

general, it cannot be denied that they have exercised a considerable influence on philosophical (and theological) thinking, if only by causing a reaction. Insofar as Existentialism can be characterized as a protest against a lack of interest in the person in philosophy it has been a valuable influence. Rahner's interpretation of St Thomas' theory of knowledge in *Geist in Welt* has been called by Hans Urs von Balthasar 'perhaps the deepest' on the part of modern scholastics, because it is an 'immanent systematization' after the manner of Hegel and Heidegger. As for his approach to theology, it is described in the first article of his *Schriften zur Theologie* (now being translated into English) and demonstrates the emphasis on the person. He shows clearly that the study of God in himself (theological theology) and that of man in his relation to God (theological anthropology) are only inadequately distinct. On account of the Incarnation and the calling of all men to the beatific vision all theology becomes anthropology and *vice versa*.

All this can give but an indication of the work of Karl Rahner—a bibliography drawn up by his students in 1954 listed 299 articles and books. In addition he has edited Denzinger and at the moment he is co-editing the *Neues Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*. But the outstanding characteristic of his work, as also of that of his brother, is its capacity to stimulate. It can be called a *theologia cordis*.

EDUCATIONAL SURVEY

The Crowther Report

THOSE who write to *The Times* deploring the regrettable habits of the majority of their fellows are sometimes reminded that the kind of offender mentioned is of course singularly unlikely to be a *Times* reader, and will continue cheerfully in his offence. The Crowther Report is being much discussed, but for the most part by the faithful; a report on the education of young people between fifteen and eighteen does well to begin by saying roundly, 'Most of them are not being educated at all', but it will be read by few who are not already well aware of this. There is room for a series of discussions on the subject in what are called the two serious Sundays papers, but also for a free translation in a *Picture Post* form.

Our tragedy is that the small proportion of adolescents under educational tutelage till eighteen are the very people whose natural

endowments or social background, or both, enable them to stand on their own feet more easily than the neglected majority. The raising of the school-leaving age to sixteen has received more publicity than any other part of the Report, but an important section also draws attention to the fact that we have extended secondary education only at the cost of serious dilution in the quality of the staff. Politicians have sometimes spoken of supplying more education, or more equal education, as though it were possible to order a quantity of education for the next generation in the same way that one can order a quantity of bricks. Since education is a reciprocal affair, a dialectic and a conversation, the master can give parity of education only to those pupils who are in one sense already his peers; there are some questions which he can put only to those who already know the answer. In discussions on the school-leaving age or on training college expansion, few people outside the educational system ask the one crucial question: who is to do the teaching? If more lecturers are to be found for the expanded training colleges, they can come only from the already depleted ranks of teachers in grammar schools.

It will take more than this Report to bring home to the general public the desperate plight of schools today. We have all heard of the overcrowding in primary schools, but one wonders, for example, how many parents paying £300 to £450 a year for a child at a boarding school have any notion of the constant anxiety about staffing which pursues many heads of such schools throughout an uneasy summer holiday. If the proportion of telephone and postage accounts spent on appealing to university tutors and principals for staff were known, the total for grammar schools throughout the country would no doubt astonish even those who are at the receiving end of such appeals. Four significant charts incorporated in the Report show how schools are living on capital in this respect. The period of economic depression in the thirties was a buyers' market for the heads and governing bodies of grammar schools, who were able to choose their staff from a large number of applicants with good honours degrees. At one stage, 80 per cent of the graduates of a certain provincial university were thankful to find posts in elementary schools. We have now reached the point where a grammar school formerly staffed entirely by Oxford and Cambridge first or second class honours men has had only one application for a mathematics post—from a non-graduate.

The Report boldly emphasizes a point which has been so often handled with a gingerly and conscious tact in the interests of a 'unified profession'. Less than a quarter of all teachers are university

graduates; the great difference between the graduate and the training college product is that there is severe competition to secure the services of the former in other careers. Industry organizes energetic campaigns in the universities to attract promising graduates. There is no comparable drive to recruit teachers; jeremiads about crowded classes certainly do not produce the needed volunteers. Graduates have in fact to be convinced that it is worth doing. The question of salary is not the chief deterrent. When officials of University Appointments Boards have asked graduates why they gave up teaching in order to pursue other careers, two replies have occurred with significant frequency. The first reason given is physical exhaustion; the second is the attitude of the uninformed public towards teachers.

It has been observed in the world of industry that disputes occur in some of the most highly-paid jobs not about pay but about status. Resolutions passed by non-graduate teachers about conditions of service have been increasingly marked by an almost paranoid obsession with status, and this question will have to be handled intelligently before any progress can be made. At the moment, we have a large body of teachers asking that 'graduate status' should be granted to students completing the proposed three-year course in training colleges. There is, of course, already one way of acquiring graduate status—by the simple process of graduating. When pressed, advocates of the title B.Ed. admit that they do not want the students to attempt external pass degrees of a university since a high proportion of these students have not the minimum qualification for admission to a university. In March 1959 a member of the House of Commons asked the Minister of Education whether he would initiate discussion with the universities with a view to the establishment of a first degree in education. The Minister replied that it was for the universities to initiate what they thought fit. The universities are rightly jealous of their autonomy, and in any case have other fish to fry at the moment.

It is ironical, and in some ways tragic, that in England, where qualities of character have traditionally been regarded as paramount in education, preoccupation with pseudo-academic labels should obscure the real issue. The very qualities which academic people profoundly admire in a superb nurse or infant teacher are tacitly denigrated if we insist on degrees in nursing or in infant teaching. It has never been sufficiently recognized that the most magnificent social work in the country is being done by a faithful army of teachers in primary and secondary schools. Yet the title 'social worker' carries more prestige than the word 'teacher' with young

people considering a career. This is far less true in Scotland and in Wales, and I would say that the prestige of a teacher is noticeably higher in Yorkshire and Lancashire than in any other English counties.

Now that there is to be a major expansion and reorganization of training colleges, has not the time come to banish the word 'training college' altogether? For historical reasons, it has acquired a musty smell which cannot now be removed by nervous little applications of Public Relations deodorant talk. Even when the three-year course comes into effect, the training college as it stands will still suffer from the fact that its students, unlike undergraduates, are all heading for the same career. If it were possible to establish Institutes or Colleges of Social Studies where future non-graduate teachers could share a common core of studies with future social workers of various kinds, the teachers would meet a much wider cross-section of the community during these formative years, while other social workers would be far more aware of the key position of schools.

Graduate teachers cannot afford to ignore this large body of status-hungry teachers who feel that the immense value of their work is not recognized; nor should the desire for status, rightly interpreted, be despised. Earlier generations of university men and women founded clubs and settlements, maybe in a paternalist way, but still with an overflowing desire to give away the treasure which they had received. It is the rich in mind who embrace poverty most ardently and gracefully. Generosity is a spiritual luxury; it is easier to fast than to starve. If the rank and file of teachers are to fulfil the task as the chief social workers of the country, they must not only be made rich, but be made to feel rich.

M. A. WILEMAN

RUSSIAN OPINION

EIGHT years ago Pope Pius XII spoke of Rome's desire throughout the centuries for friendship with Russia. His words have been made the occasion for a book published recently in Moscow by B. R. Ramm, a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, entitled *The Papacy and Russia from the tenth to the fifteenth century*.

The Pope we are told retreated into 'the mists of times long past' to gather support for his claim 'beneath the cover of myth and legend'; and there Mr Ramm follows him to present his own version of the Church's attempts by force and fear to bring Russia within her power.