in not associating laymen with us, but now that new interests develop generosity, we may hope soon to see our colleges utilize the learning of our laymen as teachers with whom we shall be proud to be associated.

I must not fail, therefore, to enter a plea for the Catholic layman as a teacher in our colleges. While the great majority of our teachers are ecclesiastics, there is a growing element of educated Catholic laymen whose ambition and taste lead them towards the teacher's desk. Graduates of our colleges, trained in normal school and university, they rightly hope to find opportunities to teach in our colleges. They are prepared to consecrate their lives to the teacher's vocation. In them, are elements of strength and assurance of success. We should utilize their talents, their experience, and their devotedness. There is in them a sympathy for youth, a keen understanding of the conditions of student life, a closer acquaintanceship with its real sentiments and dispositions. The lay element in the management of our colleges, and in our teaching corps, adds strength to our management and gives confidence to the business elements of our communities. It also contributes to more clearly

define the fact that our colleges are intended not merely as preparatory schools to seminaries, but also as fitting schools for the professions and ordinary demands of secular life. In all discussions on the teacher and the work of teaching, we cannot allow ourselves to overlook the splendid work done by our nuns and our Catholic women in every age. The demand for collegiate instruction for Catholic women has been heard on many sides in our own country, and the good nuns of Notre Dame of Namur, who follow the instructions of Blessed Peter Fouvier, stand ready to consecrate themselves to the work. Trinity College rises in our Capital to show the world the sympathy of the Church with the higher education of women under the guidance and inspiration of religion.

It is very evident that there is a strong disposition against the Catholic system. We are accused of unwillingness to seek improvement in our methods. Methods, after all, are only secondary, yet our system, I am sure, stands ready to follow the best. If it ask that these methods prove themselves the best, it is not an indication of hostility to improvement. There is so much of acknowledged "faddism" and experimentalism in modern methods of education that we are perfectly justified in the conservatism which demands a proof by results. Our duty is to educate, to send out young men who may take place among the best, training not only mind and hand, but heart and soul as well; give to society good men, good scholars, who bear about in their hearts a conscience for use in the home, in business, in professional and political life. If this be done, what matters the method? Method to the true teacher is often so much dry wood; yet method, the best method for results, is to be sought after. We all know from our own experience that if the teacher were one who taught us scholarship, we cared little about the mere surroundings.

To you, teachers of the collegiate system of our American Catholic Church, I would give a strong word of encourage-

ment. Your vocation is a high and noble one. Your mission is that of truth clearly seen, principles of life certainly known, the end and aim of life beyond all wavering opinion. Your views of education are very positively defined. You are not subjected to the whims and caprices of much of what is called pedagogy; you are not experimentalists in the purposes of education—though you are willing and free to try the best in all new methods. You are seekers after knowledge, not for knowledge's sake merely, but that it may lead you more surely to God. The Catholic whose life is consecrated to education should be the best teacher. His vocation demands the best equipment in human knowledge, in the things of science as well as in the things of religion. While I congratulate in you the successors of the great teachers who have illustrated Catholicism in the past, I know that you are not satisfied to sit idly in your chairs of teaching and waste time in chanting the glories of that past. You have the responsibility of the present and duty to the future. The Catholic college youth of our great country are looking to you for the education which will enable them to successfully compete for honors in every field of life. Look to it that you be faithful stewards of the great trust!

In this day of scientific preparation of teachers and of sharp competition between colleges for the student it behooves us as representatives of the Catholic Collegiate System to be in the front ranks, with a teaching equipment equal, if not superior, to all other systems. Commodious buildings, expensive laboratories and well-equipped gymnasiums are desirable, but above all and before all let us have well-prepared teachers. Our educational system is now complete. From kindergarten to university we are ready in this country, as never before, to do perfect educational work. The Catholic University, with its Pontifical charter and its corps of scientifically trained men, stands ready to fit the teachers for the classrooms of school and college.

I know the spirit of the University, and I can say for it that it holds nothing dearer than its interest in the teachers of our collegiate system, religious and lay, regular and diocesan. Its greatest anxiety is to contribute the best training which talent and experience can furnish, in fully equipping the teachers of our schools for the work to which they have consecrated themselves. The University feels that the superstructure on which it has to build, the education of priests and laymen, is furnished by our Catholic Colleges; hence it is bound by the closest relationship and deepest interest to all the parts of our educational system. The University exists largely that the colleges may be made capable of doing the best work, and the college in turn must shape that work so as to prepare men for the University. A common Catholic faith binds University and College, a common purpose actuates both, a common responsibility falls upon both. United, we have nothing to fear; divided, Catholic education must suffer. We have vocation, ability, aptitude, enthusiasm. We stand for the best educational ideals; our guide is the Church of God, who confides to us the message which alone will save society, honor our manhood, ennoble our citizenship, make scholars worthy of truth, and teachers worthy of education. You represent many different systems of collegiate work, yet you are a unit as Catholics, devoted to the true principles of life, and to that education which finds its perfection in the development of the intellect, in unison with and in conformity to the will of God.

The Catholic Church has always tolerated difference of rites, languages and customs,—so, too, she is not blindly devoted to any one system of teaching. Unity of purpose or even of system does not destroy individual effort,—but there is a unity imposed by undeniable perfections of science, political complexion of country and enlightened and just public opinion. Our different collegiate systems have had the experience of centuries in educational work. There is no desire in conferences such as this, to destroy their individuality, as there is

no desire to have our houses exactly alike,—but there may be brought, into each, whatever there is of benefit in the others.

Our plea then for the teacher is that he shall be prepared for his work by university training, that the range of his teaching shall be narrowed as far as possible to the special work for which he has been prepared,—or at most that he shall not be burdened except by studies correlated with his special work,—that time and opportunities be given to him for study, that he be provided with all that is helpful to him in the line of self perfection in his special studies. If this Conference have as one of its results a determination at whatever cost to place none but well-trained teachers in our college classes, I for one, am confident that we will have provided what is essential to a college worthy of the name.

THIRD SESSION.

On Thursday, at 10 A. M., the Conference opened its third session, the Right Rev. President in the chair. After prayer, the Very Rev. Patrick S. McHale, C. M., president of Niagara University, read a paper on

Religious Instruction in Colleges.

There is a striking passage in Isaias which seems to be startlingly verified in our own day: "Therefore is my people led away captive, because they had not knowledge, and their nobles have perished with famine; and their multitudes were dried up with thirst." But, is not science in honor? Is it not exalted? Do not the high priests of science worship in her temple and offer incense at her shrine? Are not all invited to come to her fountains, and drink and be filled? If, then, the people will but hearken, they need not fear captivity; for the air they breathe is impregnated with the freedom of science!

True freedom we hail in every guise. True science will always find the Catholic intellect responsive to its appeal. But, we must beg leave to reject as false all science that, of set purpose, leaves out God. Such science degrades rather than elevates; enslaves rather sets free. "Deus scientiarum Dominus" is not written upon the lintel of the modern hall of science. The result is what might be expected. God and His dispensation are either ignored altogether or quite effaced from the book of knowledge.

The changes which materialistic and agnostic science have wrought and are working in the moral and religious world are truly appalling. As an eloquent modern

writer aptly remarks: "The supernatural with its 'trailing clouds of glory,' recedes from our view; as we gaze, we perceive it—

'die away
And melt into the common light of day.'

"On every hand we witness what has been called 'the sad and terrible spectacle of a generation of men and women, professing to be cultivated, looking around in purblind fashion, and finding no God in the universe.'"

The same writer observes that "religion is becoming less a creed and more an emotion. It is passing from the region of persons and things to the domain of phrase and sentiment. It is no longer the great fact upon which the public order is based, but a private opinion or individual speculation."

Over against this "decay of truths from among the children of men" is required greater spiritual activity among children of the Faith, in the Church which has seen the intellectual vagaries of preceding centuries arise like the weed and break like the bubble—the Church, in which the Truth of God finds its only home on earth; its only propagator, its only defender.

If anything might be taken for granted in a Catholic college it would appear to be adequate religious instruction; for, Catholic educators at least and priests, as most of them are in our colleges, must be supposed to fully appreciate the need for their pupils, not of any religious instruction whatever, but of such instruction as will stand the test of the friction of a sceptical and materialistic age.

This is not a Catholic country. Nay, the prevailing sentiments, feelings, opinions as they find expression in newspaper, magazine, pamphlet and more pretentious volume, are often, if not designedly, at any rate un-

consciously anti-Christian. Catholic views, Catholic thought, Catholic ways of thinking, do not inform the masses; and much, if not most, of the literature and science of the day ignores or flatly denies the Christian dispensation.

Religious barriers are thrown down in the name of science. Who will set them up? The floodgates of a false philosophy have been opened. Who will stem the tide? In many high places of science and culture Christianity is looked upon as a myth, as an "outworn creed." Or it is so stripped of all dogmatic features as to be a vague, indefinite system, a weak, baseless morality. Heathenism hides its repulsive features under a learned name. Brutes obey it by instinct, man lowers himself to it because he wishes to cast off the restraint of a strict moral law, based upon true dogmatic teaching; because he ignores the fact of the original fall and of the consequent necessity of regeneration.

Indifferentism too stalks abroad even among some Catholics, whom it inoculates with an easy tolerance of error, forgetting that truth must ever be intolerant of falsehood. These systems and many others akin to them are in the air. They infect the atmosphere which our Catholic young men must breathe. In their most impressionable years, by association, by reading, by the glamour which surrounds great scientific names, our young men run great risk of either loosing their hold on Catholic truth, or at any rate of making dangerous compromises with error. The press discusses the most fundamental questions of religion, as if such subjects were still open to discussion; as if we were free to accept or dissent from them as we list.

