

to keep him in Japan, for we cannot control the present labour and socialistic problem by our own hand. In order to manage these difficulties, we must have a supreme power. For his example his declaration to prohibit the demonstration made the radicalist (radicals) quiet.'

So much for the Japanese opinion over *Ma Gensui*, General MacArthur. Everybody who really knows Japan and the enormous difficulties which MacArthur has to face, is convinced that he makes the best of it. So far he has done very, very well indeed. He never seeks revenge nor crushes by force. He wishes to restore the Japanese nation to normal life and to have it take its place, as soon as possible, in the family of nations. From the very beginning he has not forced American methods upon the Japanese, but he has tried and still tries, to impart to them fundamental ideas of democracy and then help them to work out their own implementation of these ideas. This task is by no means an easy one and that the results are not always perfect is but natural. As a student of the Japanese character for more than forty years—ever since he observed the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-05—he is everywhere regarded as well qualified for his difficult task.

H. VAN STRAELEN, S.V.D.

(*To be concluded*)

SECULARIZATION IN EDUCATION

THAT the majority of American colleges, even those started under strongly Christian auspices, have become secularized with amazing rapidity—within the last fifty or sixty years—is an obvious fact to be deplored or applauded according to the point of view. For the natural sciences which fought against the domination of theology secularization is, of course, a victory and one so complete that not only does religion not dominate, it is not accorded equality. This is the more striking in the highly endowed schools of the Atlantic seaboard because they were founded as theological seminaries, Harvard to 'supply the spiritual needs of the colonies', Yale as a Calvinist stronghold when Harvard became Unitarian, Amherst to prepare 'poor boys to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ'. Until 1800 all of the Fellows of the governing body of Harvard were clergymen; after 1884 no ministers were included. In 1800 the Professor of Divinity at Yale, Dr Wright, was also president of the college; by 1900 such a combination had become unthinkable.

The women's colleges have a similar history. It is interesting to trace the change in religion at Mt Holyoke, for example, from the dogmatic Calvinism of Mary Lyon (which included a belief in total

depravity) to the present day Universalism, a religion broad enough, according to the address given in 1937 by the retiring secretary of the Y.W.C.A., to include Catholic, Protestant and Jew in the worship of the one God, Father of all.

As the theological faculties declined in dignity and influence the scientific faculties increased. Religion was abolished as a required part of the curriculum at Harvard by the middle of the nineteenth century, and compulsory chapel attendance in 1886. By the nineteenth century the physical and biological sciences became required courses. At the present time a student can complete his entire college training at any of our outstanding universities without once coming into contact with religious dogma taught as an objective fact. Protestant clergymen would, of course, be hard put to find a body of dogma they could teach in this way. The natural sciences on the other hand have an organized programme. The vast mass of knowledge accumulated by them is taught as an objective truth, assented to, the student is told, by scientists the world over. It is small wonder that he concludes that science rather than religion is the greatest reality that education has to offer. He may not become a scientist. The subject matter may have only the remotest interest for him, but it forms the norm of his thinking and dominates all other concepts.

This has meant, of course, the loss of Christian intellectual leadership and the loss also of the possibility of an integrated education. Since every discipline formulates its own principles, and these may vary from subject to subject according to the particular philosophy of the professor, there is no basis for unity. The student may be called upon to be a logical positivist in Biology, an Eddingtonian idealist in Physics, a follower of Whitehead in Philosophy and a Freudian in Psychology. We have become so accustomed to this scheme of things, and so indoctrinated as to its 'freedom' that we do not realize the price we pay in mental confusion, uncertainty and the consequent insecurity. A talented person could hardly, in a life time, arrive at a working synthesis of the mass of knowledge which the average undergraduate is called upon to assimilate. It is entirely beyond young people in their twenties.

Some years ago J. B. S. Haldane amused the public very much by remarking in the course of a lecture that Marxism cured his stomach ulcers. Actually the statement is not funny at all. Mental confusion does cause the interior tension which is a predisposing factor in gastric ulcer. Marxism, embraced wholeheartedly as a philosophy of life, reduces this confusion. It presents a unified picture of a universe in which every individual existence, however insignificant, has a meaning. The zeal of the humblest worker counts towards the revolution, and will be rewarded in the final victory.

