



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1990

Edward Augustus Fitzpatrick and Catholic Education (1924-1960)

Ronald Edmund Rutkowski
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rutkowski, Ronald Edmund, "Edward Augustus Fitzpatrick and Catholic Education (1924-1960)" (1990).
Dissertations. 2900.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2900

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1990 Ronald Edmund Rutkowski

Edward Augustus Fitzpatrick and Catholic Education (1924-1960)

by

Ronald Edmund Rutkowski

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

November

1990

Copyright by Ronald Edmund Rutkowski, 1990

All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

To Mary Beth and Mark Edmund

PREFACE

The contribution of Edward Augustus Fitzpatrick (1884-1960) to Catholic education has been overlooked. He was a student of Thomas Aquinas's philosophy, and he understood education from the Thomistic perspective. Fitzpatrick's contribution to Catholic education was twofold. First, he restored to prominence an idea long ignored in Aquinas's philosophy of education: the pupil's *self-activity* in the process of learning. Self-activity was the central theme in Fitzpatrick's effort to improve education, especially religious education, in Catholic grammar schools. Similar to John Dewey, Fitzpatrick maintained that education was life. Catholic education embraced life but from a religious dimension.

Second, his commentary on Catholic higher education accented *responsibility* to the world. Fitzpatrick's emphasis on responsibility was part of a stream of literature that assumed a larger role during and after Vatican Council II and in documents following the Council. His understanding of Catholic higher education merged with the contemporary discussion of the contribution of Catholic higher education to the world.

The purpose of my dissertation is to present Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education and to note its connection with contemporary statements about Catholic education. Two reasons justify my work. First, Fitzpatrick recognized Thomism as dynamic, not static. He is part of a tradition that understood Thomism as ready to engage the world. His effort and his philosophy of education should not remain unappreciated. The second reason recalls an important point for any philosophy of education. A philosophy of education is an integral part of a philosophy of life. Fitzpatrick faced a choice between a world with God or a world without God. He

chose, and his choice engendered profound philosophical implications that shaped his understanding of the school, the curriculum, and other aspects of education.

Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education was not confined to a single book or to a single article. A reading of his books and many articles yielded the assemblage of his philosophy of education. Secondary literature clarified or supplemented Fitzpatrick's thought. Select documents before and after Vatican Council II marked the continuity of Fitzpatrick's thought with contemporary expressions of the Catholic educational tradition.

My dissertation contains five chapters. Chapter One reviews pastoral letters issued by Catholic bishops in the United States and papal encyclicals that shaped the Catholic educational tradition behind Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education. The chapter includes a review of Fitzpatrick's contribution to education in extant literature. Chapter Two presents a profile of Fitzpatrick's life accenting his career in Catholic education. A presentation of Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education is in Chapter Three. The relationship between Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education and contemporary statements about Catholic education is the focus of Chapter Four. Chapter Five is a summation of the previous chapters and concluding remarks.

Unpublished material about Fitzpatrick's life, skill as an administrator, and philosophy of education came from the archives of Loyola University of Chicago, Marquette University, and Mount Mary College. Fitzpatrick was a friend of Austin G. Schmidt, S.J., and Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J., faculty members of Loyola University. Schmidt and Wilson shared Fitzpatrick's desire to improve the quality of Catholic education, especially Catholic higher education. I thank Brother Michael Grace, S.J., archivist of Loyola University's library, for the generous donation of his time and his knowledge. Brother Grace made my visits to Loyola's archives enjoyable and rewarding. Much work about the contributions of Schmidt and of Wilson to Loyola University remains to be done. Schmidt and Wilson are fine examples of men who

dedicated their lives to Catholic higher education. Without Schmidt and Wilson, the Loyola University would be a lesser institution.

Ms. Tracy Muench deserves credit for making the archives of Marquette University available to me. Ms. Muench's kindness is appreciated. Sister Maris Stella Shea, S.S.N.D., archivist at Mount Mary College, has my gratitude for placing the college's archives at my disposal. Sister Shea made certain that my hours in the archives were comfortable. Her goodwill will long be remembered. Mount Mary College has a long history in Wisconsin and an admirable role in Catholic higher education. A history of the college would provide informative reading.

When Fitzpatrick submitted articles for the *Catholic School Journal*, he often did not sign or only initialed his articles. To ensure authenticity, the articles cited in the bibliography were compared to the official record of published articles in the college's archives. In January and February of 1935, Fitzpatrick wrote two articles having an identical title, "The Aim of the Catholic Liberal Arts College." To avoid confusion, the articles receive full citations in footnotes. Documents from archival materials cited in the footnotes are listed in the bibliography according to the catalogue title from each archives.

An oral tradition about Fitzpatrick exists at Marquette University and at Mount Mary College. From the tradition circulating at Mount Mary College, I drew two statements. The first statement came from a retired faculty member. She described Fitzpatrick's greatest achievement for the college. A librarian mentioned Fitzpatrick's effort to ensure employment for the college's graduates. Both individuals requested anonymity, and I have honored their requests. My review of Fitzpatrick's life omitted events and stories that cannot be substantiated.

Prior to his career in Catholic education, Fitzpatrick participated in several studies and organizations that sought to improve Wisconsin's public school system. The Wisconsin State Historical Society in Madison, Wisconsin has documentation citing Fitzpatrick's role in public education. The archives of Mount Mary College

and the archives of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee contain correspondence between Fitzpatrick and the Bruce Publishing Company. Fitzpatrick's friendship and business relationship with the Bruce family lasted many years. For several years Fitzpatrick was an active member in organizations affiliated with hospitals and nursing programs. One interested in the history of nursing education will find information in the archives of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. These aspects of Fitzpatrick's life did not influence his philosophy of Catholic education, and they received only little attention in my work. Equity demanded that the reader be informed of sources and of their location.

I thank Professor Gerald Gutek, Professor Walter Krolikowski, S.J., and Professor F. Michael Perko, S.J., for their advice and comments. Several of my references are written in French. Responsibility for translations and for other deficiencies that may exist is my own.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Preface	i
Chapter	
1.	1
2.	25
3.	61
4.	99
5.	116
Select Bibliography	127

CHAPTER 1

FITZPATRICK IN THE CATHOLIC TRADITION AND IN SCHOLARLY LITERATURE

Catholic Tradition

Two Catholic institutions of higher learning are in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Each institution has a distinctive character. A few blocks beyond Milwaukee's business district, on Wisconsin Avenue, Gesu Church marks the entrance to Marquette University. The university has a sizeable enrollment and offers graduate and undergraduate degrees in many disciplines. South and west of the university, seventy acres of finely manicured lawn surround Gothic buildings. The medieval setting identifies the campus of Mount Mary College. Mount Mary College is a small, liberal arts college dedicated to the education of women. Both institutions bear the stamp of Edward Augustus Fitzpatrick (1884-1960).

Fitzpatrick's role in Catholic education was unusual. When Catholic education was controlled by many religious orders, Fitzpatrick was a respected lay professor and a reputable lay administrator. He possessed abundant energy. Albert C. Fox, S.J., invited Fitzpatrick to Marquette University in 1923. By 1923 Fitzpatrick's *curriculum vitae* outlined significant accomplishments for Wisconsin's public school system. In 1924 Fitzpatrick was dean of the university's graduate school. Mount Mary College selected him as president in 1929. Had not his career at Marquette University ended in 1939, Fitzpatrick might have occupied indefinitely his offices at both institutions.

The articulation of the Catholic understanding of education was Fitzpatrick's purpose. He did not condemn opposing views. Clarification and correction were his

goals. He appropriated Thomas Aquinas's philosophy of education to meet the challenges raised by secular philosophies of education and to answer questions about the purpose of education. Aquinas's philosophy of education also enabled Fitzpatrick to use the findings of educational research for the good of Catholic education.

When Fitzpatrick was director of the Marquette Monographs in Education series, he made available to the public the first English translations of two classic works in Catholic educational theory: Thomas Aquinas's treatise *De Magistro* and Ignatius Loyola's famous *Ratio Studiorum*.¹ The achievements of Aquinas and of Loyola demonstrated the blend of scholarship and spirituality that identified the finest achievements of Catholic thought. From Fitzpatrick's viewpoint, the ideal was conspicuously absent in Catholic higher education. He scolded professors for failing to follow the mark set by Aquinas and Loyola. Using words similar to John Tracy Ellis's criticism of Catholic scholars in 1955, Fitzpatrick said,

If one considers the number of intellectual workers in the Catholic colleges, one can describe the literary or scholarly productiveness as insignificant, if not puny. The Catholic college must be . . . a place where the intellectual and spir-itual life is cultivated and developed.²

Ellis's statement caused a lively debate, but Fitzpatrick's comment received little attention.³

¹Mary Helen Mayer, trans. *The Philosophy of Teaching in St. Thomas Aquinas*, Marquette Monographs in Education (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1929). Reviews of Mayer's book were published in *America* 41 (29 June 1929): 287; and *New Catholic World* 130 (October 1929): 126. Edward A. Fitzpatrick, ed. *St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum*, McGraw-Hill Education Classics (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933). Reviews of Fitzpatrick's book were published in *American Ecclesiastical Review* 90 (March 1934): 324-5; *Catholic Historical Review* 20 (July 1934): 217; *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 34 (March 1934): 660.

²Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Aim of the Catholic Liberal Arts College," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (February 1935): 34.

³Ellis discussed Catholic scholarship in his book *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life* (Chicago: Heritage Foundation, 1956). James Hitchcock and David J. O'Brien reviewed the lively discussion caused by Ellis's analysis in their article "Dialogue: How Has American Catholic Intellectual Life Changed over the Past Thirty Years?," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 4 (Spring 1985): 176-87.

Fitzpatrick served Marquette University and Mount Mary College during critical moments. At Marquette University he transformed a stagnant graduate school into a productive body of scholars and captured a niche for the university among the premier graduate schools in the United States. Survival confronted Mount Mary College. The college's enrollment was small, and the college's financial resources were meager. His Herculean labor guided Mount Mary College through a difficult period. Chicago, Illinois also experienced Fitzpatrick's zeal for Catholic education.

A cordial and productive relationship between Fitzpatrick and Loyola University of Chicago began in 1929. Austin G. Schmidt, S.J., dean of Loyola University's Graduate School, conferred on Fitzpatrick an honorary degree for his accomplishments in education. The alliance with Loyola University strengthened when Fitzpatrick and Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J., president of Loyola University from 1933 to 1942, worked together for the National Catholic Educational Association. Wilson and Fitzpatrick shared a passionate desire: to make Catholic higher education equal to its ideal. Wilson and Fitzpatrick criticized Catholic higher education for its failures. Their conviction that Catholic higher education could fashion men and women attuned to the delicate balance between faith and reason stoked their criticism. Both men worked diligently to establish solid foundations for their universities. Apathy and resistance were often obstacles to their proposals. Catholic higher education had true friends in Wilson and Fitzpatrick. Fitzpatrick's criticism will be reviewed in Chapter Two.

Prior to his career in Catholic education, Fitzpatrick taught in a public elementary school and a public secondary school in New York City, New York. In 1912 he accepted an assignment in Madison, Wisconsin. In Wisconsin he participated in several studies which improved Wisconsin's public school system. He eventually became secretary to the Wisconsin State Board of Education. His prominence in Wisconsin's educational affairs was remarkable given his humble origin. He might

have sold antiques as his father did.⁴ His parents had little education. Fitzpatrick's mother implored Edward to attend Columbia University.

Several currents of thought shaped Catholic education when Fitzpatrick came to Marquette University in 1924. In 1879 Pope Leo XIII issued his encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (On the Restoration of Christian Philosophy).⁵ Leo called for the renewal of Christian philosophy, and Aquinas's philosophy was Leo's exemplar of Christian philosophy. When Leo became pope, rationalism and distrust of new ideas characterized Catholic philosophy. Thomism was not Leo's escape from storms generated by philosophical thinking hostile to Christianity. "Leo's favorite image for expressing the function of philosophy is that of the bridge. Philosophical activity provides the bridge for joining together our secular concerns and our religious beliefs, our intellectual interests and the practical matters of life."⁶

Catholicism needed a philosophy to answer questions and to acknowledge the achievements of modern culture. "But while insisting on the need of philosophy, Leo XIII was no reactionary against science, no advocate of a return to the subtleties of scholasticism."⁷ Leo sought to restore vitality to Catholic philosophy. He knew

⁴*National Cyclopedia of American Biography*, 1967, s.v. "Fitzpatrick, Edward Augustus."

⁵Two articles traced developments in Thomistic studies which culminated in the encyclical: Bernadino M. Bonansea, "Pioneers of the Nineteenth-Century Scholastic Revival in Italy," *New Scholasticism* 28 (January 1954): 1-37; and Gerard F. Fitzel, "Some Historical Backgrounds of the Encyclical *Aeterni Patris*," *Nuntius Aulæ* 38 (July 1956): 135-55.

⁶James Collins, "Leo XIII and the Philosophical Approach to Modernity," in *Leo XIII and the Modern World*, ed. Edward T. Gargan (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961), 185. On p. 184 Collins noted Leo's conviction that philosophy implicitly or explicitly influenced men and women: "Since the Christian faith involves an act of the understanding and an intellectually determinate content, its relation to our minds is concretely affected by what we think. Not only what we think in an informal way but also the formal elements contained in the arts and sciences, . . . philosophy exerts deep influence over the integrity of faith as entertained by the minds of living men [and women]."

⁷Edmund T. Shanahan, "The Leadership of Leo XIII," *Catholic University Bulletin* 8 (July 1902): 269. R.E. Brennan observed, "The plea of Leo XIII was not for a resurrection of the dead, but for a return of the modern world to the spirit of Aquinas; to his reverence for religion and its ethical norms; to his philosophy of the

that scholastic philosophy should turn its attention to the modern world. Flexibility to accept the world for what it was and to guide the world to God was necessary.

Contemporary questions and contemporary scholarship intrigued Leo because they contained philosophical and theological implications. Leo opened the doors of the Vatican's archives to scholars.⁸ Faith and reason were not antithetical. A sound philosophy would demonstrate that reason can recognize the reality of God and can assent to religious propositions. Religion and philosophy were not enemies. Leo's "conception of effective philosophizing as a union between living intelligence and the patterns of being points out the way of overcoming . . . [the] estrangement of the mind from nature and God."⁹

Leo did not exclude appreciation for the contributions by other philosophers in Catholicism's history. He recognized the wisdom of philosophers prior to Aquinas, and he encouraged the study of philosophers who used reason to explain the truth of Catholicism.¹⁰ But Leo decided for Aquinas. For Leo, Thomism was a "process of recovering the sound origins and foundation which will enable [Catholic philosophers] to philosophize more effectively and smoothly."¹¹

Catholicism had the obligation to answer questions raised by men and women. Christianity would be considered mere superstition if questions were ignored or unanswered. Leo was "the Pope of *the open tradition in philosophy*, which joins a firm rooting in our Christian philosophical heritage with a critical yet generous response

social nature of man; to his ideals of education and politics; to his zeal for study and the highest pursuits of the human mind." (R.E. Brennan, "Troubadour of Truth," in *Essays in Thomism*, ed. Robert E. Brennan [Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1972], 18).

⁸Shanahan, "The Leadership of Leo XIII," 270.

⁹Collins, "Leo XIII and the Philosophical Approach to Modernity," 187.

¹⁰*Aeterni Patris* (On the Restoration of Christian Philosophy) in Claudia Carlen, ed. *The Papal Encyclicals*, vol. 2, 1878-1903 (Raleigh, N.C.: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981): nn. 12-4.

¹¹Shanahan, "The Leadership of Leo XIII," 269.

to modern thought."¹² Leo believed that "scholastic philosophy is in full harmony with the progress of the natural sciences, its fundamental principle being that human intelligence is to proceed from things perceived by the senses to the higher knowledge of things spiritual."¹³ Aquinas's philosophy was Leo's "beacon, [Leo] would not have us make [Thomism] our boundary."¹⁴

Leo bequeathed freedom to Catholicism. He took a decisive step. Leo directed the Church to the world. Confident in the Church's tradition, sympathetic to the longings of the world, and zealous for a Christian vision of the world, Leo knew that "intellectual life demands freedom; and Pope Leo, by stimulating the spirit of rational inquiry, supposes a greater degree than heretofore of rational liberty, especially in literature and scientific research."¹⁵

Social relations were an important part of Leo's philosophical thought. "*Aeterni Patris* charted the grand design of philosophical renewal that would lead to political and social renewal."¹⁶ In 1891 Leo promulgated his encyclical *Rerum Novarum* (On Capital and Labor).¹⁷ The encyclical was a call for aid to the working class. As alternatives to socialism and liberalism, Leo offered a "theology of [human

¹²Collins, "Leo XIII and the Philosophical Approach to Modernity," 183.

¹³John Gmeiner, "Leo XIII and the Philosophy of St. Thomas," *Catholic World* 46 (December 1887): 375.

¹⁴V.F. O'Daniel, "Leo XIII. and St. Thomas Aquinas," *American Catholic Quarterly* 39 (April 1914): 273.

¹⁵[I.T. Hecker], "Leo XIII.," *Catholic World* 46 (December 1887): 295.

¹⁶James Hennesey, "Leo XIII's Thomistic Revival: A Political and Philosophical Event," *Journal of Religion* 58, Supplement (1978): 195.

¹⁷*Rerum Novarum* (On Capital and Labor) in Carlen, ed. *The Papal Encyclicals*, vol. 2, 1878-1908.

existence] which would consider [men and women] in [their] relationship with God and [their fellow human beings]."¹⁸

The encyclical spoke of social reform, not the destruction of the social order.¹⁹ *Rerum Novarum* maintained the tone set in *Aeterni Patris* by inviting discussion of ideas. Social reform was seen through Christian eyes.²⁰ *Rerum Novarum* addressed all Christian people. "Henceforth, it is the entire Christian people who are called by the popes to enter the construction of society. . . . People make history. All Christians are invited to make history. . . ." ²¹

Rerum Novarum rekindled Catholic sympathy for the working class. "During the years following [the encyclical's] publication there was an extraordinary ferment of social generosity. The problem of the working class, hitherto ignored, became one of the chief concerns of those who meant to live their religion."²² The religious spirit behind social reform in the United States, of which Leo's encyclical was a part, received documentation. From the *San Francisco Monitor* dated 8 September 1900, James E. Roohan quoted the statement, "It is absolutely and utterly impossible to have any permanent change in the conditions that represent industrial unrest and an armed truce between capital and labor, except through the operation of religious influences."²³ Pope Pius XI's encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* (On the Reconstruction of the Social Order) reinforced Leo's desire for social reform in 1931.

¹⁸Joseph N. Moody, "Leo XIII and the Social Crisis," in *Leo XIII and the Modern World*, ed. Edward T. Gargan (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961), 79-80.

¹⁹*Ibid.* 71.

²⁰Pierre Bigo, *La Doctrine Sociale de L'Église* (Paris: Press Universitaires de France, 1965), 46.

²¹*Ibid.*

²²H. Daniel-Rops, *A Fight for God: 1870-1939*, trans. John Warrington (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1966), 150.

²³James E. Roohan, "American Catholics and the Social Question," *Historical Records and Studies* 43 (1955): 26.

Quadragesimo Anno beckoned Christians to promote "social justice and social charity."²⁴ The encyclical stated that social renewal "can be brought into existence only by men [and women] who are thoroughly imbued with Christian principles and inspired by the lofty ideals of the Gospel, because [social renewal] presupposes for its realization moral qualities and sentiments which only Christianity is capable of producing."²⁵ In the spirit of *Rerum Novarum*, *Quadragesimo Anno* saw that solutions to social problems depended on the "Christian reform of morals."²⁶

Shocked by the breakdown of the family caused by a growing number of divorces, the widespread use of contraceptive devices, and the increasing number of women in the labor force, Pius XI promulgated his encyclical *Casti Connubii* (On Christian Marriage) in 1930.²⁷ Pius argued for the integrity of marriage as the basic unit of society and the importance of the Catholic understanding of marriage and family life. The encyclical was in the background to Fitzpatrick's remarks that Catholics should be as vigilant about the family as they were about education.

In 1905, Pope Pius X, in his encyclical *Acerbo Nimis* (On Teaching Christian Doctrine), called for renewal in Roman Catholic education. Moral laxity among Catholics offended Pius. Moral flaccidity was the result of "ignorance of things divine."²⁸ To eradicate ignorance, Pius urged educators "to do all that lies in our power to maintain the teaching of Christian doctrine with full vigor, and where such

²⁴*Quadragesimo Anno* (On the Reconstruction of the Social Order) in Carlen, ed. *The Papal Encyclicals*, vol. 3, 1903-1939, n. 88.

²⁵Charles Bruehl, "The Social Testament of Pius XI," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 39 (May 1939): 793.

²⁶*Quadragesimo Anno*, no. 15.

²⁷*Casti Connubii* (On Christian Marriage) in Carlen, ed. *Papal Encyclicals*, vol. 3, 1903-1939.