Freedom of opinion on all subjects is proclaimed to be the birthright of every American; and this freedom

is extended to the realm of revealed truth, which is believed, or modified, or rejected according to the caprice or prejudice or passion of the individual. Now while honest inquiry into the teachings of the Faith is precisely what we court, we must guard our young men against the danger of being misled by the freedom of opinion on points of doctrine which is claimed by those who are not of the fold. The foundations of faith should be so well and firmly laid in the minds of our youth that they will not be shaken by sophistry or corrupted by error.

The solvent of free thought, with a great flourish of learning and "higher criticism," has reduced the Bible to a "rudis, indigestaque moles" of ancient myths and fragments of religion. What remains? Nothing but the living voice of a divinely appointed teacher, to vindicate the Word of God, and by profounder learning restore the Sacred Books to their place in the economy of Providence.

With the great "Rule of Faith" relegated to the region of fable, non-Catholic systems of Christianity must disintegrate and dissolve. What hope remains for the religion and morality of the country? Is it not abundantly evident that the only hope for the country's spiritual life lies in the leaven of Catholicity which energizes in the mass of our Catholic men in public life; in our merchants, professional men, statesmen; on the rostrum, in legislative hall, in federal congress? And, where, if not in the Catholic college will our young men receive sufficient moral and religious training for their mission?

The extent of religious instruction, then, which we are bound to impart to our students seems to be me to be indicated by the dangers to which their faith will be exposed when they take their place in social and

political life; by the liberal and indifferentist opinions set afloat on the current of literature; above all, by the exigencies of their position as Catholic men in an age whose spirit and tendency, in both theory and practice, are unspirited and hostile to the supernatural.

In Catholic countries, where there is little or no contact with heresy, where principles of faith dominate thought and action, where the Church influences domestic and social life, there may not be so great need of doctrinal exposition and proof; but where the spirit of agnosticism and of positive infidelity hovers, and spreads its dark wings, there is imperative need of an antidote to its blighting, withering power.

Religious instruction, such as the needs of our pupils and the circumstances of the age require, implies three things: First, laying the foundation; clearly and distinctly placing before the young mind the fundamental truths of revelation, as they are set forth by the only infallible organ of God's Truth on earth, showing their harmony and beauty, how they elevate and refine and transform the soul. The moral law and its sanction, the sacramental system, the dispensation of prayer, will be explained in their relations to human life and conduct. In the next place, we must be apologetic, clearly state difficulties and objections, and fully remove or refute them. Lastly, it must be our purpose to point the way to that higher life, to that term of Christian endeavor, which infinitely transcends the "vulgar range of low desire." The questions proposed by the committee will enable me to more fully develop these points.

The questions are these: Ought religious instruction to be classified and graded?—Methods of instruction?—How far should the catechism be taught in all classes?

The answers to these questions are briefly given in chapter V, No. 146, of the Decrees of the Plenary Council of Baltimore. The paragraph reads:

"Inter ea quae docenda venient in puerorum seminariis, primum locum obtinet religionis Christianae doctrina, quae gradatim in omnibus classibus pro aetate et captu ingenii discipliorum accurate tradenda erit, adeo ut provectiores aetate et studiis penitiorem cognitionem de fidei fundamentis acquirant, atque contra errores advesos muniantur."

Instruction in Christian doctrine naturally takes first rank in the curriculum of every Catholic college; for, objectively and subjectively, truths of faith are supreme. They reveal God, and the things of God; they set forth man's external and supernatural relations toward his Creator, his Preserver, his Redeemer; toward his fellow-men. They throw a flood of light upon the obscure places of philosophy, of social and political ethics, and, indeed, upon the whole realm of science. They give the key-note of every human life which they lift above the grovelings, gropings, uncertainties, anxieties, doubts and perplexities of unaided reason, struggling toward the light amid ever-changing currents of opinion. They fix the eye of the mind upon the unchangeable truth, upon Him who is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end.

So long as we are obliged by force of circumstances to maintain in our colleges academic, and even grammar school grades, we cannot assume in many of our pupils any more than an elementary knowledge of Christian doctrine. Perhaps we do not always find even so much. At any rate we may take it for granted that the religious instruction of most of our scholars is very imperfect.

To meet the needs of these beginners we should place in their hands the smaller catechism, which they

must learn by rote whilst the teacher will explain that the truths which it contains are living truths, bearing upon the most momentous issues, directing aspiration and quickening effort. A competent teacher will know how, by illustration and analogy, to make the study of catechism attractive, while insisting on its paramount importance.

The average boy will not greatly relish dry formulæ of doctrine unless these are presented to his undeveloped mind in a dress which will compel his attention and excite his interest. It will be of little use to insist upon the prime necessity of Christian doctrine if the teacher do not convey his lesson in appropriate imagery to the unformed intellect. The beauty, also, of revealed truth may be happily pictured so that the plastic imagination and memory may receive lasting impressions.

After all, the catechism is but a skeleton of Christian doctrine, more or less perfectly articulated, with its parts well knit together. The ordinary student will not of himself perceive the perfection of the structure. It must be explained to him in its parts as a whole. The skeleton must be clothed and arrayed in garments of light.

The truths of Christianity are not mere abstractions, barren theories. They are vital forces for man's regeneration, for his guidance in every walk of life, with a direct bearing upon all his actions, setting a value upon each of them ; ever pointing with unerring finger to a goal to be reached and a doom to be shunned.

The splendid synthesis of revealed truth, of the whole scheme of redemption, is the one Church of Christ. This perfect work of Incarnate Wisdom the student should be taught from his earliest years to revere, obey and love as the spouse of Christ, as His mystic body, spotless and holy.

A boy should begin betimes to appreciate the grandeur and beauty of the Church, its divine and human elements, its unique place in the world as the one ark of salvation, the one infallible teacher of men unto life everlasting. He should begin to have a firm intellectual hold of the supernatural order; of its laws, tendency and energy, for naturalism in its protean forms is laboring to banish to the limbo of wornout superstitions all that savors of the supersensible, the divine.

As instructors of Christian doctrine we are not now to form mere believers, to merely imbue the minds of our youth with profound reverence for and belief in Catholic truths and practices. We must strive to equip our young men to become in their turn apostles, apologists, whose grasp of truth will be so firm that it cannot be unloosed by any pressure of false science, by any cunning device of the wisdom of this world. We should prepare those who take the law from our lips to meet agnostic and irrationalist, the arrogance of science and the scepticism of unbelievers; to unmask error in all its forms and show forth the truth in all its power and comeliness.

It is not an easy task, this which devolves upon us in this day. Old methods will not suffice. We are here reminded of the saying of our Lord: "Omnis scriba doctus in regno coelorum similis est homini patrifamilias, qui profert de thesauro suo neva et vetera."

The problems which the exponent of Catholic truth must face to-day may not be essentially different from those of other ages. The expression of them varies. They assume new forms and new complexities. It would not be very difficult, I suppose, to trace back modern errors to their congeners of ages ago, and to discover that, after all, we are confronted with only

new fashions of falsity. However this may be, our weapons of offense and defense must be modern in form and fashion. We are now at the eve of the twentieth century—not in the fourth or thirteenth or sixteenth. We may adapt the old and fashion new, as the occasion arises. These we shall train our disciples how to use, with the injunction that they do not let them rust.

Whilst the student exactly memorizes his text he should be taught to take notes of his teacher's explanations. The teacher himself, if he would do his full duty, cannot be content with slipshod remarks, ill-prepared comment. Lack of precision in this matter may entail serious consequences to the young, who implicitly accept the master's word. Proof should be free from cloudiness, should be clean-cut, and, of course, within the grasp of the scholar.

In the higher classes the instruction should take on a more scientific form, should present Faith in its relations and analogies with reason and science, with history and philosophy.

Even in the college grades it would appear to be desirable to use some such text as Wilmer's Hand-Book, to be supplemented by carefully prepared lectures. These the student would be required to reproduce and hand in to his professor.

In this way the undergraduate would possess at the end of his course a very practical knowledge of his religion ; would be able to render an intelligent account of his faith among unbelievers and sceptics ; would also be able to give necessary and precise information to those who inquire of him what Catholics do and do not believe.

Protected by the shield of truth, the Catholic young man would thus be guarded against the poisonous darts of unbelief which would not fail to be leveled at

him in his intercourse with men; against the arrogant pretensions of science and the allurements of a seductive philosophy. He would be able to prove that physical science is not all in all; that much which passes under that name is but crude, unproved hypothesis; that there is profounder science upon which all physical science must base its postulates; that there are heights which unaided reason cannot scale, depths which it cannot fathom.

What I have said implies that the religious teacher should be something more than a theologian; that he should have at least a speaking acquaintance with science; that he should be skilled in disentangling the webs of sophistry woven about error. I am sure that I am justified in assuming that religious instructors in our colleges are men of such, and of even higher, attainments. Thus, they have the authority of learning to accentuate their instruction. In addition to this, they have the authority of noble, self-sacrificing lives. Lacordaire, in one of his college sermons, describes an apostle of the Word, such as teachers of Christian doctrine ought to be: "The apostle," he writes, "is not only a man who possesses knowledge, and teaches by means of the spoken word. He is a man who preaches the Gospel with his whole being, whose very presence is an apparition of Jesus Christ. The divine Word is, as it were, a sacrament in which the personality of the priest has more play than in others, and which calls for greater labor on his part in proportion to the effect. The priest must take the Word of God, buried in the Sacred Scriptures, and make it live upon his lips."