'You have been naught, you shall be all.' To a world which has cast aside Christian theology and Christian hope this forms an effective substitute, and is scientific by nineteenth-century standards.

Theoretically, of course, Catholic schools have not been affected by secularization. We have kept the faith. We affirm the same dogmas as those once delivered to the saints. Theology holds its ancient hegemony as queen of the sciences. The priest is accorded the greatest authority and the highest honour. In thomist philosophy we have the basis for a complete synthesis of every branch of knowledge, infinitely superior to the *naïve* materialism of Marx. We should expect Catholic colleges to give the most perfectly integrated education.

It is amazing to discover that this is not the case. In fact, any long or wide acquaintance with Catholic education leaves one with the impression that it isn't very integrated, nor very Catholic and bears little relationship to thomism. Schools vary a great deal, of course, in details and there are many exceptions to every generalization. The experience of one individual is always limited, and interpretations always have an element of subjectivism. It seems no exaggeration to say, however, that secularism in Catholic schools has progressed almost as far as in the better non-Catholic institutions. Thomist philosophy is taught, it is true. So are religion, scripture, ethics, marriage and so on. But these are taught quite apart from the secular subjects and by teachers with very different backgrounds.

Philosophy and religion are the domain of the priest. He has had his training in a seminary, sometimes from early youth. His studies have been largely scholastic and taught generally from Latin textbooks. His knowledge of the natural sciences, English literature, sociology and other subjects of the kind at most, consists of a few undergraduate courses. He lives, in fact, in a different world intellectually, and speaks a different language from the educated layman.

All subjects other than philosophy and religion, however, even in Catholic colleges are taught from standardized text books, by standardized methods and deal with the same subject matter as in any non-Catholic school. The teachers may be non-Catholic but even if they are Catholic Sisters they will have been trained, in all probability, in non-Catholic graduate schools and can only teach what they have learned.

The student performs the intellectual feat of learning everything in dichotomy. In Ontology, he learns that matter is pure potentiality, in Physics that it is anything which has mass and weight; in Cosmology that all corporeal substances are composed of matter and form, in Chemistry that they are composed of atoms, in Psychology

that living and non-living differ in kind, in Biology that they differ only in degree, if at all; in natural theology that God created the world, in geology that it happened as a cosmic accident; in Dogma that God created man, in Anthropology that he evolved from a lower primate.

Of course, in most schools a certain amount of explanation and discussion is provided. Attempts are made at adapting survey courses given at secular universities to Catholic use, and some philosophic concepts are included. In the writer's experience, however, there is very little done in this way, and that little is ineffective. The tendency is rather to rely on faith. We are bound to believe so and so—and if that is kept inviolate the rest does not matter. We are at liberty to believe or disbelieve evolution as a matter of private judgment, for example. In short, we have that freedom of speculation considered so important in modern education. This satisfies the middle-aged, who have given up the search for truth, but leaves the young still groping for an authoritative answer.

The dangers of secularism, in a practical way, are beginning to be realised. Various schools are trying to deal with the problem. St Mary's Notre Dame, for example, has organized a graduate school of theology for Sisters and lay-women in the hope that this will provide the theological background lacking so much in our teaching. A summer school at the Catholic University in Washington will deal with the dangers of conformism and suggest methods of integrating the teaching of secular subjects with theology.

These are all good approaches to the problem, of course, but in the writer's opinion insufficient. The real solution is much more difficult. It lies in a vital synthesis of modern culture and thomist philosophy, one which while preserving tradition will realize the importance of the vast amount of data collected by scientific methods, the significance of many of the interpretations and the necessity of the revision of certain older conceptions. It is not within the scope of this article to argue the matter. The writer does not feel that any essential doctrine of St Thomas need be revised, for example, the unity of the organism in favour of pluriformism, but only that we should be ready to alter or lop off entirely certain superficial notions, which, nevertheless, some philosophers treat as first principles. The position of women is an example—and all of the silly generalizations about the respective differences between men and women—women are intuitive, men are reasonable; women are gentle, men are strong; women are emotional, men are logical; women are made to sacrifice, men to rule—ideas on a par scientifically with Aristotle's statement that the octopus is a timid animal because it lacks blood, and which nevertheless continue to be pro-

posed solemnly as a basis for a discussion of the relationship between the sexes. In this field, as in some similar ones, experimental psychology has a great deal of importance to contribute. Ignoring these contributions because of emotional prejudice militates against the principles of true philosophy's being accepted by the sciences.