²⁸*Acerbo Nimis* (On Teaching Christian Doctrine) in Carlen, ed. *The Papal Encyclicals*, vol. 3, 1903-1939, n. 1.

is neglected to restore it. . . ."²⁹ The organization of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and Marquette University's Institute for Catechetical Studies, directed by Fitzpatrick, were instances of the responses to Pius's encyclical.

The encyclical *Rappresentanti in Terra* (On Christian Education) explained Pius XI's understanding of education in 1929.³⁰ The encyclical influenced Fitzpatrick's thought. He shared the encyclical's disdain for Catholic coeducational schools.³¹ Women were entitled to the same educational opportunities as men, but the education of women differed from the education of men. "Sex differences are large factors contributing to individual differences."³² To support his claim, he cited studies conducted in the Soviet Union and in the United States. Catholic coeducational schools, including Catholic colleges and Catholic universities, were contrary to Catholic educational principles.³³ The force of Fitzpatrick's argument diminished as Catholic coeducational schools became more common.

Fitzpatrick defended the encyclical's position against the philosophy of naturalism that pervaded a child-centered approach to education.³⁴ He contended that naturalism severed education "from its dependence on divine law and, . . . [led to] that evil principle in education of self-realization when [self-realization] means

²⁹Ibid., n. 17.

³⁰*Rappresentanti in Terra* (On Christian Doctrine) in Carlen, ed. *The Papal Encyclicals*, vol. 3, 1903-1909.

³¹Ibid., n. 68.

³²Edward A. Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1938), 66.

³³Idem, "The Catholic Colleges and Universities," *Catholic School Journal* 42 (April 1942): 104; See also Fitzpatrick's articles "Coeducation in Catholic Education and in Russia," *Catholic School Journal* 44 (January 1944): 12; "Russia and Coeducation Again!," *Catholic School Journal* 44 (December 1944): 287; and his book *Philosophy of Education* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1953), 82.

³⁴Idem, *Philosophy of Education*, 60.

merely the individual's lower nature. . . ."³⁵ To foil educators who believed that Catholic education ignored a child-centered approach to education, Fitzpatrick argued for a different interpretation of experience. Catholic education "is a reconstruction of experience, but [Catholic education] is supremely a regeneration of the spirit, and the fundamental means in the reconstruction of experience is the regeneration of the spirit."³⁶

The encyclical defended the right of Catholic schools to exist without intervention by government.³⁷ Fitzpatrick agreed with the encyclical. Federal control of the Catholic school system and other religiously oriented school systems would eliminate alternatives to public education.³⁸ Fitzpatrick said nothing about the consequences of the acceptance of federal funds by Catholic colleges and Catholic universities.

Pius XI sought to defend Catholicism's right to establish and to maintain schools when European states were establishing secular school systems. Because secular schools either eliminated or disparaged religion, Pius's encyclical argued for the Catholic perspective in education. The encyclical asserted that

Christian education takes in the whole aggregate of human life, physical and spiritual, intellectual and moral, individual, domestic and social, not with a view of reducing [human life] . . . , but in order to elevate, regulate, and perfect it, in accordance with the example and teaching of Christ.³⁹

Catholic educators in the United States used Pius's assertion to defend the necessity of Catholic education. George Johnson's commentary on the encyclical stressed the point that "Christian education cannot concern itself exclusively with divine things,

³⁵Idem, "Child-Centered Education," *Catholic School Journal* 30 (March 1930): 83.

³⁶Idem, *Exploring a Theology of Education* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1950), 110.

³⁷*Rappresentanti in Terra*, nn. 51-5.

³⁸Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Our Government and Education," *Catholic School Journal* 30 (January 1930): 1-3.

³⁹*Rappresentanti in Terra*, n. 95.

but embraces all things human, inasmuch as everything human is involved in that fundamental relation with God which we call religion."⁴⁰

In 1919 Catholic bishops in the United States issued a pastoral letter. The letter discussed many topics considered important for Catholics in the United States after World War I. Among the topics discussed, the bishops stated their approval of magazines, newspapers, and other kinds of literature promoting Catholic causes; supported the organization of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; decried secularism; and expressed fear over the loss of the Christian perspective in marriage and family life due to divorce and the increase of mothers joining the labor force.⁴¹

The letter outlined several points governing Catholic education; points echoed in Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education. The bishops placed much responsibility on teachers. Education is "indeed a holy work, not merely a service to the individual and society, but a furtherance of God's design for [humanity's] salvation."⁴² The letter exhorted teachers to be trained by "those agencies which place the Catholic religion at the heart of instruction, as the vitalizing principle of all knowledge and, in particular, of educational theory and practice."⁴³

According to the bishops, the purpose of education was the restoration of awareness of God's presence in the lives of men and women.⁴⁴ The bishops formulated five principles of Catholic education: education as moral activity; the

⁴⁰George Johnson, "Papal Pronouncement on Education Explained," *N[ational] C[atholic] W[elfare] C[onference] Review* 12 (March 1930): 7.

⁴¹National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Pastoral Letter of 1919* in Hugh J. Nolan, ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 1, 1792-1940 (Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, 1983). See nn. 59-62 for the approval of Catholic magazines and newspapers; nn. 75-6 for the organization of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; nn. 101-2 for the de-nunciation of secularism; and nn. 121-136 for the bishops's statements on marriage, family life, and divorce.

⁴²*Ibid.*, n. 32.

⁴³*Ibid.*, n. 34.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*

relationship between knowledge and values; the pre-eminent place of religion in the curriculum; the relationship between religion and other disciplines; and the contribution of religion and morality to the public welfare.⁴⁵ The letter also stated that Roman Catholic schools did not segregate Catholic children from American society. The existence of the Catholic school system was a matter of conscience.⁴⁶

The alleviation of social injustice was a legitimate issue for Catholic education. The pastoral letter drew inspiration from *Rerum Novarum*. The letter eschewed revolution and recognized the right of the working class to a just share of prosperity. Social justice was a legitimate part of Catholic education. The bishops wrote: "Through the ordinary and orderly processes of education, organization and legislation, all social wrongs can be righted."⁴⁷

During and after World War II, secularism continued to be a threat to public and to Catholic education. In 1941 the National Catholic Welfare Conference issued a pastoral letter bearing the approval of American bishops. Entitled *The Crisis of Christianity*, the letter supported Pope Pius XI's condemnation of Adolph Hitler and the Nazis as the "nullifiers and destroyers of the Christian West."⁴⁸ The letter forcefully stated the Catholic position toward communism: "At no time can there be any possibility of compromising with an ideology that proclaims and acts upon the denial of a personal and omnipotent God, rejects . . . the divine Savior of the world,

⁴⁵Ibid., nn. 182-6.

⁴⁶Ibid., n. 199.

⁴⁷Ibid., n. 158.

⁴⁸National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *The Crisis of Christianity* in Hugh J. Nolan, ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 2, 1941-1961, n. 5.

all Christian principles and Christian culture. . . ."⁴⁹ The letter described the war as the "most serious crisis since the Christians came out of the catacombs."⁵⁰

An opponent of secularism, Fitzpatrick argued that religion was not a matter of private concern. In 1947 the National Catholic Welfare Conference, with the approval of Catholic bishops in the United States, issued a pastoral letter entitled *Statement on Secularism*. The bishops said, "A philosophy of education which omits God, necessarily draws a plan of life in which God either has no place or is strictly a private concern of men [and women]. . . . Secularism breaks with our historical American tradition."⁵¹ Religion deserved its rightful place in the curriculum. Appalled by the irony following the exclusion of religion from the curriculum, Fitzpatrick stated, "Secularism, naturalism, and even occasionally atheism is tolerated when religion is not."⁵²

In 1950 American Catholic bishops spoke to American public in their pastoral letter, *The Child: Citizen of Two Worlds*. The bishops noted that "striking advances have been made in meeting the child's physical, emotional, and social needs; but [the child's] moral and religious needs have not been met with the same solicitude and understanding."⁵³ The letter reminded educators that the child "must be seen whole and entire. [The child] must be seen as a citizen of two worlds. [The child] belongs to this world surely, but [the child's] first and highest allegiance is to the

⁴⁹Ibid., n. 7.

⁵⁰Ibid., n. 5.

⁵¹National Catholic Welfare Conference, *Statement on Secularism* in Nolan, ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 2, 1941-1961, n. 9.

⁵²Edward A. Fitzpatrick, *Philosophy of Education* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1953), 410.

⁵³National Catholic Welfare Conference, *The Child: Citizen of Two Worlds* in Nolan, ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 2, 1941-1961, n. 3.

kingdom of God."⁵⁴ For Catholic education, religion was the principle of integration. Religion "will help the children to develop a *sense of God, a sense of direction, a sense of responsibility, and a sense of mission in this life.*"⁵⁵

Three other pastoral letters from American bishops defended the importance of religion for society and for education. In 1951 the letter *God's Law: The Measure of Man's Conduct* discussed the importance of religion in the formation of character. According to the bishops, "The forming of character is part of the educational process; and character cannot be formed unless children are given a clear indication of what is right and what is wrong. This cannot be done without reference to the ultimate standard which determines right and wrong, namely God's law."⁵⁶

The letter *Religion: Our Most Vital National Resource* released in 1952 observed the relationship between religion and citizenship in American history. From the relationship the bishops saw an important lesson for education: "But if religion is important to good citizenship--and that is the burden of our national tradition--then the State must give recognition to its importance in public education."⁵⁷ The erosion of religion in American life caused the bishops to predict a bleak future, "The real danger to our country comes not from any division likely to result from religious education or [religious] profession. It comes rather from the threatening disintegration of our social life, due to the weakening of religion as a constitutive force."⁵⁸

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵Ibid., n. 6.

⁵⁶National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *God's Law: The Measure of Man's Conduct* in Nolan, ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 2, 1941-1961, n. 15.

⁵⁷National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Religion: Our Most Vital National Resource* in Nolan, ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 2, 1941-1961, n. 15.

⁵⁸Ibid., n. 18.

In 1953 the National Catholic Welfare Conference, in conjunction with the American bishops, issued to the American public a letter entitled *A Statement on Man's Dignity*. The importance of religion for character formation again found expression. The letter stated that "modern education is being drained of moral content. . . . Therefore, when education tries to thrive in a religious and moral vacuum, and does not aspire to impart a set of principles and a hierarchy of values, [education] degenerates into a dead and deadening juxtaposition of facts."⁵⁹ The letter also reminded Catholic Americans of their responsibility to society.⁶⁰ Christianity embraced knowledge and action.

From 1879 when *Aeterni Patris* was promulgated to 1953 when United States bishops released their pastoral letter, Catholicism defended the relationships between religion and morality, religion and society, and religion and education. Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education reflected the dynamics in Catholic education. He accepted Leo XIII's that Thomism was a living philosophy capable of answering questions raised by modern culture. Fitzpatrick employed Aquinas's philosophy to establish his philosophy of education. The student had an active role in education. Learning was one means of perfecting the student's being. Catholic education served the individual and society. All aspects of culture were roads leading to God.

Thomism was Fitzpatrick's link to papal encyclicals and pastoral letters which understood education as a means of introducing students to their relationship with God. Franz De Hovre, one of Fitzpatrick's colleagues, explained the educational implication drawn from the relationship between God and human beings:

Intellectual activity becomes spiritual advancement; formation becomes edification. . . . Thus, for instruction to be educative it must serve the ends of morality and religion; [instruction] must take into consideration . . . the subjective and objective

⁵⁹National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *A Statement on Man's Dignity* in Nolan, ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 2, 1941-1961, n. 31. See also n. 10.

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, n. 16.

aspects of intellectual formation; [instruction] must harmonize the individual with . . . social factors.⁶¹

Despite contributions to public education and to Catholic education, Fitzpatrick remained a somewhat obscure figure in educational literature.

Scholarly Literature

A search for assessments or commentaries about Fitzpatrick or his philosophy of education presented a winding trail. Where one would expect to find a remark about Fitzpatrick, none existed. An example was the omission of Fitzpatrick's name from Harold Buetow's book *Of Singular Benefit: The History of Catholic Education in the United States*. Buetow's book introduced to readers individuals who did much for Catholic education. Although Buetow passed over Fitzpatrick's accomplishments, the bibliography to Edward J. Power's book *A History of Catholic Higher Education in the United States* cited two books and one article written by Fitzpatrick.⁶²

Omission of information about Fitzpatrick in the *Bulletins* of the National Catholic Educational Association was especially curious because Fitzpatrick was an active member of the Association for many years. Information about Fitzpatrick was in books, articles, encyclopedias, and reference books. The diversity of sources demanded organization. Pertinent literature is divided into four categories: literature providing biographical information; literature pertaining to American educators; literature discussing Fitzpatrick's interest in religious or philosophical themes in education; and literature introducing Fitzpatrick to the public.

William Lamers, Fitzpatrick's colleague at Marquette University and friend for many years, circulated privately the only extensive biography about Fitzpatrick. Although Lamers wrote a sympathetic account of Fitzpatrick's life, the biography

⁶¹Franz De Hovre, *Catholicism in Education*, trans. Edward B. Jordan (New York: Benzinger Bros., 1934), 469.

⁶²Harold A. Buetow, *Of Singular Benefit: The History of Catholic Education in the United States* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1970); Edward J. Power, *A History of Catholic Higher Education in the United States* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1958), 364.

was deficient for two reasons. Lamers was silent about Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education, and the biography was incomplete. Lamers narrated only fifty-three years of Fitzpatrick's life. The appendix to Lamers's biography was valuable because it listed books, articles, and book reviews which Fitzpatrick wrote, edited, introduced, translated, and contributed to 1937 inclusive.⁶³

The *Author Biographies Master Index* and *Biography and Genealogy Master Index* provided information about Fitzpatrick's life. The popular reference works *Who's Who in America* and *Who Was Who in America* included biographies about Fitzpatrick. The *National Cyclopedia of American Biography* was most generous; almost two pages of small type gave much information about Fitzpatrick's life to the reader. E. Kevane submitted a short article about Fitzpatrick for the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*.⁶⁴

In literature about American educators, several scholars listed Fitzpatrick's contributions to public education and to Catholic education. Three editions of *Leaders in Education* appraised Fitzpatrick's achievements in education. Robert C. Cook and Eleanor Carroll accounted for Fitzpatrick's accomplishments in two editions of *Who's Who in American Education*. Kenneth John Gawrysiak and Raphael N. Hamilton, S.J., wrote about Fitzpatrick's contribution to Marquette University's Graduate School.⁶⁵

⁶³William A. Lamers, *The Public Services of Edward A. Fitzpatrick: A Biography* (Milwaukee: by the author, 1937). The *National Union Catalogue Pre-1956 Imprints*, vol. 174, p. 345-7 listed all books and pamphlets bearing Fitzpatrick's name.

⁶⁴*Who's Who in America*, (Chicago: A.N. Marquis, 1963), 32:1015; *Who Was Who in America*, (Chicago: Marquis--Who's Who, 1968), 4:315; Dennis La Beau, *Author Biographies Master Index* (Detroit: Gale Research Co., 1978): 1:354; Miranda C. Herbert and Barbara McNeil, eds., *Biography and Genealogy Master Index* (Detroit: Gale Biographical Index Series, no. 1, 1980), 3:91; *National Cyclopedia of American Biography* (1967), s.v. "Fitzpatrick, Edward Augustus;" *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967), s.v. "Fitzpatrick, Edward Augustus."

⁶⁵J. McKeen Cattell, ed., *Leaders in Education* (New York: Science Press, 1932), 315; J. McKeen Cattell, Jaques Cattell, and E.E. Ross, eds., *Leaders in Education*, 2nd ed. (New York: Science Press, 1941), 338; Jaques Cattell and E.E. Ross, eds., *Leaders in Education*, 3rd. ed. (Lancaster, Pa.: Science Press, 1948), 353; Robert C. Cook, ed. *Who's Who in Education*, vol. 2 (New York: Robert C. Cook, 1928); Robert C. Cook and Eleanor Carroll, *Who's Who in American Education*, 16th ed. (Nashville: Who's Who in American Education, 1953-4), 418-9; Kenneth John Gawrysiak, "The Administration

John F. Ohles opined that Fitzpatrick "may be the outstanding Catholic lay spokesman in education in the mid-twentieth century."⁶⁶ Fitzpatrick was "a bridge between public and Catholic education."⁶⁷ Ohles's comments were correct for two reasons. First, the number of Fitzpatrick's articles about education was large. Editorship of the *Catholic School Journal* allowed Fitzpatrick ample space for statements about many topics related to Catholic education.

Second, Fitzpatrick never claimed that public education was a threat to Catholic education. To individuals who decried Catholic education as contrary to the spirit of American public education, he said, "the parochial school reinforce[d] and support[ed] upon a moral and religious foundation the civic virtues that are taught in public schools."⁶⁸ The Catholic doctrines of the Incarnation and the human being's spiritual soul conferred a dignity on human existence that "is in accord with our democratic concept of the worth of the individual man."⁶⁹ Fitzpatrick also welcomed suggestions to improve Catholic education from non-Catholic educators when he edited the *Catholic School Journal*.

Several books and articles devoted attention to Fitzpatrick's interest in religious and philosophical themes in education. An anonymous reviewer of Fitzpatrick's book *Exploring a Theology of Education* declared that "hardly any American has been more devoted to education, especially in the Catholic schools,

of Albert C. Fox, S.J.; A Portrait of Educational Leadership at Marquette University, 1922-1928." (Ph.D. diss. Marquette University, 1973), 86-95; Raphael N. Hamilton, *The Story of Marquette University* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1953), 212, 249, 275 n. 38.

⁶⁶John F. Ohles, ed., *Biographical Dictionary of American Educators* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1978), 1:465.

⁶⁷Ibid. 466.

⁶⁸E[dward] A. F[itpatrick], "Are Parochial Schools 'Divisive'?", *Catholic School Journal* 52 (January 1952): 18.

⁶⁹Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Catholicism and American Culture," *Catholic School Journal* 41 (November 1941): 297.

than Edward Fitzpatrick."⁷⁰ The reviewer considered Fitzpatrick's writings to be "superior though not distinguished."⁷¹ Justification for the distinction was not offered. A positive evaluation ended the review. Fitzpatrick's books and articles about Catholic education "have importance . . . for, outside the work of Dr. [Thomas] Shields and Bishop [John L.] Spalding, little has been written in English by Catholics on . . . problems of Christian education."⁷²

Edward B. Jordan, Associate Professor of Education at the Catholic University of America, cited three of Fitzpatrick's books to support his exposition of the Catholic philosophy of education. W. Kane, S.J., of Loyola University of Chicago, expressed gratitude for publication of a book written by Johannes Lindworsky, S.J., translated in part by Fitzpatrick and published among the books in the *Marquette Monographs in Education* series. Books written by William Cunningham, Pierre Conway, and the book written jointly by John D. Redden and Francis Ryan, referred readers to Fitzpatrick's books.⁷³

Tad Guzie credited to Fitzpatrick one of the better explanations of Thomas Aquinas's philosophy of education. Anthony D. Gulley used two of Fitzpatrick's books as secondary sources for his study of Aquinas's philosophy of education.

⁷⁰Unsigned, review of *Exploring a Theology of Education*, by Edward A. Fitzpatrick, in *Thomist* 16 (January 1953): 148.

⁷¹Ibid., 149.

⁷²Ibid.

⁷³Edward B. Jordan, "Catholic Education: Its Philosophy and Background," in *Essays in Catholic Education in the United States*, ed. Roy Joseph Deferrari (Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1942), 24 n. 1; W. Kane, *Some Principles in Education* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1938), 39 n. 1; William Cunningham, *The Pivotal Problems in Education: An Introduction to the Christian Philosophy of Education* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1940), 487, 570; Pierre Conway, *Principles of Education: A Thomistic Approach* (Washington, D.C.: Thomist Press, 1960), 191; John D. Redden and Francis Ryan, *A Catholic Philosophy of Education* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1942), 53, 243.

Besides philosophy, Fitzpatrick's work in religious education won respect from several experts.⁷⁴

G. Delcuve, S.J., informed European readers about Fitzpatrick's contributions to religious education and Fitzpatrick's editorship of the *Catholic School Journal*. Delcuve approved of the *Highway to Heaven* Series, the product of six years of work by Fitzpatrick and the Marquette University Institute for Catechetical Studies. Charles Carmody and Raymond A. Lucker situated Fitzpatrick's understanding of catechetical instruction as an alternative to liberal and conservative approaches. Fitzpatrick wove a moderate position between conservatives who did not want to change the *Baltimore Catechism's* traditional question-and-answer method and liberals who wanted to abandon the *Baltimore Catechism*.

William J. McGucken, S.J., chose Fitzpatrick's effort to improve catechetical instruction as an example of renewed interest in religious education exhibited by Catholic universities in the United States. Fitzpatrick's understanding of religious instruction will be explored in Chapter Two. Joseph Politella recommended three of Fitzpatrick's books in his bibliography for religion teachers.⁷⁵ Despite several sources pointing to Fitzpatrick's interest in religious and philosophical themes in education, only one scholar provided an analysis of Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education.