The Word of God is, indeed, in the Sacred Book; but it is there like dried leaves in an herbarium. The living voice of the authorized teacher must make it live, and impart to it movement, perfume and color.

I have given but the barest outline of a subject which it would not be difficult to expand into a treatise. The subject is all-important, for it gives direction and tone to all human thought and effort. If it is a question for all times, it is emphatically so for ours, when religious truth is so much the sport of erratic fancy. It is a vital question for our young men, the solution of which they must constantly endeavor to make practical in life and character. They have the inestimable advantage of possessing the truth. But it may be wrested from them. They may let the torch go out. Unless this Truth inform not only their intellects, but their very souls, and lend energy to every fibre of their conscious being, unless it find expression in their character and overflow even to the hem of their garments, there can be little hope of their becoming, as they ought to become, living examples of a living faith, a savor of virtue amid corruption, light amid darkness.

We shall do our duty if we send them forth panoplied in divinely fashioned armor, young men of "light and leading," to do battle in a world of conflict.

The paper received most favorable comment from many of the delegates.

Rev. Father Conway, among other things, said there could possibly be no discussion on this paper, as all were of one mind concerning the matter treated. There could be no discussion about the religious training in our colleges, as that is the principal reason of their being. He would propose that Father McHale's paper be accepted by the Conference as representing the sentiments of all the delegates.

Rev. Father Quirk, S.J., of Boston, endorsed the opinion expressed by Father Conway, and said that it was

noticeable that in the non-Catholic universities there is a danger accruing to the collegians who come from our colleges, as experience shows that even in matters which do not formally bear on religion, such as lectures on history and literature, there is an insidious influence brought to bear on the faith of our students who are pursuing the courses. The suggestion of the paper bearing upon an advanced interpretation of religion, especially with a view to the present dominant heresies, entitles the paper to very careful consideration. From the point of view of educational influence, religious instruction is not at all to be minimized, while its refining influence is recognized by the attendance at our lectures on ethics, and at our religious instructions of scores of non-Catholics, even rationalists, who find a benefit educationally in religion.

Rev. Father Rogers, S. J., of Milwaukee, expressed his pleasure with the paper, and said that the one comment he had to make with reference to the advantage which would come to the students, if instead of insisting so much upon apologies for the Catholic doctrine and the explanation of difficulties, more were to be said of the glories of the Church. There are periods of the Church that are full of glory, and these should be insisted upon a little more strenuously, so that courage might thus be instilled into our pupils to defend Catholic doctrine.

The Right Rev. Chairman referred to a paper by Bishop Headley, read by him at the last Conference of the Catholic Colleges in England on "Religious Instruction in our Schools." He summed up by saying that the course should be one of religious dogma in English, written in a literary but sober style, so laid out as to occupy the three years' period of school course, and adapted for boys from fifteen to seventeen

years of age. This would rather meet our preparatory school condition of age than college. The ideal course should be in English. If translations from other languages be used, the translation should be a good one, and the English should be idiomatic. Bishop Headley also emphasized the point that the exposition of Catholic doctrine for boys should be in a language of certain nobility and eloquence, so as to remove it as far as possible from the style of the mere handbook. It should be the language of a master in style of speech who knows how to say old things in a new way and avoid worn-out phrases. It was suggested by the Chairman that a committee, consisting of Father Quirk and Father HcHale, report a resolution concerning the points raised by the discussion, and the committee was so appointed.

Rev. Dr. Carroll, of Dubuque, then read his paper on

Teaching Modern Languages in College.

Regarding the teaching of modern languages in college I submit to the consideration of the Conference my answers to the four following questions: 1. What place should the modern languages occupy in the curriculum of studies? 2. What should be the aim in teaching the modern languages? 3. What method should be employed? 4. Which languages should be taught?

I. In our Catholic colleges the modern languages occupy the last place; this is the verdict of our catalogues and of our graduates. If we except those colleges whose vehicle of instruction is German, or which for practical reasons make a course in German, French, Italian, or Spanish obligatory, the modern languages,

as a general rule, are omitted, or are elective, or receive scant attention for periods ranging from one to three years.

In non-Catholic colleges, on the other hand, the modern languages are assuming an importance which bodes ill to the ancient classics. It is asserted that the study of the modern is not inferior in mental discipline to that of the ancient languages; that "a man may have a liberal education without knowing Latin and Greek;" that it is more interesting, if not more beneficial, to the student to have spread out before him the literature and culture of modern peoples than to compel him to dig out of dead languages the literature and culture of the ancients. It is recommended that Latin and Greek be made elective after the freshman year. A member of the Committee of Twelve of the Modern Language Association of America speaks of "the increasing extent to which the study of the modern languages is superseding the classics in our schools."

Now, what place should the modern languages occupy? I answer first: Not so prominent a place as the ancient languages, for to these latter tradition, experience, reason—the very idea of a college, give the first place. For centuries two dead languages—Latin and Greek—have formed the basis of all intellectual training, and the greatest educators have recorded it as their opinion that the study of these languages is the most direct means of developing and enriching the mind of the youth. Experience has shown that periods of classical revival were also periods of great intellectual awakening, and that whenever and wherever taste for the old letters declined there was felt a corresponding deterioration in intellectual life.

And how could it be otherwise? It is by reason, by

thought and speech, and, therefore, by language and literature, that man is man and is elevated above everything that is not himself. Hence, the nobler the literature, the more perfect the language, the more potent will they be in developing the youthful mind and imparting to it that strength and fullness which makes man only a little less than the angels. Now, what modern language and what modern literature can compare with the languages and literatures of Greece and Rome? Never did human reason, unaided by revelation, soar so high as she did on the wings of Plato; never did her plummet sound such depths as it did in the scientific hand of Aristotle. Homer is the world's greatest poet and Demosthenes its greatest orator. If literature is the expression of a people's thought, Greece must have the noblest of literatures, for it was in her tongue that the master minds of the world expressed their noblest thoughts, and the language they used has ever been regarded as the perfection of human speech.

Cicero was not a philosopher; he originated no system of metaphysics, he made no explorations into the arcana of nature, he did not rise with Plato into the realms of the ideal or dive down with Aristotle into the bowels of matter; but, coming at the end of pagan domination, he wove into one the scattered fragments of doctrine left by the sages who had gone before him, breathed into them the living spirit of the traditions of the ages and embalmed them in language which for clarity, strength and rhythm has never been surpassed. Who that has read intelligently the first of Cicero's immortal orations does not find his ears still ringing with the music of those inimitable lines, does not even hear again the thunders of that magnificent voice as it rolls out those grand old periods that swayed the con-

script fathers and lashed into fury the popular indignation against Catiline and his fellow-conspirators? The power and majesty of the Roman tongue is incarnated in Cicero.

Our modern languages, it is true, have qualities peculiarly their own; we admire the precision of the French, the simplicity of the German, the ruggedness of the Anglo-Saxon; but these qualities are found in all their combined perfection in the tongues of Homer and Cicero. We are charmed by the music of the Italian and the sonorousness of the Spanish, yet all this is but as sounding brass compared with the gold and silver speech of our Greek and Latin forefathers.

Greek and Latin are, therefore, the most perfect of all languages, and as, being dead, they are susceptible of no further development, they easily lend themselves to scientific analysis. It is this character of perfection and fixity that makes them suitable models for study and imitation. Being living, modern languages lack both perfection and fixity. They are ever subject to the caprices of usage "penes quem arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi." This is why they are incapable of becoming an essential object or a principal means of higher education. As the tyro in anatomy is given the cadaver or the manikin not of an infant or a youth, but that of a full-grown human form on which to base all his studies, so the novice in letters should make, not growing languages, but those that have attained their fullest development, the foundation stone of his literary education. It is with language as with reasoning. Unless the principles of reasoning be certain and immutable, the conclusions drawn therefrom will never rise above the clouds of doubt; likewise unless the forms of expression be fixed and stable, the science and the art of language will ever remain an ignis fatuus.

Like the philosophers of whom St. Paul speaks, students whose literary education is based exclusively on the shifting sands of modern languages will be ever learning, but never coming to a knowledge—a scientific knowledge—of language or of literature. "Semper discentes, sed nunquam ad *scientiam* pervenientes."

Another reason why the ancient languages should hold the first place is because they are the mother tongues of our modern languages. To speak only of English—nearly three-fourths of our words have come from the Latin, and all, or nearly all, our scientific terms are of Greek origin.

Again, our modern intellectual civilization is but an outgrowth of the civilization of Greece and Rome; and as literature is the expression of intellectual civilization, it is in the languages of Greece and Rome that we must look for the sources of all that is noblest and best in our modern intellectual life. To substitute, therefore, the modern languages for the ancient in our curriculum of studies would be to forsake the original for the copies. Such a procedure would be unscientific; instead of rising from effect to cause and studying effects in their causes, we would be ever groping along in the dark and dismal region of fact, and our knowledge would ever be that of the crowd—"cognitio vulgaris." If, therefore, the college stands for liberal knowledge, and if liberal knowledge, to use the definition of Cardinal Newman, means a knowledge, not of facts, but of causes, we must give the first place in our literary courses to the mother languages of our modern civilization or cease to give the name of "college" to our institutions of higher learning.