The intellectual difficulties, however, are only a part of the problem of secularization. There are economic forces no less pressing. Catholic educators have campaigned against federal aid to schools fearing that such aid might bring with it federal control. Actually the economic and social pressure exerted by competition and by accrediting agencies produces almost as much conformity as legislation could be expected to do.

Catholic schools are all, of course, in the absence of state support run for profit. They are the result of the private enterprise of the religious orders that own them. Many of them were started with borrowed money paid back with interest only by the heroic self-sacrifice of religious. The competition is very keen. Not only must Catholic colleges compete with one another, but with the state universities and privately endowed non-Catholic institutions in the vicinity. This makes the pressure of student opinion, parental wishes, and patron suggestions very significant. The loss of one student in a small college, with tuition at the present high rate, may mean the loss of a thousand dollars, and a small college cannot support such a loss. The Order in charge may wish to give a Catholic education; it is for this the schools exist at all, but it is also necessary to please students, parents and patrons and a Catholic education does not always please. The writer knows personally of several clear-cut instances where principle was sacrificed to the supposed exigencies of a financial drive.

Usually the effect is more subtle and consists in a gradual transfer of authority to the students. This has happened, of course, to a far greater extent in non-Catholic schools, and Catholic colleges differ markedly in the degree to which the usurpation of authority has occurred. Nevertheless, almost all have been powerless in the matter of smoking, petting on dates, late dances, evening dress, frequenting taverns and similar activities. It is not a question whether or not, these things are really morally harmful; the point is that the college authorities struggled against them and were forced to yield to student pressure. This has happened in both non-Catholic and Catholic schools. In other words our schools do not control public opinion; they are controlled by it, and it is pressure by outside groups rather than principle which guides the rules of these institutions.

The question arises why this should suddenly have come to be so. Why has authority become so weakened? Why can not we produce

leadership inspiring enough to make our students want to measure up to our ideals? It has been the writer's experience in this regard that young people are most responsive to any kind of strong leadership and the history of youth movements in totalitarian countries bears this out. The majority of young men and women desperately want a goal to which they feel they can dedicate their lives. If we experience difficulty in leading them to the Christian goal, it may be because we are not struggling very consistently for that goal ourselves.

The writer feels that the expressed aims of many Catholic authorities on education are proof of confusion in this matter even with the best of intentions. Christian education is said to result in a well-rounded personality, a fully developed individual, mentally, spiritually, physically, socially, to prepare the student for citizenship; to teach him to achieve an excellent personal and social life within the framework of his occupation . . . one searches in vain for the term salvation or any distinctly Christian aim.

Yet are these goals Christian? If we give an education lacking in mental and moral rigour perhaps it is because our own thinking lacks these virtues. We do not ask ourselves whether a well-rounded personality is really necessary for, or even compatible with, salvation. There are some circumstances when it may not be. Our educational ideals are often formulated as if life were to be lived according to a blue print of our desires and what we imagine to be our natures. Nothing could be further from reality. A national emergency, family circumstances, or even the requirements of our own satisfaction may make it necessary that we work at something not in line with our talents, contrary to our desires, above or below our abilities. To a Christian it should not matter very much. In fact, the highest Christian ideal, that of religious life, calls for this sort of sacrifice. The individual embracing such a life, by placing the control of his body and will at the disposal of a superior, offers himself a holocaust to God.

This is the glory of Christianity and merits, we believe, an eternal crown. If we educated for this as an ideal—not of course that everyone will enter the cloister—rather than a perfect life on earth the writer feels that everything would fall into proper perspective. If we continue to educate for no goal except pleasure or material profit, another leadership will take over, and we will find our young people eager to make those sacrifices for a leader, for the state, for white supremacy, for the class struggle, for Americanism or any of the other goals of modern ideologies, which we felt we could not ask them to make for Christ.

J. R. HOUGH.