⁷⁴Tad W. Guzie, "St. Thomas and Learning Theory: A Bibliographical Survey," *New Scholasticism* 34 (July 1960): 287; Anthony D. Gulley, *The Educational Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* (New York: Pageant Press, 1964), 138; Gerald F. Van Ackeren, *Sacra Doctrina* (Rome: Officium Libri Catholici, 1952).

⁷⁵G. Delcuve, *Où en Est L'enseignement Religieux* (Tournai: Éditions Casterman, 1937), 284, 298; Charles J. Carmody, "The Roman Catholic Catechesis in the United States 1784-1930: A Study of Its Theory, Development, and Materials" (Ph.D. diss., Loyola University of Chicago 1975), 287 n. 53; Raymond A. Lucker, *The Aim of Religious Education in the Early Church and in the American Catechetical Movement* (Rome: Catholic Book Agency, 1966), 184-6; William J. McGucken, "The Renaissance of Religion Teaching in American Schools," in *Essays on Catholic Education in the United States*, ed. Roy Joseph Deferrari (Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1942), 341; Joseph Politella, *Religion in Education: An Annotated Bibliography* (Oneonta, N.Y.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Training, 1956), 61, 66, 74.

Franz De Hovre praised Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education in articles written in 1949 and 1954.⁷⁶ The latter article was the more informative. De Hovre observed that Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education avoided the extremes of modernism and traditionalism. He endorsed Fitzpatrick's thesis: "Catholic education has everything to gain by coming in contact with contemporary educational literature."⁷⁷ Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education exemplified respect for tradition and history; demonstrated the integral relationship between a philosophy of human existence and a philosophy of education; and considered theological themes in education.⁷⁸

The rejection of modernism and of traditionalism was an important point in Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education. Fitzpatrick was among a small group of Catholic educators who sought to blend Catholic principles of education with results obtained by research. William M. Halsey briefly described the majority of Catholics who believed that research contributed little to Catholic higher education. George Bull, S.J., exemplified the traditionalist position in Catholic higher education.⁷⁹ Bull stated, "It is the simple assumption that wisdom has been achieved by man, and the humane use of the mind, the function proper to him as man, is contemplation, not research."⁸⁰

Fitzpatrick rejected Bull's position. If Catholic education desired integrity, Catholic educators should not ignore research. Fitzpatrick and other intellectuals

⁷⁶Franz De Hovre, "A Catholic Educational Thinker: Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick," *Catholic School Journal* 49 (June 1949): 184-5; "The 'Catholic Viewpoint of Education' in the Works of Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick," *Catholic School Journal* 54 (June 1954): 199-200.

⁷⁷De Hovre, "The 'Catholic Viewpoint of Education'," 199.

⁷⁸Ibid., 199-200.

⁷⁹William M. Halsey, *The Survival of American Innocence: Catholicism in an Era of Disillusionment, 1929-1949* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980), 55-6.

⁸⁰George Bull, "The Function of the Catholic Graduate School," *Thought* 13 (September 1938): 368.

believed that Thomism "had a life giving power, a dynamic . . . to release in courageous, creative thinking. It is only thus that [Thomism] can gain a hearing in the educational world. . . ."⁸¹ Although Fitzpatrick rejected George Bull's brand of Catholic wisdom, in some respects Fitzpatrick was representative of his time.

Despite pleas for greater opportunities for the laity in Catholic education, Fitzpatrick believed that religious men and religious women, because they vowed their lives to education, should be better teachers than the laity.⁸² Harold J. O'Donnell noted in Fitzpatrick's belief an attitude prevalent among American lay Catholics: lay men and lay women were unequal to men and women who professed religious vows.⁸³

Near the end of his career, Fitzpatrick recognized the vacuity of the long standing belief that all Catholic children would be educated in Catholic schools. The belief ignored reasons why Catholic children were not educated in Catholic schools. Catholics had long ignored problems that made Catholic education undesirable.⁸⁴

Fitzpatrick's reputation extended to the wider reading public. The *Catholic Bookman's Guide* endorsed four of Fitzpatrick's books. Walter Crosby Eells and Ernest V. Hollis referred administrators in higher education to one book and two

⁸¹George Johnson, "The Need for a Catholic Philosophy of Education," in *Aspects of the New Scholastic Philosophy*, ed. Charles A. Hart (New York: Benzinger Bros., 1932), 296. Roy Joseph Deferrari took the point a step further. "It will certainly be ill for Church, for state, for science, for civilization, if the wisdom of the Church be not adequately represented in the growing research army, and ill for Catholics as individuals, if in a Catholic environment, they cannot qualify for the privileged position of tomorrow." (Frank L. Christ and Gerard Sherry, eds., *American Catholicism and the Intellectual Ideal* [New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961], 99).

⁸²E[dward] A. F[itzpatrick], "Lay Teachers and Religious Perfection," *Catholic School Journal* 41 (December 1941): 341.

⁸³Harold J. O'Donnell, "The Lay Teacher in Catholic Education," in *Enlightening the Next Generation: Catholics and Their Schools 1830-1950*, The Heritage of American Catholicism, vol. 5, ed. F. Michael Perko (New York: Garland Publishing Co., 1988), 262 n. 20.

⁸⁴Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Reconstruction of Catholic Education: No. 1. Recent Proposals," *Catholic School Journal* 60 (September 1960): 40.

articles written by Fitzpatrick. Citations to several of Fitzpatrick's books were listed in *American Authors and Books: 1640-1940*.⁸⁵

Different kinds of literature acknowledged Fitzpatrick's role in education. One approach to understanding a philosophy is to understand the philosopher. Our understanding of Fitzpatrick's life and what he accomplished for public and, especially, Catholic education will help us to appreciate Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education. We proceed to Chapter Two.

⁸⁵M. Regis, ed., *Catholic Bookman's Guide* (New York: Hawthorne Books, 1962), 495, 579, 591, 594; Walter Crosby Eells and Ernest V. Hollis, *Administration of Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1960), 80, 122; W.J. Burke and Will D. Howe, *American Authors and Books: 1640-1940* (New York: Gramercy Publishing Co., 1943), 244-5.

CHAPTER 2

A PROFILE OF FITZPATRICK'S LIFE

From New York City to Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Edward Augustus Fitzpatrick was the eldest of five children born to Thomas and Ellen (Radley) Fitzpatrick on 29 August 1884 in New York City, New York. Alfred Emanuel Smith, the first Roman Catholic to seek election to the presidency of the United States, lived near Fitzpatrick's home. Fitzpatrick's family experienced the vicissitudes of the working class. *Ragamuffin* and *uneventful* were the words Fitzpatrick used to describe himself and his childhood. Competition in school and in playgrounds prepared Fitzpatrick for an active life.¹

Fitzpatrick did not attend kindergarten. For several weeks he was a pupil at St. James School. He completed elementary education in a public school. From 1897 to 1900 Fitzpatrick attended Boys High School in Manhattan, the first school to enroll only boys in New York City. He graduated in 1900 after passing an examination issued by the University of the State of New York.² During his years at Boys High School, the school changed its name to De Witt Clinton High School. The school's new name charmed Fitzpatrick, and the allure persisted. His doctoral

¹Lamers, *Public Services of Edward A. Fitzpatrick*, 1. Unless otherwise stated, information about Fitzpatrick's life can be found on pages 2-6; 9-15; 17-22; 31-42; 50-67; 97; 101. Lamers mourned Fitzpatrick's death in his article "Requiescat in Pace," *Catholic School Journal* 60 (October 1960): 22-4.

²Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward Augustus Fitzpatrick*. Sister Maris Stella Shea copied two typed sheets having the title *Dr. Fitzpatrick's Contact with Public Education*. I have a copy of the sheets.

dissertation at Columbia University was a study of De Witt Clinton's educational theory.³

After graduation from De Witt Clinton High School, Fitzpatrick's teaching career began in an elementary school in New York City. Although she had little education, Ellen admonished Edward to continue his education. Fitzpatrick accepted his mother's advice, and he gained admittance to Columbia University. From his mother Fitzpatrick inherited respect for education and conviction in Catholicism. James T. MacEntyre, a priest and a friend of the Fitzpatrick family, also nurtured Fitzpatrick's faith.

In 1907 Fitzpatrick obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree in English literature and a diploma for teaching English literature from Columbia University's Teachers College. He taught English grammar and English literature at the High School of Commerce in New York City from 1908 to 1912. Fitzpatrick continued his education at Columbia University while he taught. He completed requirements for a Master of Arts degree in English literature and a diploma in educational administration. A devotee of poetry, he frequently quoted passages in his books and in his articles. In 1911 the university granted a doctoral degree to Fitzpatrick.

Columbia University and its Teachers College possessed the august scholars John Dewey, Paul Monroe, Edward Lee Thorndike, and William Heard Kilpatrick. Monroe and Thorndike were Fitzpatrick's mentors, and they wrote letters of recommendation for him. Monroe described Fitzpatrick as "a very capable, intelligent and energetic student in the professional study of education."⁴ Thorndike stated that Fitzpatrick demonstrated a "very high capacity in both scholarly and professional

³Edward A. Fitzpatrick, *The Educational Views and Influence of De Witt Clinton*, Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education, no. 44. (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1911; reprint, New York: Arno Press & the New York Times, 1969). Steven E. Siry studied Clinton's political career in his book *De Witt Clinton and the American Political Economy: Sectionalism, Politics, and Republican Ideology, 1787-1828* (New York: Peter Lange, 1989).

⁴Lamers, *Public Services of Edward A. Fitzpatrick*, 7.

work."⁵ Reminiscences about Monroe and Thorndike were not among Fitzpatrick's papers. In a letter to Samuel Knox Wilson, Fitzpatrick stated that Kilpatrick lacked the acumen of John Dewey.⁶

Fitzpatrick secured a leave of absence from the New York City Public School System in 1912, and he joined the Training School for Public Service. The American Political Science Association established the school during a convention at the University of Chicago on 17 November 1912. To help government resolve problems, the Training School for Public Service urged academe to become a resource for government through research and consultation. New York City would never again be Fitzpatrick's home, although Fitzpatrick occasionally returned to New York City as a consultant to the New York City School Board. The school sent Fitzpatrick to Madison, Wisconsin.

Charles McCarthy planned a review of Wisconsin's rural school system for Wisconsin's State Board of Public Affairs for Educational Investigations. McCarthy valued Fitzpatrick's administrative expertise, and he gave to Fitzpatrick responsibility for several parts of the review. The Wisconsin legislature used Fitzpatrick's research to support enactment of a minimum wage law for Wisconsin's teachers in 1913. Friendship between McCarthy and Fitzpatrick bloomed. McCarthy's contribution to Wisconsin was the subject of Fitzpatrick's book published in 1944.⁷ John M. Gaus, Professor of Government at Harvard University, praised both the book and Fitzpatrick's endeavors to make government responsive to the needs of citizens and to improve public education in Wisconsin.⁸

⁵Ibid., 6-7.

⁶Loyola University of Chicago Archives, *Papers of Samuel Knox Wilson*, Box 8, Folder 6. See Fitzpatrick's letter to Wilson dated 24 January 1936.

⁷Edward A. Fitzpatrick, *McCarthy of Wisconsin* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944).

⁸Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Personal Correspondence*, Box 7, File G. See Gaus's letter to Fitzpatrick dated 17 September 1951.

While gathering information for McCarthy's review, Fitzpatrick met several leaders of the progressive wing of Wisconsin's Republican Party. Progressive Republicans advocated the political views of Robert La Follette. They asked Fitzpatrick to write a statement about education for the Republican Party's platform in 1914. Besides responsibilities to McCarthy and to the Republican Party, Fitzpatrick was executive secretary to the Committee on Practical Training for Public Service. The committee monitored government's efficacy at the local, state, and federal levels. He was an adviser to the reviews of Wisconsin's normal schools and the University of Wisconsin's Extension Division. Never one to refuse an assignment, Fitzpatrick assisted also in the organization of the School for the Practical Training for Public Service at the University of Wisconsin in 1917. The school, the first of its kind in the United States, prepared individuals for careers in government. Fitzpatrick earned a reputation for diligence.

In 1913 Fitzpatrick married Lillian V. Taylor from Westfield, Wisconsin. Lillian's father was an official for a railway. They raised five children, but disease plagued the family. Poliomyelitis killed two children. Marjorie Jean, their only daughter, died at the age of four. Edward Augustus Fitzpatrick, Jr., the eldest son, died at the age of fifteen. Myopathy extinguished the life of another son, Richard, at the age of forty-four.⁹

During World War I, Fitzpatrick was commissioned a major in the United States Army Reserve. He supervised the conscription of Wisconsin's men for the United States Army. Under his direction Wisconsin was the first state to meet the government's quota for soldiers. The accusation of unfairly refusing deferments to men of German nationality sullied his accomplishment. An investigation ensued, but the complaint was not warranted. Obligations to Wisconsin and to the United States Army Reserve did not prevent Fitzpatrick from editing the journals *Universities and*

⁹*National Cyclopedia of American Biography*, (1967), s.v. "Fitzpatrick, Edward Augustus."

Public Service (1914), *Public Servant* (1916-1917), *Wisconsin's Educational Horizon* (1919-1923), and *Expert City Government* (1919). He also taught at Marquette University and at the University of Wisconsin.¹⁰

Fitzpatrick was an aide to General Lewis B. Hershey, director of the National Selective Service, during World War II. Fitzpatrick noted sadly in 1943 that educational deficiencies caused the Armed Forces to reject more than 143,000 men and women.¹¹ After the war ended, Fitzpatrick thanked General Hershey for issuing deferments to students in seminaries in the *Catholic School Journal*.¹² The Industrial College of the Armed Forces also employed Fitzpatrick as an administrative aide. The United States Army sent Fitzpatrick to France.

In France Fitzpatrick cultivated an interest in the educational theory of Jean Baptist De La Salle. De La Salle founded the religious order, Brothers of Christian Schools. Fitzpatrick and several members of the order exchanged letters. Brother James Emilian of La Salle College (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) obtained permission for Fitzpatrick's use of documents from the order's archives in France and in the United States for his book *La Salle: Patron of All Teachers*.¹³ Publication of the book followed Pope Pius XII's declaration of La Salle as the patron saint of teachers in

¹⁰Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Clippings*, Box 2. See the article excised from the *Milwaukee Journal* dated 7 July 1929.

¹¹E[dward] A. F[it]zpatrick], "Education of Illiterates," *Catholic School Journal* 43 (January 1943): 13.

¹²F[it]zpatrick], E[dward] A., "Deferment of Theological Students," *Catholic School Journal* 46 (January 1946): 6.

¹³Edward A. Fitzpatrick, *La Salle: Patron of All Teachers* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1951). The Latin text of Pius XII's declaration of La Salle as patron saint of teachers is in *Acta Apostolica Sedis* 42 (29 September 1950): 631-2. Abbreviated English translations of the declaration were printed in *Catholic Mind* 48 (August 1950): 511-2; and *Catholic School Journal* 50 (September 1950): 212.

1950. In gratitude for his book, the Brothers of Christian Schools permitted Fitzpatrick to use the order's initials, F.S.C., after his name.¹⁴

Fitzpatrick was secretary to the Wisconsin State Board of Education from 1919 to 1923. He guided the passage of two bills into laws. In 1919 the Bonus Law granted money for education to Wisconsin's soldiers. The Half-Time Law, enacted in 1921, protected the right of children employed in factories to attend classes on a half-time basis without reprisal from employers.

Politicians exerted an unsavory influence over the State Board of Education. Fitzpatrick described the greed and the opportunism within the State Board of Education,

The educational institutions of the state apparently regarded the meeting of the Legislature as a financial bargain-counter to which they all rushed to get the best bargains. Madison became a kind of winter resort for the heads of educational institutions. The pressure put upon the Legislature was not the needs of the educational institutions but the personal pressure of every kind that could be placed upon the members of the Legislature. There was no comprehensive thinking on educational problems; there was no agency whose point of view was that of the welfare of the whole, rather than the parts. The State Board of Education was organized to provide this State-wide point of view, and to become the center of cooperation of the educational systems of the state. This effort to secure unity of the educational system through cooperation had been met with the personal ambitions of the heads of the educational institutions to secure more students or to expand the work of the institution itself without reference either to its finances or its ability to serve.¹⁵

Fitzpatrick wanted to be eliminate the corruption, but he failed. He caused a controversy, and the board was disbanded for reasons never clearly stated. William Lamers cited the first paragraph of the board's final statement to Wisconsin as an indication of the chaotic situation confronting the board.

So many extraneous reasons were advanced for the abolition of the Board. . . [and] . . . many statements that were not true were made that the Board itself is prompted to put on record a statement, inadequate though it be, of its services to the state. . . [J]udging by the issues of discussions on the floor of the Legislature, the obvious fact is that educational reasons were not controlling in the abolition of the State Board of Education. This effort to secure unity of the educational

¹⁴Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward Augustus Fitzpatrick*. See the pamphlet *Affiliation with the Brothers of Christian Schools*, dated 23 November 1953. I have a copy of the pamphlet.

¹⁵Lamers, *The Public Services of Edward A. Fitzpatrick*, 33. See also 39-40.

system through cooperation had been met with the personal ambitions of the heads of the educational institutions to secure more students or to expand the work of the institution itself without reference either to its finances or its ability to serve.¹⁶

Disbandment of the board ended Fitzpatrick's direct involvement with public education in Wisconsin.

William Lamers recorded words of praise from two of Fitzpatrick's allies and the board's statement of gratitude for Fitzpatrick's efforts. H. T. Wyatt wrote,

His independent thinking, his fearless speaking and courageous action naturally made him unpopular with the leaders of the educational system that had long since served its day. [Fitzpatrick's] lack of respect for its antiquated customs and traditions, cherished by its leaders, was heresy and could not be allowed to go unpunished. So an insidious educational lobby, backed by the strongest political pressure and patronage, prevailed on the legislature of Wisconsin to . . . check his activities by abolishing the Board of which he was secretary.¹⁷

A. M. Brayton stated,

Wisconsin has seen the political death penalty applied to those in its employ who put service above politics. The victim was . . . Edward A. Fitzpatrick, secretary of the state board of Education. His crime was political nonconformity. He was fearlessly independent, and so dangerous. He had dared to propose a new life, expressed in terms of educational policy, for the commonwealth.¹⁸

Fitzpatrick was a martyr, and the board proposed an appropriate resolution.

Whereas Doctor Edward A. Fitzpatrick has acted as Secretary of the state Board of Education continuously since January, 1919, . . . and whereas the members of the Board feel that his conspicuously brilliant service as its secretary during this period demands an expression of its appreciation of his service to the cause of education in the State of Wisconsin be spread upon its records at this time.

Therefore Be It Resolved: That the State Board of Education gratefully acknowledges to Doctor Edward A. Fitzpatrick its great indebtedness to him. . . .¹⁹

At Marquette University

The year 1923 was important for Fitzpatrick and Albert C. Fox. Fox, president of Marquette University from 1922 to 1928, wanted to secure the university's place among the superior universities in the United States. Fox was

¹⁶Ibid., 40.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid., 40-1.

¹⁹Ibid., 41.

aware of Fitzpatrick's accomplishments. Fitzpatrick embarked on his career in Catholic education when Fox appointed Fitzpatrick dean of the university's graduate school in 1924. Additional responsibilities soon followed.

Fitzpatrick was the educational director of the university's College of Hospital Administration, the first college of its kind in the United States.²⁰ From 1924 to 1927 Fitzpatrick edited the journal *Hospital Administration*. Fitzpatrick was an active member of several organizations that counseled and secured resources for hospital administrators. He founded the Marquette University Institute for Catechetical Instruction in 1924. On 7 March 1929 the university appointed Fitzpatrick dean of its undergraduate program.²¹ He arranged publication of the *Marquette Monographs in Education* while he was dean of the graduate school and undergraduate program. Fitzpatrick was a fellow of the Council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1932.²² In 1937 Fitzpatrick was president of the Association of Presidents and Deans of Wisconsin Colleges.²³ He served the university for fifteen years.

Fox entrusted to Fitzpatrick the duty of improving the graduate school. Fitzpatrick recognized the need for change. The graduate school's faculty had little understanding of its role in the university. Minutes from a graduate faculty meeting dated 23 February 1925 recorded Fitzpatrick's statement rejecting the graduate school's pleasant association with Milwaukee as insufficient for the graduate school's reputation. The graduate school, Fitzpatrick said, would thrive on "actual services or research finds inside the University."²⁴ Fitzpatrick believed also that "appoint-

²⁰*Marquette Tribune*, 2 Oct. 1924.

²¹*Idem*, 7 Mar. 1929.

²²*Idem*, 17 Mar. 1932.

²³Ohles, *Biographical Dictionary of American Educators*, 1:466.

²⁴Marquette University Archives, *Graduate Faculty Minutes*, C-7, Series 1, Box 19.

ment to the undergraduate school did not establish a presumption to teach in the graduate school. . . ."²⁵ He envisioned the graduate school's faculty as an elite group in the university providing service to Milwaukee and scholarship to the academic community.