It were vain to urge that a knowledge of Greek and Roman civilization can be attained from translations. As well might one say, a knowledge of Ireland can be

obtained by attending a stereopticon lecture on "A Jaunt Through the Emerald Isle." The pictures may be faithful copies of Erin's peaceful lakes and winding bays, of her round towers and ruined abbeys, of her statesmen and her peasants; the lecturer may exhaust all the powers of language in describing the manners and customs, the personal and domestic virtues, the generous hospitality and the unrivaled wit of her people. The auditor is entertained, instructed, accurately and thoroughly informed, if you will; yet he does not *know* Ireland nor the Irish. The reason is that knowledge comes through feeling; it is fed and kept alive by the imagination. To feel one must see and hear, and without feeling the imagination is a dry and barren faculty. Just as to know Ireland, therefore, one must live in that country and come in daily contact with its people, so to know Greek and Roman civilization one must hear the Greek and Roman speak in their own tongues and not through the unnatural, awkward medium of a modern language. A Greek or Roman author dressed in the English or German or French vernacular looks like David in the armor of Saul. As the tragedian feels and thinks and speaks and acts like Julius Caesar, and, therefore, to his audience becomes Julius Caesar, only when he dons the costume of that great dictator, so the student can realize and assimilate the thoughts and feelings of the Greeks or Romans only when he puts on the garb of their language.

Finally, Latin is the official language of the Church; it is the language of philosophy and theology. Now, as many of the students in our colleges are making with us their remote preparation for the priesthood, they should have on completing their classical course, not only an intelligent reading knowledge, but also a

fair speaking knowledge of Latin, if they would make any satisfactory progress in their seminary studies.

My first answer, therefore, to the question, "What place should the modern languages occupy in the curriculum of studies?" is that they should not occupy so prominent a place as the ancient languages. My second answer is, that they should occupy a more prominent place than the one we assign them. If Greek and Latin are the mother tongues of all modern intellectual civilization, the modern languages, each after its own manner, emphasize peculiar features of the parent sources. The ancient languages are the sun which illuminates the whole intellectual sky, and in whose white light are blended the various tints of human learning; the modern languages are the rainbow whose many colors are the solar ray refracted and dissolved by its passage through the prism of political revolutions. Now, if a separate examination of the various colors of the rainbow aids us to a conscious and more thorough appreciation of the peerless blending of the orb of day, surely the study of modern languages cannot but strengthen and increase our knowledge of that luminary of the ancient tongues whose steady rays they so variously reflect. Analysis is a scientific process. The study of the various characteristics of the ancient languages as reflected in the modern, is, therefore, no less scientific; and if scientific, therefore broadening and liberalizing. Hence, the college, which is the home of liberal studies, should give the modern languages a no unimportant place in its curriculum.

Again, science is a knowledge of a thing by its causes. The thing we desire most to know is our own language—English; not indeed for its own sake, but because it is to us the instrument of thought and speech,

of communion with self and of communication with our fellowman; it is "the key that unlocks the treasure house of knowledge; it is the philosopher's stone, the true alchemy that turns everything it touches into gold." Now, to know English well, to know it thoroughly, to know it scientifically, we must know it by its causes. These are, as I have said, first of all the ancient languages—Greek and Latin, but after these, several of the modern languages. English is originally a Teutonic tongue, derived immediately from the Low German, of which it is the lowest dialect. In course of time there were engrafted on it many Latin words, so that to day, as I have had occasion to remark before, English is nearly three-fourths Latin. A great many of these Latin words, however, have come to us through the medium of the Norman-French. To have a scientific knowledge of our language, therefore, we should know both German and French. This is an additional reason why certain modern languages should not be omitted from the college curriculum.

There is still another. One of the aims of the college is to prepare the student for university work. Now, no matter what specialty the student pursue in the university—be it theology, or philosophy, or medicine, or law, or astronomy, or sociology, or economics, or the physical sciences—he will find it necessary, if he would make any original research, to know several of the modern languages. Time was when Latin was the medium of scientific thought, but, unfortunately for science and the scientist, that time is passed. If, therefore, the college would do well its work of preparation for the university, it must give the student at least the beginnings of several modern languages.

II. The remaining questions I shall answer briefly. The aim in teaching is to give good reading knowledge,

so that the student may be able to appreciate not only the newspaper and magazine articles, but also the great masterpieces. His speaking and writing knowledge should be sufficient to enable him to progress without the aid of a teacher. To attain this end three hours a week during three years of the course would, I think, suffice, especially if the Latin grammar were first thoroughly mastered.

III. I believe I would lose time in prescribing any special method. The method will vary according to the teacher and the pupil. A living teacher having a thorough knowledge of the language he is teaching, but especially of the language *in* which he is teaching, will use the proper method. He will pay attention to pronunciation and idiom. He will attach more importance to oral and written practice than to analysis. Remembering that difficulties lie at a more advanced stage than in the ancient languages, he will endeavor to reach that stage as rapidly as accuracy will permit.

IV. From a practical point of view, German, Spanish, Italian and French should be taught, and in the order named. German, because it is the language of a large and increasing number of our fellow-citizens of foreign birth. Spanish, because it is the language of all our newly-acquired possessions. Italian, because it is the language of the country from which the largest number of immigrants are coming and are likely to come for some years. Moreover, these people are Catholics, and to hold them in the faith those graduates of our colleges who enter the missionary field must for some time appeal to them in their own language. French, because it is the most serviceable language for the American traveler, whether he visit the Dominion of Canada or the continent of Europe. Lower Canada is practically all French and Upper Canada is fast

becoming so—at least in point of population. Outside of England each country, with the exception of France, has besides its own another language which serves as a medium of communication with its neighbors and the visiting world generally—a language which is taught in its schools and ranks in importance second only to its own. Invariably that language is French. I do not say that English has no place on the continent, for there, as everywhere, it is the language of commerce; but on the continent French is the language of international communication, in society, in politics, in the professions, while in France French alone is spoken.

From literary and scientific points of view French and German should be taught. French, because it is the language of the highest modern civilization, the most perfect copy of the clearness and logical precision of the ancient Greek and Latin, the language of the reason, of abstraction—a language through which has come into our English tongue a large portion of those Latin words which so extensively constitute our vocabulary. Finally, its prose is unequalled by that of any other modern language. German, because it is the language of the senses, of nature, and for richness of vocabulary and facility in combination of words it approaches most nearly to the ancient Greek. Moreover, the Anglo-Saxon portion of our language is derived from the same parent tongue as the German. Finally, as means of catching the scientific thought of the day, while other languages may be useful, French and German are absolutely indispensable.

The drift of the general discussion which followed was that whilst the modern languages should receive much attention in the college curriculum, they should not supersede the classical languages, Latin and Greek.

Rev. Father Cassily, S. J., of Chicago, after commending Doctor Carroll's paper, asked him what were his ideas for teaching these foreign languages; whether he would favor the acquiring of a speaking knowledge of the languages, and if so, how would he propose to carry it out in our colleges, in view of the present crowded condition of our courses.

Rev. Doctor Carroll said, that this was one of the greatest problems with which we have to contend. Heretofore modern languages have been regarded as optional studies; but he favored making them obligatory, and that for a period running from three to four years. He thought that if three years were taken for the teaching of the languages, spending an hour three times a week, or three hours each week, students might obtain a serviceable knowledge of them. He thought that German and French should be taught in all our colleges. One might be taken up at one time in the course and the other at another. His experience had led him to believe that one year's study of Latin before commencing the study of modern languages was very beneficial. After the rudiments of the Latin grammar have been mastered, it is easy to take up any other grammar. He believed that it would be easy to arrange for the teaching of these languages by distributing them through the course. As to method he did not care for method for method's sake. He believed the living teacher would use the proper method. Attention should be given to idiom, as pronunciation and idiom were to be regarded as essential to the knowledge of the modern languages. Efforts should be made to put the student over as much ground as possible, making him familiar with masterpieces of the language, and forcing him to an analysis of the best.

Rev. Father Rogers said the difficulty encountered

by all the colleges with regard to French and German was due to the crowding of the courses, all of them demanding attention, and all of them seemingly more or less necessary. If a committee would mark out some method combining these various branches in such way as we could treat them practically and study them with sufficient thoroughness, we would accomplish a great deal. The colleges all seemed to be suffering from the same difficulty—inability to get so many branches into the curriculum.

The Chairman said the Conference should bear in mind that the demand for French and German is constantly increasing, and must be met. Many of our Eastern High Schools have incorporated these two languages in their curriculum, and this might be followed in the preparatory department of our colleges, making it easier at that age for pupils to learn the languages, and saving in the college the time required for their study. No one can fail to notice the scientific value of the two languages, the absence of which forms serious defects in students presenting themselves for university work. The consequence is that usually a year is lost in supplying a reading knowledge of these languages, as a requirement for the higher degrees. The importance in professional, literary and commercial work make it necessary for us to give more attention to these two languages than our colleges have given in the past. A committee might be selected to consider this matter thoroughly, and report a plan for the adjustment of these modern languages in our college curriculum. If it be possible to place them in the preparatory courses, and not crowd them into our college course, we will take a great step forward.

A motion was then made and seconded and unanimously adopted, that the matter of adjustment of the

study of modern languages in our college curriculum be referred to the Standing Committee with authority to make such suggestions to the next Conference as the Committee may deem expedient.

The Committee on Elective Studies reported the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted :

Resolved, That while it is not the intention of the Conference to formulate any opinion on the principle of permitting students to elect moderately and under faculty directions the studies of their courses, nevertheless it believes the policy of permitting the individual student to determine absolutely at pleasure the studies that constitute his college curriculum, unwise and tending to lower the standard of education.

The Committee on Uniformity of Entrance Conditions into the Freshman Class made a report, which was resubmitted to the Committee, with a request that they formulate the same as a resolution.

The Articles of Association previously proposed, were then read and discussed with their amendments consecutively, adopted after which the Articles as amended were adopted, as a whole and made the rules of conduct of the Conference. The following are the Articles of Association :

1. This Association shall be called the "Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities of the United States." (By college is here meant any institution of learning offering a course of studies warranting the conferring of a degree in arts or science, whether such degree be actually conferred or not.)