To enhance the reputation of the graduate school's faculty, Fitzpatrick and the graduate school required scholarship as a condition for promotion. The graduate school demanded doctoral degrees from its faculty. The university intensified its effort to hire reputable scholars. Fitzpatrick gave purpose and direction to the graduate school's faculty, but some faculty members were unhappy about Fitzpatrick's directives. The graduate school abounded in rumor and gossip. Fitzpatrick expressed his displeasure at the comments he had heard. Innuendoes endangered the graduate school's reputation. He ordered the faculty to cease the spread of rumor and gossip.²⁶

Fitzpatrick's personality might have chafed some faculty members. A remark about a trait in Fitzpatrick's personality appeared in the *Wisconsin State Journal*. A.M. Brayton wrote, "[Fitzpatrick's] zeal for education may have caused him to neglect the tact that ordinarily characterized him."²⁷ Was Fitzpatrick abrasive? Were gossip and rumors retaliatory measures instigated by faculty members irritated by the flaw in Fitzpatrick's personality? The questions aroused speculation, but conclusive evidence is lacking. However, Fox and Fitzpatrick gained national recognition for the graduate school.

In 1928 Fox and Fitzpatrick happily announced that "requirements for graduate degrees at Marquette were similar to those of the top graduate institutions

²⁵Gawrysiak, "Administration of Albert C. Fox," 88.

²⁶Marquette University Archives, *Graduate Faculty Meeting Minutes*, C-7, Series 1, Box 19. See the minutes for April, 1927 and 21 July 1927.

²⁷Idem, *Fitzpatrick, Dr. Edward A., Dean of Graduate School, 1884-1960*, A 4.5, Series 9, Box 12. See the article excised from the *Wisconsin State Journal* dated 20 December 1926.



of the country."²⁸ The university "was given a special rating on the approved list of the Association of American Universities and authorized to confer the doctorate in several branches."²⁹ Under Fitzpatrick's guidance the graduate school expanded the number of courses offered, standardized requirements for graduate degrees, increased the number of candidates for graduate degrees, and ratified statutes defining the governance of the graduate school. Fitzpatrick taught a course that studied problems of university administration. The course was a requirement for all candidates for the doctoral degree.³⁰ Fitzpatrick ensured the university's interests.

In 1937 Fitzpatrick again voiced demand for scholarship from Catholics. Pope Pius XI appointed six scholars from the United States to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences in 1937. None graduated from Catholic institutions of higher learning. The failure of scholars from Catholic colleges or Catholic universities in the United States to be selected for the academy elicited Fitzpatrick's statement,

These designations are definitely a challenge to the Catholic colleges and universities of the country. They . . . suggest that what Catholic education needs in this country is a thoroughgoing co-operation of all the agencies of Catholic higher education in the promotion of scholarship and research in the sciences.³¹

Fitzpatrick's efforts to improve public education and Catholic education merited an honorary degree from Loyola University of Chicago.

In 1929 Austin G. Schmidt, dean of Loyola University's Graduate School, conferred the degree. Schmidt described Fitzpatrick as "a living force and an inspiration in the school he directs . . . ; a man deserving . . . honor for . . . the wisdom of his contribution to the common welfare."³²

²⁸Gawrysiak, "Administration of Albert C. Fox," 94.

²⁹Hamilton, *The Story of Marquette University*, 249.

³⁰Gawrysiak, "Administration of Albert C. Fox," 90-95.

³¹E[dward] A. F[itzipatrick], "Pontifical Academicians," *Catholic School Journal* 37 (February 1937): 45.

³²Loyola University of Chicago Archives, *Convocations of Loyola University*, 1929.

Schmidt became dean of Loyola University's School of Education, and he was editor of the *Loyola Educational Digest*. Schmidt "stood out among the most learned American Jesuits of his time, especially in the field of pedagogy."³³ Appreciation for good books and scholarship attracted Schmidt to the Loyola University Press. From 1928 to 1960 Schmidt was director of the Press. Schmidt was also an adviser to the *Catholic School Journal*.

Scholarship required solitude. Pleas from Jesuits for a refuge for study captured Schmidt's attention. Schmidt founded Writers House for their use. Writers House is presently located in Evanston, Illinois.³⁴ Fitzpatrick and Samuel Knox Wilson were members of the College Department of the National Catholic Education Association for the Midwest Regional Unit. Correspondence between Wilson and Fitzpatrick discussed two important issues for Catholic higher education. Recognition of Catholic scholarship was the first issue. A bibliography listing works of significant scholarship was sent to members of the North Central Association of Colleges and Universities. The bibliography omitted works by Catholic scholars. The omission caused alarm among administrators of Catholic colleges and Catholic universities.

Wilson requested from Fitzpatrick and from others titles of scholarly books written by Catholics. Fitzpatrick responded promptly. Wilson compiled the bibliography, and he circulated the bibliography among his colleagues.³⁵ Wilson's leadership in the compilation of Catholic scholarly works was appropriate. Wilson received his

³³Fortman, Edmund L., *Lineage: A Biographical History of the Chicago Province* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1987), 122.

³⁴Ibid., 122-4.

³⁵Loyola University of Chicago Archives, *Papers of Samuel Knox Wilson*, Box 8, Folder 6. See Fitzpatrick's letter to Knox dated 8 February 1936. Letters in Box 8, Folder 6 tell the struggle Wilson experienced to obtain bibliographies from some colleagues. The title of Wilson's bibliography is: *Supplementary List of Reference Books not on North Central Association List*. A copy of the bibliography is in the appendix to Edward A. Fitzpatrick, ed. *The Autobiography of a College* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1939).

doctoral degree from Cambridge University. He taught in the History Department of Loyola University's Graduate School from 1929 to 1932.³⁶

The second issue was the process of accreditation for Catholic colleges and Catholic universities. Fitzpatrick presided over the Committee on Accreditation of the National Catholic Educational Association in 1935. Wilson was secretary to the Committee. In 1935 Fitzpatrick wrote the *Report of the Committee on Accreditation*. The guarantee of the integrity of Catholic higher education was Fitzpatrick's purpose. Fitzpatrick made the committee's findings known to a wider audience. In the *Catholic School Journal* he wrote,

Catholic colleges, without the external pressure from unofficial accrediting agencies, would not have made the progress in the training of faculty, in library and laboratory facilities, and in practically all the formal requirements that they have. We do not . . . impose upon ourselves the standards which make possible an eminent service to our students.³⁷

Admission of competent students, competency among faculty and administration, accurate records for students and administrators, and adequate libraries for research including the libraries' physical condition were some essential areas diagnosed as substandard. The *Report of the Committee on Accreditation* established criteria applicable to all Catholic colleges and Catholic universities.³⁸ The assurance of equality of Catholic colleges and Catholic universities with state or private institutions of higher learning was an important task for Wilson and for Fitzpatrick.

A recommendation was also proffered. It was stated that agencies responsible for accreditation too often assigned precedence to an institution's financial condition. Fitzpatrick and the committee suggested that educational standards, not an

³⁶Fortman, *Lineage*, 53.

³⁷E[dward] A. Fitzpatrick], "Accreditation of Catholic Schools," *Catholic School Journal* 36 (July 1936): 190.

³⁸Loyola University of Chicago Archives, *Papers of Samuel Knox Wilson*, Box 8, Folder 6. See the document *Report of the Committee on Accreditation of the College Department*, 13-4. The *Report* was published in *National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin* 31 (August 1935): 1-14.

institution's financial condition, were primary. Issues of accreditation, competency of faculty, students, and administration, adequate libraries, and the primacy of educational standards above financial considerations admitted to weaknesses in Catholic higher education. Wilson and Fitzpatrick tried to correct them.³⁹ The committee disbanded after the *Report of the Committee on Accreditation* was issued. The committee established a uniform accreditation policy. Wilson directed attention to the quality of teaching in Catholic undergraduate education.

A Round Table Conference for the Committee on Graduate Studies assembled in New Orleans, Louisiana on 17 April 1941. Fitzpatrick was not present. Wilson and the conference charged "men and women who plan to receive the doctorate and make college teaching their life work [to] have some formal training in the field of education and should have the benefit of practice teaching."⁴⁰ Although Fitzpatrick did not attend the meeting, Fitzpatrick would later state his support for better teaching on all levels of Catholic education.

Among Wilson's papers there is Fitzpatrick's statement about the role of the Committee on Educational Problems and Research. The committee succeeded the Committee on Accreditation. Fitzpatrick discerned the need for "a group which shall consider . . . problems from a scholarly point of view without being involved in any administrative details, or . . . determining the policies of accrediting."⁴¹

³⁹Loyola University of Chicago Archives, *Papers of Samuel Knox Wilson*, Box 8, Folder 6. See the document *Report of the Committee on Accreditation of the College Department*, 9.

⁴⁰Idem, *Papers of Samuel Knox Wilson*, Box 22, Folder 22. See the document *Round Table Conference, Committee on Graduate Studies*, 4-5. ✓

⁴¹Idem, *Papers of Samuel Knox Wilson*, Box 8, Folder 6. See the document *Committee on Educational Problems and Research, A Personal Statement by the Chairman*, 1. The Committee's position was published with a slight change of title: "Committee on Educational Problems and Research: A Personal Statement Recommending Establishment," in the *National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin* 33 (August 1937): 92-6.

Cooperation among Catholic colleges and Catholic universities was essential to the committee. "As institutions we are generally reluctant to provide adequate organization, or adequate clerical and administrative assistants . . . Perhaps we can make good that deficiency through this Committee."⁴² The Committee acted as "a clearing house for any studies now being conducted in any Catholic college. In this way any studies going on in any Catholic college will be made available to all."⁴³

The committee met twice at Loyola University of Chicago. The first meeting convened on 5 November 1936. Members discussed the student's spiritual life, acquisition of books and periodicals deemed essential for libraries, and other topics.⁴⁴ At the second meeting, assembled on 22 February 1937, participants debated the necessity of teachers holding graduate degrees for undergraduate education, the requirement of languages in the undergraduate curriculum, and the value of athletic scholarships.⁴⁵ Resolutions were not obtained, but Wilson and Fitzpatrick grasped another opportunity to assure the integrity of Catholic higher education. They did not permit Catholic higher education to evade problems and questions.

Fitzpatrick twice made pleas for accurate presentations of teachings about the Catholic faith. He cited the article about Catholicism in the fourteenth edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* as an example of inaccuracy. The *Encyclopedia* denied Peter as the founder of the Church, claimed that Mary had other children, and condemned Catholicism as incompatible with democracy. The statements infuriated

⁴²Loyola University of Chicago Archives, *Papers of Samuel Knox Wilson*, Box 8, Folder 6. See the document *Committee on Educational Problems and Research, A Personal Statement by the Chairman*, 5.

⁴³*Ibid.*, 2.

⁴⁴Loyola University of Chicago Archives, *Papers of Samuel Knox Wilson*, Box 8, Folder 6. See Knox's letter to Julius W. Haun dated 5 November 1936.

⁴⁵*Idem*, Box 8, Folder 3. See the document *National Catholic Educational Association, Library Committee, Midwest Regional Unit, Executive Committee and Committee on Educational Problems*.

Fitzpatrick.⁴⁶ His second plea was a request dear to Catholics during his lifetime. Too often, Fitzpatrick complained, the veneration of saints included inaccurate historical details. He reminded Catholics that tales and legends were not substitutes for accurate details.⁴⁷

The treatment of Catholic education in standard textbooks about education in the United States displeased Fitzpatrick. Fitzpatrick's book *The Foundation of Christian Education* pointed to two books, Paul Monroe's *Textbook in the History of Education* and Thomas Davidson's *History of Education*, as examples of disregard for Catholicism's contributions to education in the United States.⁴⁸ Fitzpatrick bemoaned the Protestant bias in textbooks.⁴⁹ To counter the bias, he implored scholars to write books or textbooks about Catholic contributions to education in the United States.⁵⁰

When Samuel Knox Wilson established in 1936 the Institute of Jesuit History at Loyola University of Chicago, Fitzpatrick relished the opportunity for Jesuits and for other scholars to document the order's history in the United States and the Jesuit contribution to the history of Catholic education in the United States. In his speech to members of the Institute of Jesuit history, Fitzpatrick told his audience that the institute must write a history of the Jesuit contributions to education in the United States,

The fundamental challenge to the Institute that I make is then from the standpoint of educational history. What we wish you would do ultimately is to write

⁴⁶[Edward A. Fitzpatrick], "The *Encyclopedia Britannica*," *Catholic School Journal* 30 (December 1930): 465.

⁴⁷Idem, "The Lives of Saints," *Catholic School Journal* 31 (July 1931): 263.

⁴⁸Edward A. Fitzpatrick, ed., *The Foundation of Christian Education*. Marquette Monographs in Education, no. 5 (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1930), 19-20. Citations to the books written by Paul Monroe and Thomas Davidson are: Paul Monroe, *A Text-Book in the History of Education* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1918); Thomas Davidson, *A History of Education* (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1900).

⁴⁹[Edward] A. Fitzpatrick], "The History of Education," *Catholic School Journal* 29 (November 1929): 328.

⁵⁰Idem, "Catholics in American Educational History," *Catholic School Journal* 29 (November 1929): 328.

a competent and comprehensive educational . . . [and] . . . social history of the Jesuits, and that means . . . a history of Catholic education.⁵¹

The institute promoted "scholarly work in the field of American History in which Jesuits have had part."⁵² Jerome V. Jacobsen, S.J., director of the institute, stated the institute's position,

[the] Institute makes no pretensions as to its magnitude or importance. [The Institute] intends to learn and to aid in learning. [The institute] sets before itself a task which will necessarily be slow of accomplishment. . . . [The institute] is . . . is aware of its dependence upon preceding contemporary learned men and societies.⁵³

The institute realized Wilson's wish for a community of scholars dedicated to research and to publication of Jesuit history in the United States.⁵⁴

Jesuits from different provinces in the United States were members of the institute. The institute required publication of research and teaching graduate courses in the university's History department.⁵⁵ Scholars who were not members of the Society of Jesus could be appointed to the institute, if they were nominated by the institute's Board of Trustees.⁵⁶ The journal *Mid-America* published many articles written by the institute's members. Fitzpatrick was both an honorary member of the institute and the institute's educational adviser.⁵⁷

⁵¹Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "A Challenge to the Institute," *Mid-America* n.s. 7 (July 1936): 157. See also 163-4.

⁵²Loyola University of Chicago Archives, *Papers of Samuel Knox Wilson*, Box 15, File 46. See the preamble of the document *Proposed Constitution of the Institute of Jesuit History*.

⁵³Jerome V. Jacobsen, "The Jesuit Institute of Loyola University: Its Organization," *Mid-America* n.s. 7 (July 1936): 152.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, 151.

⁵⁵Loyola University of Chicago Archives, *Papers of Samuel Knox Wilson*, Box 15, Folder 46. See Article II of the document *Proposed Constitution of the Institute of Jesuit History*.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, See Article III of the document *Proposed Constitution of the Institute of Jesuit History*.

⁵⁷Jacobsen, "Jesuit Institute of Loyola University," 151.

Jacobsen and Jean Delanglez, S.J., produced fine work for the institute. Jacobsen wrote many articles about the early history of Jesuits in the United States. He also edited the journal *Mid-America*.⁵⁸ In his area of expertise, Jacobsen "was probably the most knowledgeable scholar in the United States."⁵⁹ Delanglez specialized in the history of Jesuits in colonial French America.⁶⁰ When Delanglez resided at the institute, the

Institut d'Histoire de l'Amerique Francaise of the University of Montreal conferred upon him the honorary degree of *Docteur des Lettres*; simultaneously, the Canadian government announced that a large peninsula in the Province of Quebec would hence forth be known as *Presqu'-Ilse Delanglez* in recognition of his outstanding work on the French explorers Jolliet, Marquette, and La Salle.⁶¹

The institute became inactive, but not suppressed, after Wilson left Loyola University of Chicago.⁶² The journal *Mid-America* published its last article in 1987.

Fitzpatrick's effort for Marquette University, his association with Samuel Knox Wilson, and his role in the National Catholic Educational Association attested to his conviction that Catholic higher education possessed the potential to assume a position of leadership in American society. Despite Fitzpatrick's record of achievement, his relationship with Marquette University waned. Unusual circumstances surrounded Fitzpatrick's resignation from Marquette University, and the reasons for Fitzpatrick's resignation are not in the University's archives. His relationship with Marquette University ended in July, 1939.

The decision to leave the university was mutually agreed on. On 5 May 1938, Fitzpatrick received a letter of termination from the university's president, Raphael C. McCarthy, S.J. A sentence in the letter alluded to a discussion Fitzpatrick had

⁵⁸Fortman, *Lineage*, 67-8.

⁵⁹Ibid., 67.

⁶⁰Ibid., 68.

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Michael Grace, archivist at Loyola University of Chicago provided the information.

with McCarthy prior to the letter, but reasons for non-renewal of Fitzpatrick's contract were not listed. In response to McCarthy's letter, Fitzpatrick promised not to disclose the reasons for his resignation. On 9 June 1939, the *Milwaukee Journal* reported that Fitzpatrick's resignation was the result of Fitzpatrick's disagreement with the university's policy governing the granting of graduate degrees. In response to the *Milwaukee Journal*, McCarthy said that the differences between Fitzpatrick and the university "were over essentials that needed correction, and not as to fundamentals in the conduct of the school and granting of master's and doctor's degrees as indicated by Dr. Fitzpatrick in recent speeches."⁶³

Marquette University's archives has one speech that instanced the speeches mentioned by McCarthy. On 21 April 1928, Fitzpatrick addressed the National Catholic Alumni Federation. He described the Catholic school system as "disorganized and chaotic . . . [and] . . . the 'demi-monde' of scholarship were to be found in the Catholic seats of learning."⁶⁴ The statement was acerbic, and it echoed Brayton's remark about Fitzpatrick's occasional failure to speak tactfully.

Despite the shroud surrounding Fitzpatrick's departure from the university, William Lamers recorded comments from the respected philosophers John Reidl and Anton C. Pegis affirming Fitzpatrick's value to the university. John Reidl said,

The . . . development of the Marquette University Graduate School . . . shows Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick to be an outstanding administrator and educator, for he, more than any other person, is responsible for it. . . . He has also, by his research and scholarly publication, been a real inspiration and model of productive scholarship. These traits, combined with a strong character and decisiveness, make him a most inspiring superior.⁶⁵

⁶³Marquette University Archives, *Fitzpatrick, Dr. Edward A., Dean of Graduate School, Letter of Resignation*, D-2, Series 4, Box 11. See the letters dated 5 May 1938 and 28 May 1938. The article excised from the *Milwaukee Journal* is in the Marquette University Archives, *Fitzpatrick, Dr. Edward A., Dean of Graduate School, 1884-1960*, A 4.5, Series 9, Box 12.

⁶⁴Idem, *Fitzpatrick, Dr. Edward A., Dean of Graduate School, 1884-1960*, A 4.5, Series 9, Box 12. See the article excised from the *New York Evening World*, dated 21 April 1928.

⁶⁵Lamers, *Public Services of Edward A. Fitzpatrick*, 50-1.

Anton C. Pegis stated,

Energy, scholarship, a serious effort to define clearly and to put into practice high educational ideals--these are the characteristics which are uppermost in my mind when I think of Dr. Fitzpatrick as dean. . . . [H]e has imparted to his duties as a dean the vision of man who, seeing life steadily and seeing it whole, has been able to reflect in his work a philosophy of life which is also an educational creed.⁶⁶

Mount Mary College observed Fitzpatrick.

At Mount Mary College

Several members of the School Sisters of Notre Dame, founders of Mount Mary College, studied at Marquette University.⁶⁷ Some enrolled for Fitzpatrick's courses. An anonymous historian for the order described Fitzpatrick's personality during a summer session, "Through his unerring good humor, idealism, and sincerity, he accomplished much for Mount Mary's future in those six weeks of summer school."⁶⁸

In 1929 Mount Mary College designated Fitzpatrick as president. He acquired the distinction of holding important offices in different academic institutions.⁶⁹ Fitzpatrick was president until 1954. The college then conferred the rank of president *emeritus*, and Fitzpatrick represented the college at civic functions until 1956. The college has a long history.

Mother Caroline Friess founded St. Mary's Institute and Academy in Prairie Du Chien, Wisconsin in 1872. According to Fitzpatrick, Mother Caroline possessed a "richly endowed mind, a resolute will, extraordinary executive ability, . . . and [she was] a true missionary."⁷⁰ The United States archbishops John Martin Henni, Martin

⁶⁶Ibid., 51-2.

⁶⁷Fitzpatrick, *Autobiography of a College*, 59.

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹I have a copy of the pamphlet issued by Mount Mary College that announced the appointment of Fitzpatrick as president.

⁷⁰Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Foundations of St. Mary's College," *Catholic Educational Review* 27 (March 1929): 129-30.

J. Spalding, and John Ireland were aware of Mother Caroline's dedication to education.⁷¹ The institute changed its name to St. Mary's College and Academy in 1913. Desire to expand facilities and to increase enrollment brought St. Mary's Institute and Academy to Milwaukee in 1928. In 1929 St. Mary's changed its name to Mount Mary College. From the college's earliest days to the present, the education of women has been the college's mission.⁷²

Campion College of the Sacred Heart, organized by the Society of Jesus, was a neighbor to St. Mary's Institute. The college aided St. Mary's Institute and Academy from its earliest days. Professors from Campion taught at the institute and advised the institute's administration. "Among those deserving special praise for unstinting cooperation is Reverend Albert Fox, S.J."⁷³ The bond between the Jesuits and the School Sisters of Notre Dame may account for Fitzpatrick's positions at Mount Mary College and at Marquette University.

The college's selection of Fitzpatrick as president was propitious. The number of faculty and the number of students were small. The college granted only thirteen degrees in 1930.⁷⁴ Fitzpatrick's ability to attract funds and students was vital. Many of Fitzpatrick's letters appealed for donations from Milwaukee's business community, and Milwaukee's moneyed citizens were generous.

Fitzpatrick seized every opportunity to advertise the college. A former faculty member succinctly described his greatest accomplishment for the college, "He put us on the map!" Fitzpatrick's administrative duties at Marquette University and Mount Mary College made him a candidate for the presidency of two institutions of

⁷¹Ibid., 129.

⁷²Fitzpatrick, *Autobiography of a College*, 8-10.

⁷³Ibid., 56.

⁷⁴Ibid., 23. St. Mary's College granted seventy-nine degrees during the years 1916 to 1929.

higher learning and one position in the State Department. He was not selected for the positions.

In 1933 Fitzpatrick was a candidate for the presidency of Hunter College.⁷⁵ When the University of Massachusetts searched for a president in 1947, Samuel Knox Wilson, Robert Maynard Hutchins, and General Lewis B. Hershey wrote letters in support of his application.⁷⁶ In 1951 the State Department reviewed Fitzpatrick's qualifications for the position of cultural attaché in Rome, Italy.⁷⁷

Fitzpatrick's tenure at Mount Mary College was calm. He had a firm grip on the college's day-to-day activities, and he enjoyed the college's pleasant environment. The college's archives has pictures of Fitzpatrick attending many functions. He attended regularly the college's Father and Daughter Day. Edward and Lillian Fitzpatrick enjoyed dancing, and they tired orchestras at dinner-dances sponsored by the college. Students once organized a Greek festival. On the day the festival began, Fitzpatrick walked about campus wearing a toga as his sign of support for the festival.⁷⁸ Appointments were not necessary because the door to his office was always open.⁷⁹ One student wrote a paean to Fitzpatrick:

In touch with his own age and with the generation still in the cradle, he envisions a new generation--youth, gay and beautiful, discovering anew the romanticism of life, the challenge of every new day, the opportunity of every age to move in fullness to that 'One far-off Divine event to which the whole creation moves.'⁸⁰

⁷⁵Marquette University Archives, *Fitzpatrick, Dr. Edward A., Dean of Graduate School, 1884-1960*, A 4.5, Series 9, Box 12. See the article excised from the *Milwaukee Journal* dated 27 March 1933.

⁷⁶Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Personal Correspondence*, Box 9, File Q. The file contains Fitzpatrick's expressions of appreciation to the individuals who supported his application.

⁷⁷Idem, Box 9, File S. See Professor Guy Snavely's letter to Fitzpatrick dated 9 April 1951.

⁷⁸Idem, *Pictures*.

⁷⁹Fitzpatrick, *Autobiography of a College*, 56.

⁸⁰Ibid.

The student's language was ornate, but the sentiment was unmistakable.

One organization was suspicious of the college's small enrollment. The American Association of University Women rejected the college's application for admission in 1951. The college's salary scale and the college's facilities failed to meet the association's standards. Fitzpatrick's defense of the application was sharp and swift. The association and Fitzpatrick negotiated for more than one year. In 1953 the association accepted the college's application.⁸¹

Fitzpatrick cultivated a mutually beneficial relationship with Milwaukee's business community. The relationship began when Fitzpatrick became dean of Marquette University's Graduate School.⁸² Employment opportunities for the college's graduates were always needed. Fitzpatrick refuted hints that a liberal education was unsuitable for business. He reminded Milwaukee's business community that a liberal education was appropriate for many positions.

The role of religion in higher education was very important to Fitzpatrick. A *Faculty Memoranda* dated 28 March 1935 explained his understanding of the Catholic liberal arts college. A Catholic liberal arts college fostered Catholic men and women; presented not only religious instruction but also Catholicism as a creative force in Western culture; and developed specialized knowledge built on the foundation of liberal education. The faculty was responsible for implementing Fitzpatrick's theory of Catholic undergraduate education.⁸³ Others noticed his interest in the relationship between religion and culture. Fitzpatrick became a member of the executive committee for the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and

⁸¹Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Personal Correspondence*, Box 5, AAUW File.

⁸²Marquette University Archives, *Marquette University Publicity Publications (1924-1934)*. See the document written by Fitzpatrick, *The University's Vision of the City: Marquette's Vision of Milwaukee*.

⁸³Mount Mary College Archives, *Faculty Memoranda, vol. 1 (1932-1944)*, no. 28.

Cultural Affairs.⁸⁴ He was also a member of the Institute for Religion and Social Studies.⁸⁵ In 1957 Fitzpatrick was the chairman of the Committee of the Commission on Higher Christian Education of the American Association of Colleges.⁸⁶

Milwaukee's citizens had an occasion to judge the merits of Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education. In 1949 he lectured for the *Milwaukee Centennial Lectures* on Education sponsored by Alverno College, Mount Mary College, Marquette University, and Cardinal Stritch College.⁸⁷ He published his lectures in his book *How to Educate Human Beings*.⁸⁸ The book was translated into German.

Fitzpatrick corresponded with many in Europe and the United States. Some letters were friendly exchanges of information. Other letters mentioned defeats and triumphs affecting different organizations to which Fitzpatrick belonged. A review of several of Fitzpatrick's letters reveals more about his life and personality.

Marquette University's Institute for Catechetical Instruction and Fitzpatrick's interest in religious education lead to an exchange of letters, during the years 1938-1954, with Franz De Hovre, a Belgian priest, educator, and director of the Catechetical Institute in Louvain, Belgium. De Hovre appreciated Fitzpatrick's effort in religious education, and he wrote an article about Fitzpatrick for the journal *Vlaamsch Opvoedkundig Tijdschrift*.⁸⁹ He also reserved a column for an article about

⁸⁴Idem, *Faculty Minutes*, vol. 2 (1939-1949). See the minutes dated 11 December 1946.

⁸⁵Idem, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Personal Correspondence*, Box 7, File F. See Louis Finkelstein's letter to Fitzpatrick date 14 June 1952.

⁸⁶Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Thomism--Not So Bad after All," *Catholic School Journal* 57 (January 1957): 10.

⁸⁷Mount Mary College Archives, *Faculty Memoranda*, vol. 3 (1948-1950), no. 616.

⁸⁸Edward A. Fitzpatrick, *How to Educate Human Beings* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1950).

⁸⁹Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Personal Correspondence*, Box 7, File C. A copy of the article is in the file.

Fitzpatrick in the encyclopedia *Katholic Encyclopaedic voor Onderwijsen Opvoeding*.⁹⁰ Fitzpatrick reciprocated. The *Catholic School Journal* published an article about De Hovre's writings.⁹¹

Friendship between Fitzpatrick and Frank Bruce, patriarch of the Bruce family and chairman of the Bruce Publishing Company, lasted many years. The company advanced the work of Catholic authors, and Frank Bruce had a keen interest in Catholic education. Mount Mary College received grants and books from the company.⁹² Convinced the *Catholic School Journal* had failed to protect the interests of Catholic education, the company purchased the *Catholic School Journal* in 1929, and the company underwrote all expenses. At the request of Frank Bruce, Fitzpatrick accepted the position as editor. Fitzpatrick edited the *Catholic School Journal* until his death on 13 September 1960.

A debate occurred between Fitzpatrick and Robert Maynard Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago. Hutchins's Great Books Program attracted much attention in the United States. Fitzpatrick objected to Hutchins's disdain for theology, but he did not deny the program's merit. When Hutchins and the Ford Foundation decided to move the program beyond colleges and universities, Fitzpatrick took umbrage. The tactic proclaimed the program to be an elixir for the uneducated. The program belonged in the college or university. Fitzpatrick's book *Great Books: Panacea or What?* stated his position.⁹³

⁹⁰Idem, Box 5, File C. See De Hovre's letter to Fitzpatrick dated 30 January 1950. Despite seventeen years of correspondence, there are only a few letters in the file. De Hovre and Fitzpatrick corresponded in French. De Hovre's script is difficult to read. The letters are in Box 7, File C.

⁹¹Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Catholic Educational Thinker, F. De Hovre," *Catholic School Journal* 49 (June 1949): 184-5.

⁹²Mount Mary College Archives, *Faculty Memoranda*, vol. 2 (1945-1947), no. 307. When Frank Bruce died, Fitzpatrick wrote and published a eulogy entitled "Frank M. Bruce 1885-1953," *Catholic School Journal* 53 (April 1953): 105-6.

⁹³Edward A. Fitzpatrick, *Great Books: Panacea or What?* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1952).

William Heard Kilpatrick received a copy of Fitzpatrick's book, and he agreed with Fitzpatrick's position. Kilpatrick aimed an invective at Mortimer Adler, Hutchins's associate. Kilpatrick characterized Adler as "the most insecure man of intellectual standing I have ever known."⁹⁴ Hutchins and Fitzpatrick remained friends, but Fitzpatrick's disapproval lingered. In 1957 Fitzpatrick wrote in the *Catholic School Journal*, "If we take . . . the educational pretense out of the Great Books program, we have simply a commercial enterprise with a clever, inexpensive sales program, utilizing 'local school officials,' parent-teacher associations, and adult education associations."⁹⁵ Fitzpatrick was an elitist. Colleges and universities reserved the privilege to investigate the great ideas and the great accomplishments of Western culture.

Fitzpatrick's letters to his colleagues were sincere and friendly. He responded promptly to inquiries, and he never denied a request for help. Yet Fitzpatrick was not reluctant to express criticism. Merle Curti, celebrated historian at the University of Wisconsin, was a target of Fitzpatrick's criticism. His criticism followed the publication of Curti's history of the University of Wisconsin. In a letter to a colleague, Fitzpatrick outlined the circumstances.

Merle Curti had planned to write a history of the University of Wisconsin. Fitzpatrick had sent to Curti an article that recounted his work for the university. Curti did not acknowledge receipt of the article. After Fitzpatrick had read Curti's book, he mused on two possibilities: either Curti did not use the article or Curti

⁹⁴Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Personal Correspondence*, Box 8, File K. See the letters exchanged between Kilpatrick and Fitzpatrick dated 3 March 1952 and 10 April 1952.

⁹⁵E[dward] A. F[itpatrick], "The Great Books Once More," *Catholic School Journal* 57 (February 1957): 42.

incorporated the article without Fitzpatrick's permission.⁹⁶ Fitzpatrick said nothing more about his suspicions.

When Fitzpatrick retired in 1954, his final act was the award of an honorary degree to John Tracy Ellis, noted historian of Catholicism in the United States.⁹⁷ The college's newspaper *The Times* summarized Fitzpatrick's achievements: member of the American Association of Colleges' Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, the first layman to govern the Midwest Region of the National Catholic Education Association in 1939, member of the National Commission on Christian Higher Education of the Association of American Colleges in 1946, the first layman to receive an honorary degree for contributions to education from St. Mary's College, San Francisco, California, in 1948, and visiting professor for a summer term at Auslands-Dolmetcher Institute (part of the University of Mainz, Germany,) in 1951.⁹⁸ Besides Loyola University of Chicago, St. Mary's College in Winona, Minnesota (1951), St. Louis University (1933), and Loyola University of New Orleans (1939) granted honorary degrees to Fitzpatrick.⁹⁹ *The Times* failed to quote Fitzpatrick's claim that Mount Mary College was the first college in the United States to organize a course in Occupational Therapy.¹⁰⁰

Upon retirement, he and Lillian Fitzpatrick resided in Washington, D.C. Illness often forced Fitzpatrick to decline to speak at civic ceremonies and academic

⁹⁶Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Personal Correspondence*, Box 6, File A. See the letter dated 13 January 1950. The citation to Curti's book is: Merle Curti and Vernon Carsten, *The University of Wisconsin: A History 1848-1925*. 2 vols. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949; reprint, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1974).

⁹⁷Mount Mary College Archives, *Faculty Memoranda*, vol. 4 (1951-1954), no. 1132.

⁹⁸Idem, *Clippings*, copy of *The Times*, 17-21 May 1954, 1.

⁹⁹I appreciate the effort of Sister Maris Stella Shea compiled a list of honorary degrees granted to Fitzpatrick from Catholic colleges and Catholic universities. I have a copy of list.

¹⁰⁰Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Catholic Colleges and Universities, 1941-1942," *Catholic School Journal* 42 (April 1942): 104.

affairs. St. Procopius College, now Illinois Benedictine College, invited Fitzpatrick to speak at its commencement ceremony on 29 May 1957. Fitzpatrick accepted, and the *Catholic School Journal* published his commencement address.¹⁰¹ His health did not prevent him from being a guest of the Brazilian government to review and to make suggestions for improving Brazil's educational system.¹⁰² He died in Washington D.C., and his body is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.¹⁰³ Since Fitzpatrick's retirement, the college developed several graduate programs and extended its influence in Milwaukee. Mount Mary College dedicated a building bearing Fitzpatrick's name.

Despite responsibilities to Marquette University and to Mount Mary College, Fitzpatrick held important positions in two other organizations devoted to Catholic education. Both organizations afforded insights to Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education. The Marquette University Institute for Catechetical Studies and the *Catholic School Journal* were the forums of Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education.

In the acknowledgement to his book *A Curriculum in Religion*, Fitzpatrick stated that plans for the institute began when he was asked by Daniel Cunningham, an archdiocesan superintendent of schools from Chicago, Illinois, to aid the development of a program for religious education.¹⁰⁴ Fitzpatrick taught courses that studied religious education. Acclaim for the courses led to the institute's establishment. Fitzpatrick recounted the institute's early history, "We set up an Institute of Catechetical Instruction with five Jesuits on the board of the Institute and [myself]

¹⁰¹Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "New Earthly Paradise," *Catholic School Journal* 57 (September 1957): 203-5.

¹⁰²Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "A North American Confers with Brazilian Educators," *Catholic School Journal* 57 (June 1957): 177-9.

¹⁰³Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Obituary*. The file has obituaries that were printed in Milwaukee's newspapers and other newspapers in the United States including the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*.

¹⁰⁴Edward A. Fitzpatrick, ed., *A Curriculum in Religion* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1931).

as the executive. We accumulated a special library on catechetical instruction."¹⁰⁵ The institute requested advice from priests teaching in Catholic colleges or Catholic universities, parish priests, and seminarians.¹⁰⁶

A spirited debate among religion teachers and authors of catechetical materials existed when the institute was organized. Should religious education be directed "to the 'intellect' or 'the will'"; toward the increase of knowledge or a change of behavior?; . . ."¹⁰⁷ One's answer determined how one would employ the *Baltimore Catechism* or smaller catechisms based on the *Baltimore Catechism*. Some refused to change the *Baltimore Catechism's* content and question-and-answer methodology. Memorization preserved correct doctrine, and correct doctrine was the index of one's commitment to the Catholic faith.¹⁰⁸

Fitzpatrick rejected memorization as the sole teaching methodology. "The child's interest in the logical formulation of theological truth which the *Catechism* represents is not in accord with normal child development or normal child interest."¹⁰⁹ The *Catechism* was too abstract for children. Memorization did not present the Catholic faith as a *response* to a loving God. "Conventional methods of teaching religion and training for character must be frankly faced and constructively criticized."¹¹⁰ Religious knowledge should produce a change. "Knowledge is for living. The approach must be through the mind . . . to the will of [men and women].

¹⁰⁵Idem, "The Making of Textbooks," *Catholic School Journal* 56 (November 1956): 279.

¹⁰⁶Ibid.

¹⁰⁷Carmody, *Roman Catholic Catechesis*, 264.

¹⁰⁸Ibid.

¹⁰⁹[Edward A. Fitzpatrick], "Romance and the Catechism," *Catholic School Journal* 30 (February 1930): 68.

¹¹⁰Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Editorial Announcement," *Catholic School Journal* 29 (September 1929): 196.

Doctrine is an essential part of religious education, but the test is its effectiveness in and on life. . . ."111

The institute's approach to catechetical instruction emphasized both the child's psychological development and Catholic doctrine. Fitzpatrick explained, "We want the saving truths of religion definitely formulated and expanded into the whole Christian view and attitude toward life in the psychological development of each individual. This must be our ideal, and to miss either aspect is fatal."¹¹²

There was a flaw in a methodology that stressed memorization. Fitzpatrick knew that the "mere fact that the child has memorized . . . the catechism is no guarantee . . . that the child can see the significance of the explanation that comes to his [or her] mind."¹¹³ He readied the talents of Marquette University's School of Education to aid the institute. He believed that "the education department should devote its energy to the supreme task of Catholic education: religious education in the elementary school level."¹¹⁴ Fitzpatrick acknowledged the importance of religious education in the elementary school. "What the student gets in elementary school should not be 'static' ideas about religion, but germinal ideas centered around the doctrinal ideas of the catechism."¹¹⁵

The organization of the institute was timely. As the Catholic school system grew in size and enrollment, skepticism about the utility of the *Baltimore Catechism* as a textbook for religious education increased. When few Catholic schools existed

¹¹¹[Edward] A. Fitzpatrick, "Knowledge and Religious Education," *Catholic School Journal* 34 (April 1934): 83.

¹¹²Idem, "The Child and the Catechism," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (February 1935): 38.

¹¹³[Edward A. Fitzpatrick], "Do not Teach What Needs to Be Unlearned," *Catholic School Journal* 32 (June 1932): 204.

¹¹⁴Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The 'Highway to Heaven' Series," *Journal of Religious Instruction* 37 (February 1937): 525.

¹¹⁵Idem, "Catholic Ideal in Education," *Sign* 19 (June 1940): 663.

in the United States, the *Baltimore Catechism* provided information, and parents were responsible for their child's religious formation.¹¹⁶ More schools and larger enrollments shifted responsibility for religious formation to Catholic educators.

Frustration with the *Baltimore Catechism* "surfaced at the annual meetings of the archbishops. It was more clearly evident at the grass roots level."¹¹⁷ The institute was not alone in its effort to improve religious education. De Paul University in Chicago, Illinois and Loyola University of Chicago evaluated religious education programs and suggested alternatives.¹¹⁸ The improvement of religious education for elementary schools was an important service the institute and other Catholic institutions supplied to Catholic education.

The institute was part of a larger movement in catechetical education called progressive traditionalism. Progressive traditionalism was a compromise between traditionalists who did not want to change the question-and-answer methodology and radicals who sought to abandon the *Baltimore Catechism* in favor of a methodology emphasizing child psychology. Progressive traditionalism "retained the catechism as the basis of religious instruction with a continued insistence on some memorization but progressive in so far as it . . . stressed greater explanation of the catechismal text and its enrichment by narrative, pictures, hymns, poems, etc."¹¹⁹ Progressive traditionalism also underlined the pupil's self-activity in the teaching of religion.¹²⁰

¹¹⁶Lucker, *The Aims of Religious Education*, 167.

¹¹⁷Mary Charles Bryce, *Pride of Place: The Role of the Bishops in the Development of Catechesis in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1984), 99.

¹¹⁸McGucken, "Renaissance of Religion Teaching," 338.

¹¹⁹Carmody, *Roman Catholic Catechesis*, 262.

¹²⁰*Ibid.*, 332.

An improved textbook for religious education classes ranked first on Fitzpatrick's agenda. Textbooks "should be as well organized, as carefully selected . . . and appropriately illustrated and printed as text-books in secular subjects."¹²¹ His interests multiplied. He urged the improvement of teaching methodologies, pleaded for better educated religion teachers, and applauded individuals who explored the relationship between liturgy and doctrine.¹²²

Pastors and educators could not evade responsibility to provide the best catechetical materials and the best catechetical instruction. Fitzpatrick parried complaints about the lack of religious zeal among students. He observed that "religious education does not get translated into personal experience--is not incarnated in the individual life. God is an abstraction. Mere knowledge about God is sterile."¹²³ If properly formulated, religious education instilled a "sense of mission, a dedication of the life of the individual to God."¹²⁴

The institute used the *Baltimore Catechism's* content. To the content Fitzpatrick added religious art, religious hymns, religious poetry, biblical history, church history, liturgical rites, and stories about virtuous living to enliven the *Catechism's* content. "These were not merely so many elements; they would be

¹²¹Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The 'Highway to Heaven' Series: Part II. The Underlying Educational Ideas," *Journal of Religious Instruction* 37 (March 1937): 606. Fitzpatrick identified Cornelius Shyne, Gerald Ellard, and Robert Johnston as Jesuits associated with the Institute when the Series was published. It is uncertain if they were members of the Institute's board when the Institute was founded. Rudolph Bandas was also associated with the Institute when the Series was published.