2. All Catholic colleges and universities in the United States shall be invited to membership in the association, and delegates accredited by them shall represent them at the annual conference.

3. The objects of the Association shall be: (a) To facilitate the interchange of ideas and information on all college matters; (b) to watch over Catholic interests in case of any proposed legis-

lation as to collegiate education and to take such steps as may be considered advisable to procure the due consideration of such interests.

4. The affairs of the association shall be managed by a Standing Committee consisting of the chairman and secretary of the conference, both ex-officio, and four other members, four to form a quorum. They shall meet once a year and oftener if the chairman deem it advisable.

5. The chairman shall be elected annually at the general meeting and shall be eligible for re-election.

6. The secretary shall be elected annually at the general meeting. He shall also act as treasurer.

7. The members of the standing committee shall be elected at the annual general meeting.

8. The annual conference shall be held at such time and place as may be decided by the conference at the annual meeting. It shall last at least two days. The committee shall be empowered to make any rules to regulate the reading and discussion of papers which may be deemed advisable.

9. Other general matters may be called by the committee as may be thought desirable.

10. The committee or the chairman of the conference shall be empowered to invite the co-operation of gentlemen distinguished as authorities on education, and to invite them to the annual or other meeting when deemed desirable.

11. None but regularly accredited delegates shall be allowed to vote. Others may read papers or join in the discussions, at the invitation of the chairman of the conference.

12. In the settlement of all questions each delegate shall be entitled to but one vote.

13. To defray current expenses of the association the annual subscription for each college shall be $10, payable at the annual conference.

14. No alteration shall be made in these rules except at the annual general meeting, and by a majority of two-thirds of the members present, written notice of the proposed alteration having been given to the secretary at least one month beforehand.

15. At least one fortnight before the annual meeting, the secretary shall send to each member a list of Agenda, including any proposed motions; but the conference will not necessarily limit its discussion to such Agenda, should other topics arise.

16. Any doubt arising as to the interpretation of these rules or as to the eligibility for membership under rule 2 shall be referred to the committee, whose decision shall be final.

The election of officers resulted in the unanimous choice of the following: Rt. Rev. Mgr. Thomas J. Conaty, D. D., President; Rev. John A. Conway, S. J., Secretary and Treasurer; Rev. W. L. O'Hara, Rev. Vincent Huber, O. S. B., Rev. James French, C. S. C., Rev. L. A. Delurey, O. S. A., members of Standing Committee. Chicago was chosen as the place and Easter week as the time of the next annual conference. Copies of the proceedings were ordered to be printed and the chairman was authorized to attend to this matter.

Father Delurey presented a resolution embodying the previous report on Entrance Conditions. This gave rise to some discussion and resulted in a demand for more explicit statements.

The Right Rev. Chairman suggested that the matter be left over until after luncheon, and at 1 P. M. the Conference took a recess for luncheon.

FOURTH SESSION.

At 2.30 P. M. the Conference again assembled, and after prayer, the Rev. M. P. Dowling, S.J., of Creighton University, Omaha, read his paper on

Development of Character in Students.

It is a subject of deep regret that some students go through college without any appreciable development of character. They spend years under conscientious, painstaking and zealous instructors, they learn a certain amount from books, but somehow they fail to strengthen their weak points of character; they may be scholars and students, but they are not men. They come forth from their studies weak, vacillating, uncertain, without energy, promptness or decision. They wait for someone to put them into a suitable niche, for an impossible combination of circumstances which they fondly hope will make everything easy for them. They undertake and accomplish nothing because the difficulties always seem insurmountable; they discuss and deliberate, but never act. The real trouble is that they are constitutionally lazy, do not like to bend their backs and dislike very much to work between meals. Another class have no sense of responsibility, hold no promise sacred and having imbibed no established principles of conduct are untrustworthy and mean-spirited; they are easy-going and genial, but unreliable; without attention, perseverance or courage; without order, system or practical sense. Others still are rough, uncouth, devoid of tact, gentility or powers of observation; they have no spirit of self-sacrifice, self-respect or self-control, no disposition to take anyone's feelings into consideration. All the book learn-

ing in the world will not cure such defects, or enable their victims to wield any influence.

We meet these educational misfits every day and we often hear parents complain that sons on whom they spared no expense and to whom they had given every opportunity have turned out a disgrace to the family, disobedient, ungrateful, worthless. The surprise and disappointment of parents indicate that something more is needed than books, talent, money, application, and successful studies at school. A wealthy scion of a noble house went to Father Kneipp for treatment. After detailing all his symptoms and telling what he took for breakfast, how he lunched, the variety of dishes and wines that made up his dinner, what formed his supper, he finally asked the patient priest: "What is the matter with my health; what is wanting to me?" "What you need," said Kneipp, "is two stomachs." So too what our students need is something more than study from books; they need development of character in addition to knowledge.

In respect to these failures Catholic colleges do not stand alone, and it is highly probable that other colleges register a higher proportion of students without character. It must be so, for our colleges possess this advantage, that the relations between professors and students are closer and kindlier, that there is a stronger personal tie. The young do not avoid those whom they regard as foster-parents and not as step-fathers; they do not consider as their natural enemies those who are so deeply interested in their welfare as to take part in their sports, sympathize with them in defeat, counsel them in trouble, care for them in health and nurse them in sickness. Catholic discipline is seldom irksome, except in the case of a boy unusually mean and self willed, or a teacher strangely lacking in tact

and discretion. Under such conditions youthful thoughts are readily turned to nobler ideals, even from no higher motive than desire to please professors whom they respect; and it is gratifying to see that in obedience to religious sentiments the savagery of hazing has never obtained a foothold in Catholic colleges. What can be expected in the way of sympathy when the professor comes to the class-room and teaches a book for an hour; and then withdraws his light for twenty-three hours, without a thought of the soul he is supposed to be unfolding? What if he proves to be a prim, anaemic, statistical person, with a manner marked by a certain acid propriety, with no more red blood in his veins than a shad, with talk and behavior that makes a youth feel as if someone were putting snow down his back! A boy likes a man that understands him, one that is kindly, affable, accessible, helpful, one with a plethoric heartiness that is human, one that can lead and inspire, that can baptize him into manhood with his own strong and loving flow of soul; but he never takes to the bookworm, the learned and unpractical pedant. The inability to grasp and understand boy nature explains why it is that gratitude and affection seldom go out to former teachers, and that the nearest approach to interest is contained in the question: what has become of "Old Fifty Lines?" Why is the one time mentor dismissed so lightly? Because he dealt with budding souls as with so many dry sticks; because he was a teacher, not a man or an educator; because he never reached human hearts. He awakened no enthusiasm, communicated no inspiration, did not build up or furnish the mind, left no lasting mark on the character.

How far are we responsible for those life failures we deplore among college-bred men? Like persons of every

class, we are liable to run into ruts and mistake the means for the end. On what other principle can we explain the variety of opinions among educators as to the nature of their calling and what it is in school training that is valuable for the purposes of life?

Some seem to think that they have done all that is required of them when they teach a book, when they dole out so many lines of Cæsar, so many of Xenophon, so many theorems in geometry, so many precepts of composition, all compounded into a mental tonic, much as a pharmacist will make up a prescription out of several chemical ingredients. In their opinion a man is fitted for teaching when he is competent to hear a recitation; and education means cramming into minds the contents of a pile of books, or the ability to answer certain questions from text-books. All this may be necessary, but it is by no means sufficient for intellectual culture, which does not consist merely in the acquisition of knowledge. No book holds within its covers the profound mystery of education.

Other teachers have a weakness for lists, and they are of the opinion that all is well in a college when everything has been reduced to lists; lists of students, absentees and late-comers, good-conduct list, premium list, and so on to the end of the chapter. Sometimes marks take the place of lists and seem to be the chief end of existence. The business of the student is, then, not so much to acquire knowledge and character as to obtain marks. His standing, reports, and stay at at college depend upon marks. Marks are the ghosts that haunt him by night and track him by day. Marks rarely tell anything else but ability to recite glibly from a book, but the educator, nevertheless, becomes a marker. Others are satisfied if ranks are perfect, if students keep step and march with precision, if at the

sound of the bell all fall into line like a military company preparing for dress parade. Yet drill is not education; it is not even an elevating process; nay, the most exacting drill sergeant never looks upon himself as fulfilling a great moral mission. Others are pleased when no smoking is going on and no talking in the corridors; to offend against either being as bad as breaking the decalogue. If the boys move straight forward, with ghost-like tread, all is well; the college is a success. They resemble the captain who informed the subaltern that he wanted nothing from him but silence and very little of that.

All these elements are helpful, but they do not constitute education. They are never more than means and are often more a hindrance than a help. When reduced to a system or erected into a superstition they dwarf character instead of developing it. Some of the points insisted upon are about as important as if a boy were told that when he reaches a certain place he must wink with the right eye and twenty feet farther on wink with the left, or were obliged to substitute four buttons instead of two on the back of his coat.

If mere acquisition of knowledge, the exercise of memory, or the marshalling of facts is not sufficient, we must consider the factors that go to develop character. Prominent among them are discipline, the dormitory system, honor methods, prizes, supervision, espionage, liberty, and athletics. I am rather glad that I must touch upon these briefly, because I approach them with great diffidence and if I make any positive recommendations at all, it is for the sake of eliciting discussion and suggestions.

Plato's experience with young people was evidently far from happy. He gives us an idea what youth is without Christian discipline when he describes boys as "of

all beasts the most difficult to manage, crafty, keen, and above all things, insolent, so that it is necessary to bind them as it were with many chains." There is very little reverence for the child in this sweeping declaration. Most of us understand that the average boy is more taken up with the sweet things he has eaten and the sweet things he hopes to eat than with any very spiritual conceptions. To allow him to grow up without restraint and follow his natural inclinations would be about as sensible as for a physician to say to his patient: "If you will kindly suggest to me what disease you think you have and what kind of treatment you would like, I will do the best I can to carry out your ideas."

Discipline in the minds of some stands for what is rigorous, inflexible, rigid, unyielding. But coercion alone is not discipline, neither is severity, nor stern, unrelenting, absolute exercise of power. Discipline must be in accord with reason and justice, otherwise it degenerates into despotism An army gives evidence of discipline when at the critical moment it yields instant, trustful, self-sacrificing obedience, and each soldier, because previously trained, knows what to do and how to do it, as soon as a command is given. St. Bernard enumerates the fruits of discipline when he says that "it bows the haughty neck, restrains the wandering eye, bridles the idle tongue, checks the appetite, moderates laughter, represses anger, gives firmness and modesty to the whole look and gait of man."

The aim of discipline, then, is to produce a self-governing being, endowed with self-control, imbued with the spirit of obedience to legitimate authority, respect for others, regard for order, and gifted with moderation, patience, discretion, earnestness of purpose; one who knows how to concentrate his powers and is willing

to labor conscientiously and devote his energies in behalf of the right and the good. If this be what is meant by the word it is evident that both youth and manhood should obey the scriptural injunction and pray daily for discipline.

In establishing a system which will produce such discipline, what shall be our standard or guide? It is an established law of human action that the knowledge of the end must precede and direct the choice of the means. In accordance with that law the system required at any given period depends on the national character, the social and political development of the people, the duties the citizen will be called on to fulfill. The successful scheme must answer these conditions; its rise, growth, popularity and permanence will depend on how effectually it meets the needs of the time. The practical world, conscious of its wants, can be placated only by practical methods. In accordance with the standard, Persian children, as Herodotus tells us, were taught "to ride, to shoot, and to tell the truth." The duty of the educator at any time is to train those under his charge for the work assigned them by their age and country. As an educator it is not his business to be a discoverer or a reformer; he does his duty if he teaches what men of the time most need to know and develops their character so as to prepare them for the actual world in which they are to live; if he gives the world what it asks for, within the limits of sound morality. Now, our political, social, religious and economical conditions are different from anything that ever existed before; the American boy is different from any subject the educator ever had to deal with in times past. He lives in a different atmosphere at home, he determines for himself where he shall go to school, and

whether he shall go at all, his parents having simply abdicated their authority. And yet whenever I read that passage in the book of Macchabees commending the virtues of the Romans, I instinctively turn to the American and find their counterpart in my own countrymen. It is a noble type of manhood, with its virile intelligence, unconquerable industry, its independence, courage, patience, energy, strong sense of natural justice and love of fair play. The best qualities of the parent are handed down to the children, the noblest traits of the American character are found in embryo in the American boy. He is manly, open, truthful, generous, fearless, self-reliant, as quick to resent injustice and oppression as his fathers were. It is true he does not set much store on submission for its own sake, and some of the most essential Christian virtues, such as humility, meekness, patience and forgiveness, he is apt to look upon with suspicion as indicative of a mean-spirited person. He will not lie, or steal, or cheat, or take an unfair advantage, because these would be dishonorable. Honor, not virtue, is the standard of his conduct; and his sense of honor is not founded on God, but on self. Still his natural virtues are an excellent foundation on which to rear a supernatural structure of no mean proportions. In mapping out the proper system of discipline for such a type we ought to proceed on some other theory than a boy's inherent wickedness, his supposed disposition to be wilfully disobedient and culpably careless, his willingness to make trouble whenever he finds he can do it with comparative impunity. He may not be always equally amiable and attractive, but he has excellent traits; he will not be terrified into any half-hearted submission unless it is rooted in justice; and at every turn he will question the right of the stronger to "make him" do a thing because he has the power.

As a rule our boys are too carefully coddled at home, and it is a healthy experience for them to become inured at school to such little hardships as will make them robust and manly, wear off their sharp corners, round their character, sweeten any acerbity of temper, and accustom them to bear with patience inconveniences and defects which cannot be corrected. On that account the dormitory system as a disciplinary arrangement is not an unmixed evil. It habituates a boy to respect order, for he goes to bed at a regular time and rises at a seasonable hour, feeling fresh in the morning after proper rest, without dissipation at night or the indulgence of the pernicious habit of lying abed as long as he wishes. If a dormitory is a place to sleep, he gets what he wants when he goes there; and for the specific purpose of sleep the room system offers no special advantages, except in the case of nervous, highstrung or sickly lads.

Yes! but what about private rooms as a place for study? Are comfort and convenience not to be taken into account; health and sanitation; light, heat and ventilation adapted to individual tastes; the enjoyment of a room furnished according to one's means and social standing; improved facilities for serious study, free from the remorseles and vice-like grip of routine, noise and interference, inevitable where many are together? Is there nothing in the approach to home life; the liberty to arrange hours to suit oneself and to dispose of time to the best advantage? Is the developed sense of responsibility and the encouragement of self-reliance of no educational value? Must a boy cut himself off from all individuality and be merged into a machine because he goes in search of an education? Boys love liberty, they do not relish barrack life any more than their elders do; and since

their parents allow them to do pretty much as they please, is it not expedient for us to adopt the private room system, so as to retain those who will go elsewhere for the liberty we refused, go where they can get what they consider "superior advantages?" Will this course not prevent the drift to other colleges? In other words we are invited to compare the two systems in their relation to comfort, health, study, home life and popularity.

Under proper restrictions many of these advantages can undoubtedly be gained from the room system; if, for instance, the small boy, the lazy boy, the unruly, self-opinionated, unmannerly boy be ruled out from the enjoyment of privileges regulated by merit rather than by length of purse, privileges granted only to older, steady, reliable and studious young men and withdrawn when a student abuses them or for any reason proves unworthy of confidence. Without such precautions the room system easily lends itself to loss of time, loafing, the useless interchange of visits, staying up to unseasonable hours at night, card playing in secret, and kindred abuses. Even the attempt to maintain its advantages is likely to be interpreted as espionage. All these considerations leave untouched the important question of expense and ignore the fact that many have graduated under the dormitory system who would have found the additional outlay for a private room a practical bar to a higher education.

Supervision is good and necessary, but if carried to excess it becomes an evil. What is suitable for other countries is not suited for boys in the United States; and these are the ones we have to deal with. While admitting that there should always be proper safeguards for innocence, and protection against bad example and the contagion of wicked companions, I

have no patience with a system which watches a boy narrowly from the time he gets up in the morning till he goes to bed at night. Never feeling that any confidence is reposed in him, he naturally becomes a sneak and is imperceptibly transformed from the manly, frank, honest, straightforward boy into a time-server, sycophant and hypocrite. What is the result? Deadly haters of religion and Christianity, which in the persons of its representatives cast a blight on youth and tyrannized over their years of growth and took all the freshness and bloom out of life.

Rules that are reasonable and methods of government that are honorable always rest on some sound principle duly weighed and applied. Hence all eavesdropping, needless repression, iron rules hastily framed on the slightest provocation, the imposition of a host of small, exacting and necessarily burdensome regulations, hanging over the young like a pall, inspire no faith in an imaginary being, half detective and half guardian angel, when the being actually in sight seems to be a spy. Whatever fosters suspicion and breeds distrust, whatever resembles espionage, is ruinous to character; whatever destroys mutual confidence is fatal to uprightness and digs the grave of honor.

A young man deeply imbued with principles of honor will not easily do anything mean or deceitful, whether he knows he is watched or not; he will avoid what is underhand and unmanly. When he is grown up he will consider his fair name a precious possession to be preserved without blemish and he will make an effort to shun whatever may bring disgrace on himself or his family. He may not always be actuated by the highest motives, but he will struggle much before he will descend to what is disreputable and base; and if his natural sense of honor be reinforced by supernatural

motives you can pledge his integrity against any ordinary assault upon virtue. This is to be expected, for honor is rooted in justice, one of the cardinal virtues. What else means the oft-repeated appeal for "fair play" among childish companions; the exact and even-handed punishment of those who cheat in games; the nice adjustment of differences of opinion and disputes about the management of sports; the equitable distribution of what is won; the impotent outcry and indignation of the child against unjust accusations and undeserved punishment? Honor is the natural inheritance of ingenuous Christian youth and it needs only to be encouraged to bring forth fruit a hundredfold.

Prizes kept within the limits of moderation are, no doubt, good, and promote praiseworthy emulation. Moreover, parents like to see their boy come back from college with a medal, to attest that their darling is not a dunce. But the wholesale bestowal of premium books and medals bids fair to run into an abuse. When a premium must be given to almost every pupil and in the absence of any sufficient reason is dispensed as a reward for "trying to be good;" when parents are directly or indirectly called upon to pay for medals promiscuously awarded with impartial hand to the deserving and the undeserving, their value as an incentive to study is reduced to the minimum. I have often asked myself why prizes in such profusion should be necessary in Catholic colleges. Public high schools and even some private colleges prosper without them. If prizes are not more largely introduced into public schools it is certainly not because the treasury of the school board is empty or the generous tax-payer unwilling to encourage application and industry. It seems to me that as an incentive to effort scholarships and purses would be more practical and effective.