¹²²An example of Fitzpatrick's plea for improved teaching methodologies was his article "No Teaching without Learning," *Catholic School Journal* 33 (January 1933): 8-9. In two articles Fitzpatrick stated his wish for better educated religion teachers: "Advanced Training for Sisters," *Catholic School Journal* 30 (January 1930): 35; and "Laymen Part of the Church," *Catholic School Journal* 31 (May 1931): 183. Fitzpatrick explained his understanding of the relationship between liturgy and doctrine in his article "The Fundamental Principle of the Liturgy," *Catholic School Journal* 32 (November 1932): 333.

¹²³Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Child: Citizen of Two Worlds," *Catholic School Journal* 51 (January 1951): 2.

¹²⁴*Ibid.*

incorporated into a progressive, cumulative, reinforcing whole."¹²⁵ Depth and vision were important.

The materials of a religious curriculum must be as extensive as Catholic culture and not merely confined to Christian Doctrine or the catechism. It must deal with not only religious doctrine but with Christian life guided by knowledge and love of God and neighbor. . . . Christ must be the center and the organizing thread throughout all of it.¹²⁶

Fitzpatrick and the institute made certain that the child had the opportunity to apply "what he [or she] is learning to his [or her] own life and of his [or her] playmates and neighbors, in home, on the playground, and in the street."¹²⁷ In 1930 the institute published two series of textbooks, the *Religion in Life Curriculum* and the *Highway to Heaven Series*. The *Religion in Life Curriculum* was produced for the Chicago archdiocese, and it was the prototype for the institute's program, the *Highway to Heaven Series*.¹²⁸

Fitzpatrick was proud of both series. They demonstrated "a comprehensive, organized, and unified presentation of [Catholicism] on the elementary school level."¹²⁹ The *Religion in Life Curriculum* and the *Highway to Heaven Series* related the *Catechism*

to the child's experience and development, [and] put [the *Catechism*] in a form and language that [the child] can understand and appreciate and finally [gave to the *Catechism*] a setting and association that will lead to action at every possible opportunity in [the child's] life.¹³⁰

¹²⁵Fitzpatrick, "The 'Highway to Heaven' Series," 528.

¹²⁶Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Curriculum in Religion: A Preview," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (April 1935): 97.

¹²⁷Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The 'Highway to Heaven' Series Part III. Special Features," *Journal of Religious Instruction* 37 (April 1937): 720.

¹²⁸Lamers, *Public Services of Edward A. Fitzpatrick*. The appendix lists the titles of textbooks comprising the *Religion in Life Curriculum* and the *Highway to Heaven Series*.

¹²⁹Fitzpatrick, "The 'Highway to Heaven' Series," 526.

¹³⁰Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Religion in Elementary Grades," *Commonweal* 18 (30 June 1932): 238.

In the *Highway to Heaven* Series, each textbook examined a different aspect of the Catholic faith.

In the first two years the child is occupied entirely with the life of Christ. In the third grade the concern is with Christ the Redeemer and Christ in his Church. The fourth and fifth grades Christ in the history of [humanity] is the interest. Jewish history is treated as a preparation for Christ as the Messiah. The continuing life of Christ in us and in the Church as the Body of Christ, as it finds expression in the liturgy, is the interest of the sixth grade. The seventh and eighth grades deal with the whole Christian redemptive scheme through Christ with the doctrinal aspects emphasized.¹³¹

The series reduced the amount of material to be memorized.¹³² Each textbook suggested teaching methodologies and recommended supplementary materials.¹³³ Other features of the series were: vocabulary understandable to the pupil, liturgy centered on the pupil's ability to understand, text-books designed to be attractive and comfortable to hold, illustrations pertinent to the immediate lesson, training in virtue, and the encouragement to write stories or to invent situations whereby what was taught became internalized in the student.¹³⁴ A member of the Jesuit community at Loyola University of Chicago, George Keith supplied audio-visual equipment for the sixth grade textbook.¹³⁵ Fitzpatrick wrote the series's text-books for the third, fourth, and sixth grades.

The institute's activity languished after a productive beginning. Disappointment in the fate of the institute irritated Fitzpatrick. George H. Mahowald, S.J., directed the institute after Fitzpatrick left Marquette University, and Mahowald gave little attention to the institute. Fitzpatrick later accused the university of neglect

¹³¹Fitzpatrick, "The 'Highway to Heaven' Series Part II," 607.

¹³²The role of memorization in religious education continues to be a problem. Cf. Una O'Neil, "Memorization in Catechesis," *Living Light* 16 (Summer 1979): 209-16; Paul J. Philibert, "The Promise and Perils of Memorization," *Living Light* 17 (Winter 1980): 299-310.

¹³³Fitzpatrick, "The 'Highway to Heaven' Series," 529.

¹³⁴*Ibid.*

¹³⁵Fitzpatrick, *A Curriculum in Religion*, 105.

toward the institute in a letter to a friend.¹³⁶ His interest in religious education found new quarters at the *Catholic School Journal*.

Besides recommending books and materials to improve Catholic education, the *Catholic School Journal* alerted readers to issues and programs judged important to the National Catholic Education Association. Readers met the leaders of Catholic education. The *Catholic School Journal* published papal and synodal statements about education. Many columns reported the success or failure of different programs for religious education. Non-Catholic scholars and non-Catholic teachers who supported religious education were welcomed.¹³⁷ Fitzpatrick told readers that all educational literature "whether written by Catholics or non-Catholics, which is fruitful in ideas, fertile in suggestions, or constructive in its proposals, and serviceable in carrying out the great ideal of Catholic education, . . . will be found . . . in these pages with specific reference to Catholic educational practice."¹³⁸

Fitzpatrick summarized the his perspective, "The scope . . . was to include the whole range of educational problems in the elementary and secondary schools together with such general considerations of purpose, organization, and administration of the whole Catholic educational system as affected by these."¹³⁹ Fitzpatrick and the *Catholic School Journal* worked "to change the emphasis on our popular slogan that 'every child should be in a Catholic school' to the more significant slogan . . .

¹³⁶Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Personal Correspondence*, Box 3A, Bergstrom File. See Fitzpatrick's letter to Gertrude Bergstrom dated 8 November 1949.

¹³⁷Fitzpatrick, "Editorial Announcement," 196.

¹³⁸*Ibid.*

¹³⁹Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Catholic School Journal 1929-1949," *Catholic School Journal* 51 (January 1951): 180.

'every Catholic school should be worthy of the Catholic child.'¹⁴⁰ The pages of the *Catholic School Journal* were an outlet for Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education.

Fitzpatrick's career in public and Catholic education revealed a man of enormous energy, and he was a person who committed himself wholeheartedly to his tasks. His accomplishments connected him to individuals who made their mark on the world. There was something more to Fitzpatrick than the individuals he met, argued with, and considered his friends. Fitzpatrick's convictions were sincere.

Sincerity in his work for public education and Catholic education made him an asset to each educational system. Fitzpatrick could have attacked public education as the foe of Catholic education, and he could have accepted George Bull's interpretation of truth. In each case Fitzpatrick forged and defended his own position. One might not have agreed with Fitzpatrick, but one understood clearly his position.

Secularism emerged as a formidable opponent to a religious perspective on human existence during Fitzpatrick's association with Catholic education. Fitzpatrick believed that public education was wrong to exclude religion from the curriculum, but public education was not in itself evil.¹⁴¹ Catholic bishops in a pastoral letter noted that religion was an integral part of the history of the United States, and they urged educators in public schools to "give recognition [to religion and] to its importance in public education."¹⁴²

Fitzpatrick's interest in religion in education employed a philosophy of education which demonstrated how religion perfected human existence. Catholic bishops in the United States in a pastoral letter echoed Fitzpatrick's position.

¹⁴⁰Ibid., 181.

¹⁴¹E[dward] A. F[it]zpatrick], "Religion in Public Education," *Catholic School Journal* 47 (October 1947): 272.

¹⁴²*Religion, Our Most Vital National Resource* in Nolan, ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 2, 1941-1961, n. 7.

The forming of character is part of the educational process; and character cannot be formed unless children are given a clear indication of what is right and what is wrong. This cannot be done without reference to the ultimate standard which determines right and wrong, namely God's law.¹⁴³

Editorship of the *Catholic School Journal*, director of the Marquette University Institute for Catechetical Studies, and president of Mount Mary College were Fitzpatrick's opportunities to write and to reflect on Catholic education. Supported by papal encyclicals and the pastoral letters by bishops in the United States, Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education attempted to bring Catholicism to all aspects of life. Catholic education was the arena for the merging of secular and religious concerns.

Religion was not a sign of a residual, primitive past that faced extinction. The religious end to human existence necessitated the inclusion of religion at the center of the curriculum. Religion was not hostile to an educational program. Fitzpatrick would argue that to be human was to be religious.

Fitzpatrick believed that Christianity perfected human existence. Catholic education welcomed all that was good for human existence and directed the good toward a supernatural end. Similar to Leo XIII, Fitzpatrick's appropriation of Thomism as a philosophy of education was a means of explaining how the student can see the world from a religious perspective welcoming the achievements of men and women. An account of Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education will be our focus in the next chapter.

¹⁴³*God's Law: The Measure of Man's Conduct* in Nolan, ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 2, 1941-1961, n. 10.

CHAPTER 3

FITZPATRICK'S PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

Thomistic Foundation

The central theme in Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education was the student's self-activity in the process of learning, a theme Fitzpatrick borrowed from Thomas Aquinas. Many philosophers of education believed that Jean Jacques Rousseau's philosophy of education was the exemplar of the student's self-activity in the process of learning, and Rousseau's heirs refined the theme. They either ignored or overlooked the fact that Aquinas's philosophy of education stressed the student's self-activity in the process of learning. Rousseau was not the first to discover the theme.

In *De Magistro*, Thomas Aquinas developed the same theme for his philosophy of education. In the introduction to Mary Helen Mayer's translation of Aquinas's philosophy of education, Fitzpatrick pointed to the vitality in Aquinas's philosophy of education,

[Learning] is a process of self-activity, self-direction, and self-realization of [a human being's] highest potentialities. Extrinsic agents--teachers, textbooks, and the whole range of social tradition, are merely the conditions of its development. They are aids; the process is one of self-development.¹

To philosophers and to educators who disregarded a Catholic philosophy of education, Fitzpatrick said mockingly, "Recent educational literature makes it appear almost a modern discovery, a distinguished characteristic of modern education that life is the great teacher, and that education is a kind of living."² Aquinas's

¹Mayer, *Philosophy of Teaching in St. Thomas Aquinas*, 8.

²Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Education and the Incarnation," *Catholic School Journal* 29 (December 1929): 366.

philosophy of education was Fitzpatrick's defense against detractors who believed that Catholic education sacrificed the student's self-activity for authority and for tradition.

An examination of themes associated with Aquinas's philosophy of education is appropriate. Unless we acquaint ourselves with Aquinas's philosophy of education, we shall not appreciate the foundation of Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education. *De Magistro* is Question 11, Articles 1-4, a part of Aquinas's larger work, *De Veritate*. The examination is neither a textual analysis nor a historical analysis of *De Magistro*.³ Our focus is the essential themes philosophers have recognized in Aquinas's philosophy of education.

According to Aquinas, human beings were rational. Learning was a natural tendency. Human beings had the potential to learn. Through understanding the student derived meaning from things.⁴ Learning rested solely with the student.⁵ Understanding was a natural function of the student's mind, and understanding marked the mind's activity in the process of learning. "What is learned should never be passively or mechanically received. . . . It must rather be actively transformed by understanding into the very life of the mind. . . ."⁶ Learning perfected reason, and learning extended throughout one's life.⁷

³See n. 73 in Chapter 1 above for authors who provide textual and historical analyses of Aquinas's philosophy of education.

⁴Robert J. Slavin, "The Thomistic Concept of Education," in *Essays in Thomism*, ed. Robert E. Brennan (Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1972), 322.

⁵G.J. Shannon, "Aquinas and the Teacher's Art," *Clergy Review* n.s. 31 (June 1949): 377.

⁶Jacques Maritain, *Education at the Crossroads*, Terry Lectures 1943 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943), 50.

⁷Francis C. Wade, "Saint Thomas and Teaching," in *Some Philosophers on Education*, ed. Donald A. Gallagher (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1956), 71.

Learning was dependent on God. God supplied the student's mind with the first principles of knowledge. First principles were self-evident, and first principles enabled the student's mind to grasp the reality of things presented to them. From first principles "all other principles proceed as if from certain seeds of reason."⁸

Discovery and teaching were the principal ways of learning. Discovery "is a natural action, the [rational movement] in the student by which he [or she] acquires science by himself [or herself]."⁹ Discovery "consists in applying the common principles which are immediately known to determined matter and then proceeding to some particular conclusions, and from these conclusions to others."¹⁰ "Teaching is an artificial action; it is the [mind's rational movement] induced artificially . . . by the teacher in the [student]."¹¹ The teacher induced the rational movement of the student's mind from knowledge already acquired to new knowledge.¹² For Aquinas and Thomists, "God is the creative First Cause of the learner's perception of truth and certitude of what is proposed to him [or her] in instruction."¹³ God was the depth of the student's being acting as an intrinsic principle in the process of learning.

In most cases, a student learned by instruction, and teachers had a distinctive role in the process of learning. Teachers nurtured the student's self-activity. Learning focused on the student, not the teacher. "It is . . . the teacher's responsibility

⁸Van Ackeren, *Sacra Doctrina*, 60.

⁹Ibid., 69.

¹⁰Ibid., 61.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid., 66.

¹³Gulley, *Educational Philosophy of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, 67.

to produce conditions under which [self-activity] will be stimulated."¹⁴ Teaching "is not a transfusion nor a transfer of knowledge."¹⁵ The teacher caused "a personal discovery in the mind of the student."¹⁶ Following Aquinas's analysis, "to teach in a human fashion means to lead a [student] to new knowledge through a [movement] which is the intellectual operation of the [student] . . . but caused externally by a teacher . . . through the instrumentality of words. This [movement] in the [student] is the movement of the intellect from potential to actual knowledge."¹⁷

Words, spoken or written, were the teacher's medium, but words did not convey knowledge. Words were only the proximate cause of knowledge. Words stimulated the process of reasoning that led to new knowledge.¹⁸ Teachers also offered to students examples from

experience or particular statements which the pupil is able to judge by virtue of what he [or she] already knows. . . . The teacher has further to confront the mind of the pupil by putting before [the pupil's] eyes the logical connections between ideas which the analytic or deductive power of the pupil's mind is perhaps not strong enough to establish by itself.¹⁹

Books, films, and other aids to learning exercised the student's self-activity and served the teacher's instrumental role in the process of learning. When aids to learning became the *ends* of learning, learning and teaching were confused.²⁰

¹⁴Thomas Corbishley, "St. Thomas and Educational Theory," *Dublin Review* 212 (January 1943): 7.

¹⁵Mayer, *Philosophy of Teaching in St. Thomas Aquinas*, 4.

¹⁶Etienne Gilson, "The Eminence of Teaching," in *Truth and the Philosophy of Teaching*, McAuley Lecture 1953 (West Hartford, Conn.: St. Joseph College, 1957), 7.

¹⁷Van Ackeren, *Sacra Doctrina*, 61-2.

¹⁸Ibid., 62.

¹⁹Maritain, *Education at the Crossroads*, 31.

²⁰Lawson, "Neo-Thomism," 51-2.

Effective teachers possessed knowledge of their disciplines and knowledge of the best methods to stimulate the student's self-activity.²¹

In the process of learning, the student developed the habit of learning. "Learning is a process of self-activity by which an intellectual habit is formed. Teaching is the helping of that process [habit formation] by ministering materials and tools. . . ." ²² Habit had an important role in Aquinas's philosophy of education. Aquinas respected the

student's intellectual and moral virtues. Thomism avoids the teachings of extreme intellectualism which pretends that virtue is simply knowledge; Thomism maintains that the principles of the virtues are acquired through science, though virtue itself is acquired by the repetition of acts, and not simply knowing what is right and what is wrong.²³

For Aquinas, a *person* was a unity of all aspects of existence.

So education for citizenship, for service, for industrial and commercial and political self-reliance, may have their place, but only if they contribute in the right proportion to the making of persons in the full sense, which includes uniqueness, freedom, responsibility, and immortality.²⁴

The unity of existence was based on Aquinas's metaphysical insight that creation was ordered from the lowest to the highest kinds of created beings. Human beings were related to all created things. Human beings perceived creation's unity and constructed an ordered existence. Balance was a key feature in Aquinas's philosophy of education.

Catholic education believes there is a supernatural end to human existence. The supernatural end did not require flight from the world. The supernatural end "includes the salvation and completion of [human beings] in time."²⁵ The God of

²¹Mayer, *Philosophy of Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas*, 21-2.

²²*Ibid.*, 128-9.

²³Lucien Dufault, "The Aristotelian-Thomistic Concept of Education," *New Scholasticism* 20 (July 1946): 253.

²⁴Lawson, "Neo-Thomism," 50.

²⁵Anton C. Pegis, "Catholic Education in American Society," in *Disputed Questions in Education* (New York: Doubleday, 1954), 14.

Catholicism abhorred neither human effort nor human culture. The Incarnation was the guarantor of God's love for creation. By being in the world the person finds "himself [or herself], [his or her] very humanity, building, by the monuments of science and art, of inventive and social progress, of moral and spiritual growth in human relations, his [or her] . . . incarnate spirit into a [person]."²⁶

Knowledge, intellectual virtues and moral virtues, relationships with society, and the promotion of culture produced ontological changes in men and women. Aquinas's philosophy of education called for the fullness of human existence. His philosophy of education was part of a philosophical and theological understanding of human existence. Men and women came from God, and they returned to God. Aquinas's philosophy of education urged men and women to construct

a civilization on earth as the vehicle of their dedication to heaven. Our work is in the world; in [men and women] and [their] cultivation as . . . human person[s]; in the humanization of the earth through the education of [men and women] according to all the spiritual height of [their] humanity; . . . to build a society that is full of the true spirit of [humanity] and that is open to the reign of Christ.²⁷

Love grounded the relationship between God, student, and teacher. Creation was the act of God's love. The love of parents for child, of child for parents, of individuals for each other and for society reflected God's love for creation.²⁸ For Thomists, education was an opportunity to experience God's love for human beings.

The loving relationship between God and human beings identified the Catholic philosophy of education. Creation was *good*. Human existence had *intrinsic value*. Creation was not morally neutral. Creation was the material from

which [men and women realize themselves], [their] world, and [their] God. Thomistic education . . . understands the nature of the educable, but its true value lies in its formal object--[men and women] considered as perfected, and conse-

²⁶Ibid., 12.

²⁷Ibid., 14.

²⁸A.C.F. Beales, *Education under Penalty* (London: Athlone Press, 1963), 6-7.

quently educated, by the complete development of [their] natural and supernatural faculties.²⁹

Fitzpatrick's appropriation of Aquinas's philosophy of education was an attempt to formulate a Catholic response to educational issues. The issues focused on two questions: what is the nature of the human being and what is the end of human existence? Secularism suspended consideration of religion and religious issues. Fitzpatrick advocated a philosophy of education that embraced religion. He followed scholasticism's dictum: philosophy was the handmaid of theology.

The question of the nature of human beings was not a small matter. The human being's relationship to the world bore philosophical consequences. Fitzpatrick accepted Catholicism and its effort to direct culture to a religious end. Albert Dondeyne captured the importance of the relationship of Catholicism to culture.

Christendom, as a living community of believers, is not merely an instrument in the hidden hand of God working for the salvation of the world. It is also a humanism, an original intensely spiritual and personalist way, not only of conceiving human existence, but of accepting it, exercising it, and promoting it for oneself and others.³⁰

A gulf did not separate the world from God. God was alive in the world, and the Christian was alive to God. Fitzpatrick said, "[T]he center of education is the human being and the meaning of the environment is what it means to the human being."³¹ Aquinas saw the world as open to a religious interpretation. Fitzpatrick followed Aquinas's insight. We now review Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education.

²⁹Robert J. Slavin, "The Essential Features of the Philosophy of Education of St. Thomas," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 13 (December 1937): 22.

³⁰Albert Dondeyne, *Contemporary European Thought and Christian Faith*, trans. Ernan McMullin and John Burnheim, Duquesne Studies, Philosophical Series no. 8 (Pittsburgh, Pa.: Duquesne University, 1958), 197.

³¹Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Some Thoughts at the Beginning of This School Year," *Catholic School Journal* 42 (September 1942): 203.

Fitzpatrick's Philosophy of Education

An important statement introduced Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education. He claimed that education was "a great thing, a holy thing, and [men and women are] divinely human thing[s]."³² Education had the most serious task of molding an individual. Excepting the family and religion, no other influence affected the formation of an individual as directly as education.

Fitzpatrick's description of the human being as "a divinely human thing" was equally important. Human beings had a divine worth. "Man [or woman] is an immortal spirit, and his [or her] education is to realize this highest in him [or her]-in spirit and in truth."³³ True education was responsible for the student's spiritual formation.