Athletics are one of the modern factors calculated to meet the wants of the living age, which requires a sound mind in a sound body. Parents want athletics and their children want them. If they are sometimes accompanied by danger and result in broken limbs, let those who want them take the chances and be responsible for the results. It is trying enough to divide with parents their responsibility with regard to intellectual and moral requirements, without undertaking to be father, mother, aunt, uncle, and all the rest of kin to "Tommy," when, with some risk, he insists on developing his muscles. Often enough we are compelled to go against the stream in opposing educational theories and practices, because there is some principle at stake; but when there is no principle at stake, I believe it is wise to do as other colleges do. If people want an education which includes physical culture, give them what they want and they will send their children to you.

Standing opposed to any form of systematic physical culture are those who would be content to see boys hatchet-faced, thin-blooded, scrawny, with spindle shanks, flat chests, narrow shoulders, soft muscles, weak arms and lacking physical courage. All the objections merely prove that while athletics are good servants they are bad masters. They are all right as long as they do not interfere with study. But they do interfere with study, say the objectors; and more than that, valuable time is squandered and what some denominate noble games might more properly be called brutal sport. Everyone will admit that athletics are sometimes cultivated to excess, that they sometimes interfere with serious study, and that the safe return of the college athletes from the field of prowess is often hailed with a devout "Te Deum," as if one more danger were passed and their friends were free to breathe once more.

But we must remember, too, that the best athletes are often the best students; backward young men can be barred out by proper authority and the time lost affects comparatively few, while the healthy college spirit engendered, the enthusiasm for excellence aroused more than counterbalance these disadvantages. Recreation need not consist in lounging about doorways, moping through corridors, creeping along from place to place; something virile ought to be aimed at, the development of a manly spirit. Where is this to be acquired; in the classroom? It is a mistake to suppose that men learn only from those appointed to teach them; there is a great deal of useful education to be had from mixing with college companions, and character is developed on the gridiron and in the diamond, on the campus and athletic field as well as in the precincts of the classroom. The educational results of athletics are numerous enough to be overwhelming. The self-denial required in training promotes discipline; the struggle for supremacy prepares one to take the hard knocks the world will subsequently give; the moderation and submission required in accepting adverse decisions teaches self-control in trying circumstances and under strong provocation; the tense engagement of mind and muscle leaves little place for lewd conversation, drinking habits and the malignant influence of troublesome coteries. These advantages flow especially from games played in combination, where there is question of courage as well as skill, where the player being of less importance each one learns the necessity of organization, the art of playing together and the need of sacrificing his athletic reputation in a critical emergency, for the common good, particularly where there exists the disposition rather to lose a game than win it unfairly. There is undoubted generalship in many of these games

and a practical lesson in administration. Quickness is needed, decision, courage, determination to win, ability to give and take; these qualities are all of the highest moment for the battle of life.

Education, the development of character and the proper scope of discipline are topics that never grow old; they are subjects contemporaneous with every age and generation; they are questions continually receiving different answers; they are problems ever meeting new solutions, according to the changing ideas of epochs and of men. Even when disputants agree upon the major premise they will part company at the minor proposition and find themselves hopelessly estranged when they have evolved their antagonistic conclusions. I have not the presumption to believe that this paper will settle any of the disputed points or lead to substantial agreement; all that I can hope for is that it may lead to some profitable discussion.

In the discussion which followed, Rev. Father Burns, C. S. C., said that among the many admirable and interesting topics dwelt upon by Father Dowling in his very clever paper there is one that seemed especially live and important, and that is the question of private rooms. The mere fact that in non-Catholic colleges throughout the country there is practical unanimity in the adoption of the room system, whereas in our Catholic colleges there is almost unanimity in the non-adoption of it, shows how important the discussion and the consideration of this question ought to be for us here. He said that it was a question, the merits of which depend upon experience rather than upon any abstract conclusion to be drawn from principles and theories. He believed the experience of the colleges adopting the room system would be helpful, and he would like to get an expression from the repre-

sentatives of such colleges as a supplement to Father Dowling's admirable topic. Notre Dame had considerable experience with the room system. Beginning a dozen years ago with forty rooms, the number had been gradually increased, until to-day about two hundred and thirty students occupy separate rooms. As a general result, there is an unanimity of opinion in Notre Dame about the necessity of enlarging still farther the room system. As a specific benefit, there has been a large increase of students. Many parents were unwilling, after the preparatory course, to have their students remain without the privilege of a private room. The handling of students is made easier, as each hall becomes a little college by itself, with its administration, its societies, its reading-room, etc. Students are happier and are made to have greater sympathy with the institution. He called on Father Fagan to give the experience of Georgetown in connection with the room system.

Rev. Fagan, S. J., said he thought there was every reason to be satisfied with the working of the room system, as it existed at Georgetown, where there is still the double system of dormitory and room. The preparatory system has the dormitory system alone. With regard to the seniors and college students, rooms are given to the seniors and the juniors as far as they can be accommodated, as also to the sophomores and freshmen, if there be accommodation. He said he did not come into immediate working contact with the system, but from what he had heard he thought there was a disposition to extend the room system. Boys are more contented, as there is a greater degree of privacy, which he thought boys of a certain age are entitled to, while the discipline which takes away the room because of bad conduct acts as a menace of forcing submission to rule. He thought the experience of Georgetown would confirm that of Father Burns of Notre Dame.

Rev. Father Hearn, S. J., of New York, speaking of discipline in the college, said he thought that as far as is consistent with proper control a great deal should be done to lighten what may be called the burdens of regulations and of discipline. Certain privileges compatible with the general life and health of the college community should be granted to students in a manner corresponding to their years of progress in the college. The privileges may become wonderful helps and aids to the proper discipline and control of the students without stirring up any acrimony or without putting the college bodies, as it were, on edge. Boys feel very keenly the taking away of any privilege, no matter how light it may be, and so by means of that, instead of direct punishments, the discipline and healthful condition of the college may be controlled. He suggested that as far as possible the boys should be encouraged to control and work their own organizations within the school and college system. This encourages boys, develops manliness, and brings about a pleasant administration. A spirit of unity is formed and co-operation results, whereas the direction and guidance by members of the faculty of the meetings of college organizations are apt to be regarded with suspicion. He favored the giving of privileges, especially to the boys in the upper classes, as also the allowing of the boys to control their own organizations.

Rev. Father Quirk said that he enjoyed the story, as he might call it, of the American boy, as portrayed by Father Dowling. He thought the story of the American boy a story of honor. It would be well for us to discuss what that sense of honor will do in the future, after the student has left the discipline of the college. It is a common experience to hear of students having fallen by the wayside when, after having passed through our hands they have entered into the life in which they are left more to their own self-control, and

have become more independent. He suggested that it would be well to consider how to build up this sense of honor, and how to make it take deep root in the students under our charge, so that afterwards, when they are emancipated from our rule and discipline, they may conduct themselves as men. It is common experience that students when left to themselves after their college days have been given to self-indulgence in one way or another, have forsaken the habit of study, or may have gravitated in some way toward vice. The students should be taught self-control, and should be gradually emancipated, especially in the senior classes, from the more stringent measures of discipline, so important in the earlier years of college life. By these means a sense of honor and self-control may be built up, so that when men are put upon their own responsibility, their manhood will be sufficiently developed to prove that they have profited by our teaching and our instruction.

The Right Rev. Chairman then called attention to the report of the Committee on Entrance Conditions, the consideration of which was suspended at the hour of luncheon. He suggested that as the matter was of too great importance to be settled in the short time allowed the committee, it would be well to refer the whole matter to the same committee, to report a plan or program of entrance conditions to the next Conference. The discussion on this matter had proved that there was competence enough in the Conference to arrange a program of studies which would fit better into our collegiate conditions than the program adopted by the National Association. Legislating for our own colleges from the study of our own conditions would be more practicable. He spoke of the methods used at the University for entrance conditions in the Departments of Theological Sciences, as also of the work done

by the Faculty of Philosophy, as to what it would regard to be the equivalent for an A. B. degree. He thought the present committee enlarged to five might give a careful consideration to the investigations made by the National Association committee, as well as the study of our own collegiate conditions, and that at least a month before the meeting of the next Conference a copy of the recommendations of the committee might be sent to the president of each college, that thus he might be prepared through the delegate sent to the Conference to consider the matter intelligently and be ready to adopt some plan of entrance conditions.

Rev. Father Higgins, S. J., said he thought the suggestion made by the Right Rev. Chairman met exactly the difficulties which the committee had to face, and he moved that the Chairman's suggestion be adopted. The motion was seconded, and it was unanimously agreed that the matter of the program of studies as entrance conditions to freshman class be referred to the committee, with instructions to report to the next Conference. The motion that two additional members be added was adopted. The Chairman appointed the committee as follows: Rev. L. A. Delurey, O. S. A.; Rev. James P. Fagan, S. J.; Rev. W. L. O'Hara, A.M.; Rev. James A. Burns, C. S. C., and a Benedictine, to be appointed by the Arch Abbot of St. Vincent's, Pa.

The committee appointed to report on the paper read by Rev. Father McHale brought up the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Conference that the paper on Religious Instruction in College is deserving of the full and cordial approbation of all the members present, and that the arguments advocating advanced instruction of senior students, with a view to equip them for combatting the errors of the day, are especially to be commended.

BUSINESS MEETING.

The business meeting was held at the appointed time —3.30 P. M.

The Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, D. D., Rector of the Catholic University, Washington, D. C., was unanimously re-elected President. Rev. John A. Conway, S. J., was chosen to fill the office of Secretary. On motion, the other members of last year's Standing Committee were also re-elected. The vacancy caused by the withdrawal of Rev. John T. Murphy, C. S. Sp., was filled by the election of Rev. L. A. Delurey, O. S. A., of Villanova College.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE YEAR 1900–1901.

Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, D. D., Rector Catholic University, Chairman.

Rev. John A. Conway, S. J., Gonzaga College, Washington, D. C., Secretary.

Rev. William L. O'Hara, Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md.

Rev. Vincent Huber, O. S. B., St. Bede College, Peru, Ill.

Rev. James French, C. S. C., Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, Ind.

Rev. L. A. Delurey, O. S. A., Villanova College, Villanova, Pa.

Chicago was again selected as the place, and Easter week as the time of next year's Conference.

The Standing Committee submitted the following resolutions, which were adopted :

Resolved, That the thanks of the Second Annual Conference of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, from fifty-five Catholic colleges of the United States, be offered to the following:

First, to His Grace, the Most Rev. Patrick A. Feehan, Archbishop of Chicago, for his letter of welcome and encouragement to the Conference.

Secondly, to His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate, and to His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore, for their inspiring words of sympathy.

Thirdly, to the Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, D. D., Rector of the Catholic University of America, for his scholarly address in behalf of the teacher, and for the tact, and untiring and self-sacrificing zeal with which he presided over the deliberations of the Conference.

Fourthly, to the Rev. Gentlemen who have prepared the papers read at this Conference.

Fifthly, to the Rev. Hugh McGuire, Pastor of St. James Church, for a repetition of his extraordinary kindness of last year, in placing at the disposal of the Conference the school building of his parish and the hospitality of his house.

Sixthly, to the Press of Chicago, for its fair and liberal notices of the deliberations of the Conference.

The printing of the proceedings of the Conference was left to the Rt. Rev. Chairman.

It was ordered that the assessment for this year be paid to Rev. John A. Conway, S. J., Gonzaga College, Washington, D. C., before the 1st of June.

The Right Rev. Chairman said that the regular business of the Conference was completed, and asked if any delegate desired to speak.

Rev. Father Dowling, S. J., spoke of the importance of considering the place of laymen in the work of Catholic education. He said that in not making use of the Catholic laity more largely we are contending with one hand tied to our bodies, and are practically depriving ourselves of the use of one of our hands. The Catholic Church has a right to the intelligence, the ability, the good will, the tact, the business experience, the practical knowledge of the Catholic laymen, just

as well as of the Catholic clergy. There is a distrust of the clergy among the American people, who think that the clergy and laity do not stand together as representing one body of thought and doctrine, and the clergy are regarded as supervising, ruling, and controlling the laity. They seem to be afraid of clerical interference, and foolishly imagine that, because they see the laity obedient children of the Church in all that relates to faith and morals, that they will obey our voice as faithfully in political matters. We all know that once we go outside the question of faith and morals we could not get together, even on so insignificant a matter as shooting at a mark. He thought it would be well for us to give some large share, even in the higher institutions of learning, to laymen. The layman has greater opportunities to be heard than the priest. The public look upon him as a parent, as a citizen, as a taxpayer, and in many other relations as having some influence upon the policy of the country. He thought it would be well to enlist greater co-operation between clergy and laity in matters of education.

On invitation of the Chairman, Rev. Thomas B. Hodnett, and Rev. M. Dorney, both of Chicago, addressed the delegates, and spoke of the benefits to Catholic education which must result from the Conference. They both emphasized also the importance of lay co-operation in educational work.

The Rt. Rev. Chairman then announced that a cable dispatch had been received from Cardinal Rampolla, of which the following is a translation :

> The homages and good wishes of the representatives of the Catholic Colleges were received by the Holy Father. He returns thanks and from the fullness of his heart imparts his benediction.
>
> CARD. RAMPOLLA.

The Rt. Rev. Chairman then made the closing address of the Conference. He said:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONFERENCE: We have finished the work of this Conference, and I think we have reason to be pleased with the results of the work. A year ago our Conference was an experiment; it was simply an attempt at coming together and seeing whether or not we desired to form a partnership in the interests of education. We were so well pleased that we determined to stay together. The attendance is larger than last year, and the representation of all our great systems of collegiate instruction in the classical courses is more extended. We have pleasure in knowing that the Superiors of many of our religious orders have passed judgment upon our Conference during the year, and they have determined that it is a work in which they desired to be associated, and as a result, their delegates are in attendance.

This shows the confidence which the Conference has created among the great leaders of our educational systems, and, gentlemen, the work that we have done during these few days can hardly be estimated by us who are actors in the work. There is outside our circle a large element interested in the work of our colleges. There is a large element, perhaps, curious to know what our colleges stand for, what our colleges intend to do. To both those we go out with words of hopefulness: To our friends, who have stood loyally by us, and who have hoped and prayed that we should be in the front ranks in the work of collegiate instruction we give hope and encouragement. To those who are critical and curious of our work we give encouragement also. And I want to say to this Conference that it has been my privilege, within a very short time, to have met the most distinguished leaders of education

in this country, and I know, from their inquiries, that they look to this Conference with more interest than we would have had any reason to expect ; because they felt that this Conference represented a great solid body of men with diversity of system, but with unity of intention and unity of aim, with the great Catholic Church behind it, strengthening it, enlightening it, and enabling it to do its work.

We have reason to be grateful to Almighty God for the blessings that have come to us in our successful meeting. You, gentlemen, have come from your busy school rooms and college halls, you have come long distances to meet here for the purpose of uplifting and improving college conditions. I feel satisfied that not one of you will go back to your college home without feeling that you have been rewarded by the efforts of this Conference. We look into one another's faces, and it is encouragement to do so ; we hear one another's voices, and it is a strength and a life to us in the greater ability to face the difficulties of our work. We know that strong friendships have been formed in a Conference like this, and as one man we stand a united body, demanding the best collegiate work.

During the sessions of the Conference there has been the greatest of considerateness. It has been an easy convention to preside over. You have come to do the work, and it has been simple enough for me to guide and direct it. I certainly thank you for the confidence which you have shown in me as your presiding officer, and I appreciate more than words can say the extension of that confidence in asking me again to preside over you, and thus to honor me beyond my deserts. I have but one aim and purpose, and that is to do the best I can for the uplifting of our college work, the bringing of enthusiasm into our college teaching, the carrying

of ourselves to the front as leaders of education,—Catholic educators. We cannot expect to do it all in a day, we cannot expect to do it in a dozen Conferences, but, gentlemen, you have done to-day more than you thought it possible a year ago, and you will do in succeeding Conferences still more.

I thank you, then, most sincerely. As Rector of the University, I come to you from out the heart of that great institution with its best wishes to you college men. For if, as has been said by the distinguished clergyman of Chicago, the schools are the college sources, the colleges are the sources of the University strength. The colleges look to the University, the University looks back to the college. We are one in purpose, one in aim, one in love. The University is simply a part of the great system—the head of it by virtue of position—aiming to guide and help.

Gentlemen, I said to you last night, from out the depths of my heart, the good word of the University to the College teacher. I bear back to the University the good will of the College teachers to the University. For in honoring me you honor the position in which a kind Providence has placed me. Therefore, gentlemen, together we work, together we labor, together we reach out for improvement, and anything that we can do to help one another will be of benefit to the great Church of which we are the ministers.

Might I say one word more? There is no one among us that does not reach out in anxious care for the best there is in methods and in improvement. The Catholic layman has a right to expect from us that confidence which he gives to us, and the spirit of our collegiate institutions, I am sure, reaches out to him. As I said last night, the University has given its confidence to the layman because the layman has given his generous bequests to the University, and has given

his heart and mind as well. Gentlemen, our Catholic laymen are coming into the front as educators, and I am sure that we are all looking to the time when generous hearts aiding our colleges will give us the opportunity to utilize all the forces of our educational life, and make our colleges thoroughly representative of the people, as they are thoroughly representative of the best instincts in education.

But, gentlemen, our work is ended; this Conference at this moment has completed the program mapped out for it. Now we adjourn to go back to our several homes and work faithfully, according to the lines suggested to us. Many suggestions received here will actively engage our attention for the coming year. We will strive to put into practice the resolutions suggested, and we hope to meet again, a year from now, under this hospitable roof, with the same determination, with the same strong affections for our ideals, and the same disposition to criticize ourselves and be criticized in order that we may be better.

Gentlemen, I declare our Conference at an end, simply reminding you that the meeting this evening, will be the public closing, as it were, of the work of these two days.

PUBLIC MEETING.

At 8 o'clock P. M. a public educational meeting was held in St. James' School Hall. Nearly all the delegates, many clergymen of the city, and a large representation of the laity attended. William Dillon, Esq., editor of the *New World*, of Chicago, presided and introduced the speakers.

Rev. John A. Conway, S. J., spoke on education. Among other things, he said: "Education is the great cry of our time. Not every little red schoolhouse is a sign of true progress; not every speech in favor of education is a mark of culture; not every speech against appropriations is a mark of mere disinterested patriotism; not every school book tells the truth, nor are our school teachers infallible guides. God has been driven out of the schoolroom in the name of progress. Such progress is destruction."

Rev. Dr. Dunne, of Chicago, spoke on Parochial Schools, and told of the close relations between the parochial school and the college. He dwelt upon the effect of the College Conference as an incentive to better work in the intermediary and primary departments of the school.

Rev. Vincent Huber, O. S. B., spoke on the work of the School Men.

Right Rev. Monsignor Conaty was the last speaker. He made an address on the underlying reasons for the Conference as found in the necessity for the Catholic College. He developed the idea which underlies the Catholic College, showing the need of religion in all the grades of mental development, and especially at that time when, as in college, a man's character is formed. Religion alone can make men good and thus build character.

INDEX.