Education prepared an individual for a particular kind of life. "The end of education is a kind of life. It is an organized life. In the highest sense it is a spiritual life. It is a life in society manifesting the love of neighbor and realizing its powers for human welfare."³⁴ In stark contrast to the uncertainty about the end of human existence among some educators, Fitzpatrick's position was firm. "It is the uncertainty about [humanity's] destiny that is the basis of so much confusion of modern education. This is the central educational problem."³⁵

Fitzpatrick refused to compromise, "[Men and women have] a spiritual nature or [they have] not. [They are] destined for immortality or [they are] not."³⁶ The end of human existence was reflexive; the end established the purpose of education. The

³²Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Parents and Education: A Word to Parents," *Catholic School Journal* 53 (September 1953): 202.

³³Edward A. Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1938), 123.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 164.

³⁵Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Theology and Some Educational Implications," *Catholic School Journal* 47 (December 1947): 335.

³⁶Fitzpatrick, *Philosophy of Education*, 62.

end of human existence punctuated the importance of a philosophy of education. For schools and educators to be sure of their purpose, their understanding of human existence "makes a difference which conception of [human] nature and of [human] destiny [one accepts]."³⁷

Philosophy of education united all the facts of the science of education and the hierarchy of human values, including the nature and purpose of man [and woman], the nature of human acts . . . of learning and teaching. [Philosophy of education] aims to determine the highest human values, or aim, or objective, . . . and then organize the materials about them.³⁸

A philosophy of education was an integral part of philosophy of life. "The meaning of education can be resolved only in terms of the meaning of life."³⁹

Definitions of Human Being and Education

Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education began with a definition of a human being: "[A human being is] rational. [A human being] has free will. [A human being] is capable of thought. [A human being] has the power of self-activity or self-determination."⁴⁰ To his definition he added a spiritual dimension. A human being possessed the image of God, the spiritual element in human existence. The spiritual element mandated education's responsibility for spiritual formation. "Education must regard [the human being] as a spiritual entity, an individual creative force in the

³⁷Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 64.

³⁸Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Education: Science, Philosophy, and Theology," *Catholic School Journal* 46 (April 1946): 110.

³⁹Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 10. In his commencement speech at Creighton University in 1926, Fitzpatrick told graduates, "The individual must develop a philosophy of life--not a philosophy of the textbook, nor formulated in intellectual terms for the purposes of exposition--but a philosophy of life that expresses itself in his [or her] every act. He [or she] must have a philosophy of life that has definite attitudes toward God, freedom, and immortality, and toward his [or her] neighbor, his [or her] fellow-worker, and his [or her] community--in short, it must be a philosophy incarnate in his [or her] life, an effluence of himself [or herself]." Fitzpatrick's speech is in Marquette University Archives, *Fitzpatrick, Dr. Edward A., Dean of the Graduate School, 1884-1960*, File A-12.3, Series 2.

⁴⁰Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Catholic Ideal in Education," *Sign* 19 (June 1940): 663.

world, a soul, and not merely a biological entity, a social animal, or a thinking machine."⁴¹

Integration was an important characteristic of education. "[Education] is an integration of personality--a character guided by the ultimate ends of life."⁴² Education was a highly individualized process. "The process of education when it is genuine is a process of self-development, self-directed. [Self-development] is independent of schools or buildings or the paraphernalia of education. . . . [Self-development] is dependent upon the self-active human soul."⁴³

A Christian philosophy of life and a Christian philosophy of education differed radically from secular philosophies of life and secular philosophies of education.

[W]hat we want is not merely the adjustment or adaptation to the kaleidoscopic changes in the external aspects of our . . . civilization, but a revealing search for meaning and values in the principles and purposes of our life--for the abiding and enduring eternal values of human life.⁴⁴

True education imparted a sense of *wholeness*. "The purpose of education is to give an individual . . . full possession of his [or her] powers to see, to dream or imagine, to conceive, to judge, to reason, to feel, to create."⁴⁵ Education was neither "learning, nor scholarship, nor knowledge, but the making of men and women. It is the making of a human being. [Education] is cooperating with Divine Providence in fulfillment

⁴¹Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 58.

⁴²Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Aim of the Catholic Liberal Arts College," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (January 1935): 2.

⁴³[Edward A. Fitzpatrick], "Self-Education," *Catholic School Journal* 30 (May 1930): 180-1.

⁴⁴Edward A. Fitzpatrick, *The Catholic College in the World Today* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1954), 128.

⁴⁵Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Catholic College of the Future," *Catholic School Journal* 55 (October 1955): 256.

of the creative act."⁴⁶ He summarized his understanding of education, "Mastery of self and direction of his [or her] powers is the purpose of education."⁴⁷

To achieve self-dominion, a specific kind of knowledge was necessary. Fitzpatrick recognized two kinds of knowledge. The first kind was the accumulation of facts. Knowledge of facts had little influence on a person. The second kind possessed a "propulsive power." This kind of knowledge sought meaning and integrated one's personality. The individual experienced a change of self-understanding. A changed individual changed society.⁴⁸ The second kind of knowledge had a moral dimension. The test of education "is the quality of the life [one leads]. The test is not in mere knowledge, or power, or notoriety, nor prestige, but in service, the service of love to [one's] fellow [human being]."⁴⁹ The two kinds of knowledge and education's moral test were Fitzpatrick's signals against a too facile assumption about education and schooling.

The School and the Teacher

People assumed too often that "education is possible only in schools and that education is inevitable in schools."⁵⁰ The opposite was true. "Education occurs in the individual soul and individual changes must take place in the physical, mental, and moral make-up of the individual. This is not a mass process, it is an individual process."⁵¹ The school was responsible for "the physical, intellectual, emotional, and

⁴⁶Fitzpatrick, "Parents and Education: A Word to Parents," 201.

⁴⁷E[dward] A. F[itpatrick], "Self-Education No. 2: Giving the Individual Self-Conscious Control of Himself," *Catholic School Journal* 48 (November 1948): 310.

⁴⁸Edward A. Fitzpatrick, *Exploring a Theology of Education* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1950), 141.

⁴⁹Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Commencement Addresses*, Box 4. See the Address dated 9 June 1935.

⁵⁰Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 190.

⁵¹E[dward] A. F[itpatrick], "Mass Education and the Capacity of the Individual," *Catholic School Journal* 41 (January 1941): 13.

volitional formation of the individual."⁵² Other purposes were secondary. "The primacy of the individual over all social ends of education needs to be reiterated . . . and to be insisted on without compromise."⁵³

Teaching was "a spiritual process. . . . The teacher's function, using all the educational aids, devices, equipment, and personnel, is to create a special environment in which the human mind through its own powers powers may develop."⁵⁴ The teacher's responsibility was "to give the child an opportunity entirely independent of [the teacher's] own personality to have an educative experience that will enable [the student] to grow in self-dependence, in widening interest, in wisdom and character."⁵⁵ The primacy of the child's self-development in education was beyond dispute. "Schools exist for children, not for teachers. The goodness of teaching depends upon its effects on the students."⁵⁶

The teacher had an indirect responsibility in the learning process. "The goodness of teaching is determined by the goodness or effectiveness of learning."⁵⁷

Fitzpatrick explained the relationship between the teacher and the student,

The teacher's job is to give the individual student possession and control of those great mysterious powers of a human being: memory, imagination, judgment, reasoning, emotion, will. [The student] learns the meaning of self-activity, which

⁵²Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 193.

⁵³E[dward] A. F[it]zpatrick], "A Bad Start," *Catholic School Journal* 48 (March 1948): 96.

⁵⁴Fitzpatrick, *Catholic College*, 274-8.

⁵⁵Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 173.

⁵⁶E[dward] A. F[it]zpatrick], "Lay Teachers and Religious Perfection," *Catholic School Journal* 41 (December 1941): 341. In an earlier article Fitzpatrick said to teachers, "How you think of the child is of more importance in your teaching, and of more significance to the child, than all your information on the subjects included in the curriculum, all your knowledge of, and skill in educational procedures. The heart of the educational problem is the conception of the child." (Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "What Is It to Be a Child?," *Catholic School Journal* 29 (September 1929): 165.)

⁵⁷Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 174-5.

the teacher helps, but cannot provide a substitute. The teacher must stay in the background.⁵⁸

The teacher's role affected usage of instructional aids and methodology.

Self-activity was primary. Textbooks and other aids to learning were secondary. "The textbook is a subordinate instrument in the educative process. It is only a tool of the teacher. It is an aid to the pupil. It must not dominate either."⁵⁹ Fitzpatrick spoke of methodology from a similar perspective, "It is a fundamental error of method if the teacher is the center, if the [student] does what he [or she] does to please the teacher. . . ."⁶⁰ The teacher and the teacher's methodology were at the service of the pupil. "The [student] is the star; about the [student's] self-activity, the [student's] plans, the [student's] purposes, must revolve educational activity."⁶¹

Although the teacher and the teacher's methodology were subordinate to the child's self-development, The teacher's importance for education was not devalued. The teacher had a specific role in God's plan for human beings. "The teacher presides over and directs an activity that has eternal consequence. . . . Thus teaching becomes the supreme offering of the individual, for the teaching service in the interest of the child's salvation and his [or her] own."⁶² Teaching was a high calling. "Teaching is a fine spiritual adventure in human service--it is an angel service."⁶³ The value of

⁵⁸E[dward] A. Fitzpatrick, "Self-Education No.4: The Teacher and Self-Education," *Catholic School Journal* 49 (January 1949): 12.

⁵⁹Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 106.

⁶⁰Ibid., 145.

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Fitzpatrick, "Parents and Education," 125.

⁶³Fitzpatrick, *Theology of Education*, 125. A contemporary explanation of the spiritual quality in teaching is provided by Maria Harris in her book *Women and Teaching: Themes for a Spirituality of Pedagogy*, 1988 Madeleva Lecture in Spirituality (New York: Paulist Press, 1988).

the teacher made all other occupations pale in importance.⁶⁴ A teacher must be "spiritually formed as well as intellectually, volitionally, and socially."⁶⁵ The teacher was a model for a particular kind of life, and the teacher initiated students to a particular kind of life. Besides the teacher's example, the curriculum was another gateway to a particular kind of life.

Schools could not provide all things to all students. Careful selection was requisite. The curriculum was

a selected, simplified, idealized organization of the spiritual inheritance. . . . It is a planned life, not an accidental life. The child lives in the school, but the school's life is not the life of the world outside. The school is a kind of life. It is not all of life.⁶⁶

A properly designed curriculum was an "opportunity for the student to translate effectively in his [or her] own life activities, mental and physical, the proposals of the curriculum. . . ."⁶⁷

A philosophy of life and a philosophy of education gave structure to the curriculum.⁶⁸ Fitzpatrick challenged educators who built a curriculum on theories of citizenship or career training as purposes of education.⁶⁹ Theories of citizenship or career training indicated an erroneous understanding of the curriculum.

The main problem in the construction of a curriculum is to translate with a single, definite, unmistakable aim, the more immediate objectives which are its corollaries into a series of school and life activities that take into account the personal capacity and development of the pupil and lead him [or her] on through his [or

⁶⁴*In the Service of God*, trans. Mary Caritas and ed. E[dward] A. Fitzpatrick (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1938), vii.

⁶⁵*Ibid.*, ix.

⁶⁶Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 157.

⁶⁷E[dward] A. F[itzpatrick], "A Teacher Must Translate a Curriculum into Life Activity," *Catholic School Journal* 40 (November 1940): 300.

⁶⁸Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 163.

⁶⁹E[dward] A. F[itzpatrick], "Social Competence," *Catholic School Journal* 40 (September 1940): 227.

her] own activity in a maximum degree to that highest development of [the pupil] which we call Christlike. . . .⁷⁰

Other curricular theories lacked depth. Advocates of social competency minimized the importance of culture. "The great problem of all education is to give as fully as possible to every student the benefit of the vicarious experience of the race."⁷¹ Culture transmitted values conducive to humane living. Culture empowered "[one] to stand on the shoulders of all past generations and to utilize vicariously their experience to solve . . . problems."⁷² Fitzpatrick viewed culture as "more significant than all aspects of [a human being's] physical environment."⁷³ Education should help the student to attain a "proper evaluation of the past as embodied in social inheritance."⁷⁴ Fitzpatrick denied that human beings merely adjusted to their physical environment.⁷⁵

Culture passed on to students their social inheritance. "Education must give an appreciation and understanding of the social institutions."⁷⁶ Social inheritance "furnishes the material and distills it so that the distinctly human powers of [men and women] may build the great worlds of art, literature, science, and philosophy. [Social inheritance] lays the basis of [humanity's] great (and little) achievements."⁷⁷

Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education maintained the student's self-activity in the process of learning and the realization of the student's potential. The school and

⁷⁰Fitzpatrick, *Curriculum in Religion*, 11.

⁷¹E[dward] A. F[itzpatrick], "Our Children Must Know What Has Been Happening," *Catholic School Journal* 43 (September 1943): 194.

⁷²Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 121.

⁷³*Ibid.*, 117.

⁷⁴*Ibid.*, 120.

⁷⁵*Ibid.*, 118.

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, 119.

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, 92.

the teacher sought the greatest development of the student's talents. By developing the student's talents, students prepared themselves for their supernatural end. Christianity recognized the goodness of life and understood life as one's journey towards God. "[Men and women are] end[s] in [themselves], not . . . means . . . citizenship cannot, therefore, be a final end of education; nor social efficiency, nor culture."⁷⁸

Self-Activity of the Learner

Reason, emotion, and will were constitutive elements of human existence. "Self-realization can only mean in the human sense a realization of the highest and best in [men and women]."⁷⁹ Fitzpatrick considered fallacious the belief that "anything is the product of education except a quality of life in the individual child or student."⁸⁰ Self-activity was primary.

[Education] is futile . . . if only memory is trained, and students regurgitate to their teachers the platitudes, the 'bromides,' and even the inert truths of instruction. The reason and the will must be involved and coordinated on a material worthy of the highest hope of our human nature.⁸¹

Self-activity was not a license for self-indulgence. "Education is not the following of the whim of the student but is self-discipline which can be helped much by the wisdom of adult experience and the insight into life of teachers."⁸² True "educational philosophy makes the essential character of genuine human education a process of self-education."⁸³ Learning was the center of the educational process.⁸⁴

⁷⁸Ibid., 57.

⁷⁹Ibid., 19.

⁸⁰Ibid., 113.

⁸¹Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Thoughts about Education for 1946," *Catholic School Journal* 46 (January 1946): 1.

⁸²E[dward] A. F[itzipatrick], "Teachers Should Work," *Catholic School Journal* 42 (March 1942): 73.

⁸³E[dward] A. F[itzipatrick], "Self-Education," *Catholic School Journal* 40 (May 1940): 150.

The student "must not only be doing something but have some idea of what [he or she] is doing. The experience must be purposeful and meaningful."⁸⁵

The student's intellect withered from an education based on the accumulation of facts. "The great stimulus to education is life experience which stimulates and germinates ideas which become the cross-fertilizing means in dealing with symbols which constitute so large a part of education."⁸⁶ Fitzpatrick used reading to demonstrate his point. Books should *engage* a student. Reading solely for comprehension was insufficient.

The active soul, in order to secure genuine educative results from books, must be attuned, in its experience and its organization of experience, to the vicarious experience of the book. There must be a potentiality of relationship which the active soul sees and can grasp. Books, in which are the great and varied experience of all men [and women] in all nations in all past time, must be related to the narrow experience of the learner in relation to all the environmental factors of contemporary life.⁸⁷

The student should see the relationship between the book and the student's world. "[The student] has an active soul with almost infinite possibilities. Passiveness and receptivity goes with trick training, and training by cues."⁸⁸ Limits to learning were not "in [the student's] original endowment of tendencies and capacities but in the ultimate development and organization of these in the [student]."⁸⁹ Confidence in the student's ability to learn caused Fitzpatrick to be wary of reliance on tests and measurements.

Tests and measurements ascertained only a part of the student's talents. "Batteries of tests have aimed to reach the fundamental objects, but they have been

⁸⁴Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 41.

⁸⁵*Ibid.*, 98.

⁸⁶Fitzpatrick, "Parents and Teachers: A Word to Parents," 202.

⁸⁷Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 102

⁸⁸Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Children or Wild Animals?," *Catholic School Journal* 29 (November 1929): 302.

⁸⁹Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 79.

merely an aggregate of items rather than a measurement of the organized life at which education aims."⁹⁰ Although tests and measurements detected talents and deficiencies, there was an ominous element. "Educational Calvinism" was a result of tests and measurements. Tests and measurements predicted how the student should serve society and suggested the student's educational program.⁹¹ Opportunity to explore the greatest number of educational experiences decreased.

A materialist philosophy permeated arguments from supporters of tests and measurements. "In its last analysis the measurement thesis would assume no qualitative difference in the universe, and that all changes were in amounts of some ultimate monistic substance."⁹² Denial of the student as an incarnate spirit rendered the student less than human. Education was not able to understand human existence in its totality. "In the desperately human problem of education we should subordinate all factors such as tests and measurements so that we do not compromise the fundamental conception of education as life, as human life, as an ordered human life."⁹³

To advocates of tests and measurements Fitzpatrick argued that the

basic subject matter of education is (1) changes in human beings not merely physical or psychological changes, but changes in ideas, skills, in attitudes, any changes in thoughts, feelings, and emotion or will, and (2) how such changes are brought about in human beings.⁹⁴

He was also suspicious of educational philosophies that understood the school as an agency for social change.

⁹⁰Ibid., 164.

⁹¹Ibid., 165.

⁹²Ibid.

⁹³Ibid., 168.

⁹⁴Fitzpatrick, "Education: Science, Philosophy, and Theology," 109.

Universal education was a noble, but a flawed, ideal. Universal education never intended "custodial care in schools of American youth."⁹⁵ The school existed for education. The school "cannot build Utopia."⁹⁶ The school's relationship to society was indirect. The school had neither

revelation, nor any access to special sources of information, nor are teachers generally possessed of the insight equal to the responsibility [of changing society]. . . . [The school] will study the content of existing social institutions and social practice and progressively it will reveal its quality in the light of moral and social standards. . . . [T]he quality of the individual life it trains, its courage and insight, will furnish the criticism of the age and the leadership to go toward the ultimate human achievement in social and human destiny.⁹⁷

Fitzpatrick neither denied nor renounced any relationship between the school and society. *How* the school contributed to society was his question. He believed that the individual, not the school, produced social change. "The primary characteristic of the school is that it is a conscious, planned, organized agency of education."⁹⁸ Education was a process of moral and intellectual formation. The relationship between the individual and society began *after* formal schooling.

The relationship between school, society, and the individual rested on Fitzpatrick's definition of a self. A self was "a mental organization consisting of ideas, attitudes, appreciations, skills, feelings, and volitional elements, organized as a fairly coherent whole about some phase of a [person's] life or experience."⁹⁹ Character revealed the self's unity. "Character is the ultimate expression of the integration of personality."¹⁰⁰ Fitzpatrick's account of the self and character had

⁹⁵E[dward] A. Fitzpatrick, "Meeting the Educational Needs of American Youth," *Catholic School Journal* 54 (December 1954): 326.

⁹⁶Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 197.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*, 198.

⁹⁸*Ibid.*, 192.

⁹⁹Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Scholastic Self: Mental Health of Students," *Catholic School Journal* 40 (November 1940): 288.

¹⁰⁰Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 84.

an implication for education. "One way of stating the educational problem in psychological terms is that the function of education is the higher synthesis or integration of these selves by education."¹⁰¹ His understanding of the self spurred objections to philosophies of education that sacrificed character formation for other purposes. "Preoccupation with social studies and with life adjustment programs . . . is . . . a serious deterrent to genuine education."¹⁰²

¹⁰¹Fitzpatrick, "Scholastic Self," 288.

¹⁰²Ibid.

Formation of Character

Imagination, will, and play contributed to the formation of character. Imagination was too often a neglected aspect of educational psychology. Imagination thrived on experience.

By all means utilize the experiences of the [student] for the development of his [or her] imagination. By all means give [the student] as wide an experience as possible, as the instrument by which his [or her] imagination must use for its cultivation.¹⁰³

Imagination enabled the student to see relationships, to ask questions, and to be creative. Imagination enlivened knowledge. There was an indissoluble link between experience and imagination. "I believe the wider and fuller and richer the individual experience, the more scope and the finer the work of imagination."¹⁰⁴

The will transcended mere obedience to commands. Motives and values were essential to the will. "The secret of the will is in the cultivation of motives, values. Unless the child has a motive for the action we desire, [the child's action] will, in all human probability, not be performed, or . . . [the action] will be done under compulsion, and we get a divided state [in] the child's mind."¹⁰⁵ Fitzpatrick defended Catholicism's doctrine of the will's freedom. He rejected behaviorism because it denied free will. Habits were necessary for the will to achieve the good. Habits required direction. Direction was conscious recognition of the good for human beings. Law and authority did not help will and habit to direct actions proper to a person's moral well-being. "Habit training must be progressive, dynamic, hierarchical."¹⁰⁶ Knowledge and values aided the will and the development of habit.

¹⁰³[Edward A. Fitzpatrick], "The Imagination in Education," *Catholic School Journal* 30 (June 1930): 213.

¹⁰⁴Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 108.

¹⁰⁵[Edward A. Fitzpatrick], "Motives and Will," *Catholic School Journal* 30 (June 1930): 212.

¹⁰⁶Fitzpatrick, "Children or Wild Animals?," 302.

Education could not avoid questions of value. If the good were to be achieved, values necessarily had a role in education. "The contemporary problem is not so much an over-emphasis on intellectual teaching as on a pseudo intellectualism, an intellectual training divorced from moral and spiritual values."¹⁰⁷ One might possess an extensive body of knowledge, but lack of appreciation for values made such knowledge sterile. The educator was responsible for presenting knowledge and values. "It is the growth of the mind, the growth of love, the growth of virtue that is characteristic of the teaching process. . . ."¹⁰⁸

The relationship between play and character attracted Fitzpatrick's attention. "I believe that the fundamental educational activity for the child is play. . . . The child lives in the spirit of play--and learns much. [Play] is an uncoerced spirit, a spirit of complete absorption."¹⁰⁹ The child revealed his or her personality through play. "[Play's] self-activity, its social character, its identification with the individual, its outpouring and revelation of [the child's] personality are the very qualities which make play so significant in education."¹¹⁰

There comes in play the imaginative projection of oneself. Cooperation and other social qualities will need the imagination. The spirit of play will promote the social qualities of the individual, give the school a social spirit and create the conditions of an embryonic social community.¹¹¹

Play had a moral quality. The concept of "playing fair' must be a conscious attitude, an ideal built into [the child's] make-up until it becomes in [the child's] play and . . . life almost second nature."¹¹² Play required acceptance of rules, and

¹⁰⁷Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Mind and Soul," *Catholic School Journal* 51 (June 1951): 192.

¹⁰⁸Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 175.

¹⁰⁹*Ibid.*, 112.

¹¹⁰*Ibid.*

¹¹¹*Ibid.*, 114.

¹¹²*Ibid.*, 116.

rules imposed structure. Without rules, play had neither aim nor purpose. Play instilled cooperation and respect for rules. For education,

play emphasizes two important . . . principles, the principle of adequate motivation and the principle of self-activity. The absorption of the individual in his [or her] play, the identification himself [or herself] with [his or her] activity are aspects of all genuine educational activity. . . . [Play] takes . . . complete possession of the individual and directs [his or her] energy.¹¹³

Play, will, and imagination combined to form character. Character was inherently moral.

The quality of life, the life of order which we seek in education, is . . . the life of *character*. . . . Character is not merely habits, instincts, sentiments, impulses, urges, drives, feelings and emotions, or even will. [Character] is all of these organized into an orderly life.¹¹⁴

Education nurtured character, but education did not give character to the student. The student's self-activity was ultimately responsible for character. "The clear indication that the process of integration is proceeding is evidenced by the individual . . . taking more and more active direction of the process."¹¹⁵

Catholic Education

Because a human being is endowed with divine dignity, religion and morality were necessary components of Catholic education. "The function of the student is not merely intellectual, it is human, it is Christian; it is dealing with the whole [person], intellectual, moral, volitional."¹¹⁶ Too often Catholic education fell short of its goal. "It would be a wonderful thing indeed if Catholic educational practices approximated in any way the Catholic educational ideal."¹¹⁷

¹¹³Ibid., 115.

¹¹⁴Ibid., 17.

¹¹⁵Ibid., 82-3.

¹¹⁶Ibid., 83.

¹¹⁷E[dward] A. F[itzipatrick], "Some Thought on the New School Year," *Catholic School Journal* 47 (September 1947): 232.

Animosity did not motivate Fitzpatrick's criticism of Catholic education. His criticism pointed to the ideal presented by Catholic education. Catholic education embodied the principle of the relationship between nature and grace. Religion should inform the curriculum. Grace perfected nature. The relationship between nature and grace was the cornerstone of Catholic philosophy and Catholic theology.

The relationship

does not mean that in the domain of things secular the Christian has an especially privileged position, or that the unbeliever can be but a second-rate physicist, doctor, economist. The term 'nature' is ambiguous, inasmuch as human nature, being open to values, has many different possibilities and capacities. As such Christian faith is meant neither to throw light on or to perfect the secular life of the Christian. . . . It is through Christian morality that Christianity has had an influence on the secular history of the world.¹¹⁸

The Incarnation grounded the doctrine of nature and grace. The fullness of being human found its exemplar in the Incarnation. The Incarnation affirmed the goodness of human existence and God's love for human beings. Catholic education sometimes failed to demonstrate clearly how Christianity perfected human existence.

The child's education should be

a complete education, of body, mind, and spirit, rich with the fruits of religion, science, literature, art, music, so taught that they form the 'holy spirit of [men and women]' and help [the child] to approximate the comprehensive ideal of living to the 'fullness of the stature of Christ.'¹¹⁹

Fitzpatrick saw the disjunction between the ideal and the actual condition of Catholic education. Catholic education suffered five defects. First, Catholics often equated quality with the number of Catholic schools built and with the number of students enrolled in Catholic schools.¹²⁰ Second, there was a pervasive attitude that Catholic schools were immune from *internal* criticism. Parents were reluctant to

¹¹⁸Dondeyne, *Contemporary European Thought and Christian Faith*, 193.

¹¹⁹E[dward] A. F[itzipatrick], "Eminence of Catholic Education," *Catholic School Journal* 40 (September 1940): 226.

¹²⁰E[dward] A. F[itzipatrick], "Is Progress Inevitable? No!," *Catholic School Journal* 51 (April 1951): 149.

criticize Catholic education.¹²¹ Third, Catholic students neither appreciated nor responded to the ideal presented to them.¹²² Fourth, Catholic schools either neglected to or refused to clearly formulate their contribution to society.¹²³ Fifth, the objectives of Catholic education were often confused. "Inferior objectives are set up, citizenship and character, the improvement of American society, and these prove to be only phases of a passing social efficiency, but they take most of our energy."¹²⁴ The values inherent in Catholic education needed "revivification and redirection."¹²⁵

To improve Catholic education, Fitzpatrick offered suggestions. His suggestions reflected an understanding of Catholic education rooted in the Incarnation. "[Catholic education] is a life of service, a life according to an ideal--the full measure of the stature of Christ."¹²⁶ Christianity did not belittle human existence. "It is a misrepresentation of the two worldviews of Christianity that otherworldliness has no relationship to the world. In fact the whole concept is based on the ultimate interrelation of the two worldviews and what one sows in one he [or she] shall reap in the other."¹²⁷

Revivification and redirection began with the teacher. Fitzpatrick urged religious orders of women to grant time for study at colleges and universities.¹²⁸ Lay

¹²¹Ibid.

¹²²Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Three Statements from *Osservatore Romano*," *Catholic School Journal* 44 (February 1944): 38.

¹²³Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Need for Catholic Studies in the History of Education," *Catholic School Journal* 51 (April 1951): 149.

¹²⁴Fitzpatrick, *Exploring a Theology of Education*, 30-1.

¹²⁵Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 366.

¹²⁶Fitzpatrick, "Education and the Incarnation," 366.

¹²⁷Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Liberal Education and Other Worldliness," *Catholic School Journal* 48 (February 1948): 36.

¹²⁸Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Advanced Training for Sisters," *Catholic School Journal* 30 (January 1930): 1.

educators also needed professional training. His desire to improve the quality of teachers in Catholic education was part of his philosophy of education: the teacher was a cooperator with God in the process of learning and introduced the student to a particular way of life.

Fitzpatrick envisioned lay educators as apostles. The formation of an organization named Lay Educational Apostles had Fitzpatrick's endorsement. The organization

would admit to its membership all Catholics. [The organization] would express the policy that every Catholic, whether he [or she] has children in the Catholic school or not, should be interested, and cooperate actively in [the school's] support and development. [The organization] would be organized as lay educational evangelicalism.¹²⁹

Lay Educational Apostles "will be interested in the physical welfare of the children, [they] will provide the essential equipment and tools needed, [they] will be interested in the curriculum of the school, and the methods of teaching, and personal influence of teachers."¹³⁰ Besides the school, Lay Educational Apostles watched over the child's home and the child's environment outside of the home and the school.¹³¹

The role of the laity in Catholic colleges and Catholic universities received special attention. Fitzpatrick did not intend lay men and lay women to usurp the clergy's role in higher education. He argued for the laity's opportunity to participate in teaching and scholarship in Catholic institutions of higher learning.

It would a significant thing for Catholic culture, Catholic education, and Catholicism if Catholic colleges as a matter of deliberate policy would open to Catholic laymen and laywomen the possibility of a career in scholarship and learning in the Catholic higher institutions of learning.¹³²

¹²⁹Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "An Apostleship of Education," *Catholic School Journal* 33 (August 1933): 175-6.

¹³⁰*Ibid.*, 176.

¹³¹*Ibid.*, 176-7.

¹³²[Edward A. Fitzpatrick], "Lay Teachers in Catholic Colleges," *Catholic School Journal* 38 (February 1938): 48.

Acceptance of the laity in Catholic higher education presented an advantage. Clergy and laity working together in teaching and in research "will be intellectual and spiritual powerhouses for the entire group of Catholic institutions."¹³³

Fitzpatrick made several suggestions to integrate the laity. If care were taken in the selection of lay faculty members, if the college or university had clearly stated policies for tenure and salaries, and if there were clearly stated conditions of employment, then integration would proceed smoothly.¹³⁴ For lay people on all levels of Catholic education, Fitzpatrick noted the need for adequate salaries.¹³⁵ Admission of the laity to teaching positions in Catholic schools rested squarely with administrators. They had the choice of clearing or obstructing the path of lay men and lay women who sought to teach in Catholic schools.¹³⁶

Theology and Education

Catholic education could not ignore the importance of theology in the curriculum. Because the Incarnation was the supreme example for human existence, Catholic education bore a heavy responsibility.

For Catholics, educational effort is directed to the Christian formation of [men and women]. This is the aim of Catholic education. It is the organization of a life. It is the domination of life by Christian principles. It is the formation of [men and women] of character, that is 'the supernatural man [or woman] who thinks, judges and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with reason illuminated by the supernatural light of the example and teaching of Christ.'¹³⁷

Catholic education did not abandon the world. The Christian educational ideal was possible only when the ideal was grounded *in* the world. "The Christian conception

¹³³Ibid.

¹³⁴Ibid.

¹³⁵F[itzipatrick], "Thoughts for the New School Year," 232.

¹³⁶E[dward] A. F[itzipatrick], "The Church and the Laity," *Catholic School Journal* 53 (June 1953): 182.

¹³⁷E[dward] A. F[itzipatrick], "A Catholic Educational Policy--II.," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (October 1935): 264. Fitzpatrick quoted from the encyclical *Rappresentanti in Terra*.

of life--the making of an individual an *alter Christus* does not restrict life nor confines it, but enriches it. [The Christian concept of life] makes for the highest quality of human life--a divine conception of it."¹³⁸

The issue was not simply the teaching of theology. The establishment of the curriculum on a religious foundation was essential. Theology was more than an adjunct to the curriculum.¹³⁹ "The curriculum in religion itself in Catholic education needs more attention than it has received in the past. On all its sides it must relate itself to the fundamental aim of Catholic education, the ultimate spiritual destiny of [men and women]."¹⁴⁰

Disregard for theology's role in Catholic education risked indifference similar to the neglect of religion caused by secularist philosophies. "Religion is not and cannot be a thing apart. Our negative religion and our indifferentism to religion are . . . influencing our life and civilization as positive religion influences [our life and civilization]."¹⁴¹ Catholic education had a conception of human existence, and the concept included the supernatural end to human existence.¹⁴² Theology was, for Fitzpatrick, an invaluable resource for Catholic education.

Theology complemented a philosophy of education. Catholic education must not "avoid the basic theological ideas of revelation. These are intrinsically part of the meaning of life. . . . Any Catholic educational program must include the theology

¹³⁸Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Mystical Body of Christ and the Theology of Education," *Catholic School Journal* 48 (April 1948): 116.

¹³⁹[Edward A. Fitzpatrick], "Religion in Education," *Catholic School Journal* 33 (June 1933): 143.

¹⁴⁰Fitzpatrick, "The Curriculum in Education: A Preview," 97.

¹⁴¹Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 143.

¹⁴²Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Theology in Educational Theory," *Catholic School Journal* 46 (September 1946): 223.

results."¹⁴⁹ Formation of the individual was primary. "[Catholic education] cannot go along satisfying the formal requirements of education without penetrating deeper into the mind and heart of the individual Catholic."¹⁵⁰ But Fitzpatrick did not forget that the individual was a part of society. "In explaining the actually formative power of the Church in the sanctification of men [and women], we need to emphasize the community of all Christians rather than the individual Christian or the autonomous individual. . . ."¹⁵¹ He further clarified his point in writings about the Catholic college and the Catholic university.

The role of the Catholic college and the Catholic university in modern society sharpened Fitzpatrick's argument for moral and spiritual formation. Catholic higher education "has a moral aim."¹⁵² A problem for Catholic colleges was the matriculation of men and women "Catholic in creed and anti-Catholic in culture."¹⁵³ In books, articles, and commencement speeches delivered at Mount Mary College, Fitzpatrick discussed Catholic graduate education and Catholic undergraduate education.

Catholic Higher Education

Fitzpatrick defined the Catholic college in terms of the role of religion as the center of the curriculum. In the Catholic college,

religion is not an appendage to the curriculum, an incidental thing, a non-credit course, or merely one of a number of subjects required or elective. [The Catholic college] is a college in which the principal order of the college, its hierarchy of values, its motivating center, its *Weltanschauung* is found in religion.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁹Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Christian Education System," *Catholic School Journal* 30 (April 1930): 120.

¹⁵⁰E[dward] A. F[itzipatrick], "The Challenge of the Year," *Catholic School Journal* 49 (January 1949): 12.

¹⁵¹Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 201.

¹⁵²Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Aim of the Catholic Liberal Arts College," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (January 1935): 3.

¹⁵³*Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁵⁴Fitzpatrick, *Catholic College*, 91.

If disparity existed between what the Catholic college represented and what the Catholic college produced, Fitzpatrick located the disparity in the teaching of theology.

It has been assumed that religion was the principal ingredient in education and yet has been satisfied with teaching [theology] entirely as a separate subject, often without a rationale or comprehensive development, without any visible effects in the spiritual development of the individual or any elevation of the quality of the individual's life. These things must be the inevitable result of our religious teaching if [theology] is to be the real factor in education which the Catholic college assumes.¹⁵⁵

He argued that "a religious humanism should be at the center of a liberal education."¹⁵⁶

Religious humanism was

the moral and spiritual formation of the individual, generally through the means of grace which the Catholic Church offers but more particularly the college [by] the cultivation of the intellect. [Religious humanism] regards knowledge not as an end but as a means. [Religious humanism] appeals to the mind[s] of [men and women]. [Religious humanism] carries intellectual and moral development along in the integration of character.¹⁵⁷

Faith was the foundation of religious humanism. Albert Dondeyne explained the meaning of faith. Faith

is an existential and concrete reply to the supreme question, the question of the *ultimate meaning of existence*, the sense of existence *as a whole*, as it affects the 'I,' the person. . . . [T]he life of Faith gathers together within it all the elements of secular and historical existence. [Faith] . . . giv[es] them a new sense, a new dimension, without weakening either their specific content or their proper historical structure.¹⁵⁸

The educated person was one who had "the power of insight, the perception of meaning and values."¹⁵⁹ Fitzpatrick rejected the emphasis on the intellect alone

¹⁵⁵Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 21.

¹⁵⁶Fitzpatrick, "The Aim of the Catholic Liberal Arts College," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (January 1935): 3.

¹⁵⁷Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Aim of the Catholic Liberal Arts College," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (February 1935): 35.

¹⁵⁸Dondeyne, *Contemporary European Philosophy and Christian Faith*, 193-4.

¹⁵⁹Fitzpatrick, *I Believe in Education*, 26.

in Catholic undergraduate education. The aim of Catholic collegiate education was "not a mind but a person, not an intellect but an integrated body-soul with an intellect and emotions and will."¹⁶⁰

The Catholic college had a responsibility to society.

If the knowledge which graduates of Catholic colleges [acquire] does not brighten the meaning of life, reveal . . . values, and show [men and women their] potential greatness whatever be [their] actual weakness and sin, then [graduates] have been miseducated. No matter what job [they] hold, . . . nor what reputation they acquire in their specific fields, knowledge is for action. . . . Knowledge must always be in the service of love.¹⁶¹

Love, service, and knowledge indicated the special position Catholic colleges had in society and in the Catholic Church. Catholic colleges were not institutions established merely to extend one's opportunity for education. They were "essential to an intelligent program of Catholic action, and to [Catholicism's] maintaining an intellectual respectability."¹⁶² The Catholic college was a necessary part of the Church's structure. "The Catholic liberal arts college is an instrument of the Catholic Church. . . . Its purpose is . . . the purpose of the Church--the salvation of [men and women]."¹⁶³

Knowledge benefitted society. Knowledge contributed to culture, and culture conveyed values that promoted social well-being. "We need today a revolution in our values, our purposes, and our meanings. We need a reassertion of the spiritual nature of [men and women], . . . a fresh view of life. . . . We need spiritual renewal and spiritual renovation."¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁰Ibid., 104.

¹⁶¹Fitzpatrick, *Catholic College*, 51.

¹⁶²[Edward A. Fitzpatrick], "Are Catholic Colleges Orphans?," *Catholic School Journal* 32 (August 1932): 256.

¹⁶³Fitzpatrick, "The Aim of the Catholic Liberal Arts College," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (January 1935): 2.

¹⁶⁴Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Commencement Addresses*, Box 4. See the address dated 3 June 1947.

Spiritual renewal and spiritual renovation depended on a philosophical understanding of human existence. Catholic colleges and Catholic universities committed themselves to a Christian interpretation of human existence. "The most important thing in education then, more important than the facts or accumulation of facts or skills is the philosophy of life that [Catholic higher education] gives."¹⁶⁵ Graduates of Catholic colleges and Catholic universities had the responsibility to bear Christian witness in their lives. "The graduates of our Catholic colleges each year with a passion to make reason and will of God prevail, could be a leaven in the lump, and graduates . . . in all the [Catholic] colleges of this country and in the world ought to be able to leaven the whole."¹⁶⁶ The Catholic philosophy of human existence and the Catholic philosophy of education formed men and women "who are stamped with certain traits which come into play and govern their approach to life in every sphere. . . ."¹⁶⁷ For Fitzpatrick, "Catholicism is not simply a creed but a culture."¹⁶⁸

The importance of values applied also to professional education. "The moral purpose is just as clearly an objective of the Catholic [professional] school as it is of any other part of the Catholic university."¹⁶⁹ The divorce of values from knowledge resulted in a pseudo-intellectualism "without reference to human values and human purposes."¹⁷⁰ Education without values "is a training in cunning, a

¹⁶⁵Ibid. See the address dated 6 June 1944.

¹⁶⁶Ibid.

¹⁶⁷Fitzpatrick, "The Aim of the Catholic Liberal Arts College," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (January 1935): 4.

¹⁶⁸Ibid.

¹⁶⁹E[dward] A. F[itzipatrick], "Catholic Professional Schools," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (August 1935): 209.

¹⁷⁰Fitzpatrick, *Catholic College*, 107.

formal training in intellectual pride, the hothouse product of schools instead of the vivifying energy of life."¹⁷¹

Catholic graduate education was also responsible for the development of Catholic civilization.

Catholic civilization emphasizes the moral as superior to the economic, the cultural as above the practical, the humanistic as ever against the material. . . . Catholic education must follow this conception of Catholic civilization. It must emphasize the cultural elements, the humanistic elements, the spiritual elements.¹⁷²

All knowledge found its completion in religion. "Scholarship, mental discipline, social responsibility find their real significance in relation to the fundamental moral and religious aim."¹⁷³ Fitzpatrick suggested one means of correcting the emphasis on the intellectual. The foundation for graduate study should be a humane education. "Neither a technical training nor professional training as such is a satisfactory prerequisite for university work. The prospective university student should have contact with life and learning in its major aspects. These include . . . the literary, the linguistic, the institutional (political-economic-social), the aesthetic, and the religious."¹⁷⁴

Fitzpatrick feared the "multiplication of mediocre graduate schools."¹⁷⁵ Too many graduate schools obscured the "conception of the nature of the university and the function which it may serve in our common life."¹⁷⁶ He made two suggestions. His first suggestion noted that in the United States Catholicism needed

¹⁷¹Ibid.

¹⁷²E[dward] A. F[itpatrick], "The Cultural and the Practical," *Catholic School Journal* 34 (January 1934): 12.

¹⁷³Fitzpatrick, "The Aim of the Catholic Liberal Arts College," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (February 1935): 33.

¹⁷⁴Fitzpatrick, *Catholic College*, 256.

¹⁷⁵E[dward] A. F[itpatrick], "Development of Catholic Universities," *Catholic School Journal* 36 (April 1936): 95.

¹⁷⁶Fitzpatrick, *Catholic College*, 249.

not one great university, but at a minimum of four great regional universities, one or two in the East, one in the Northwest, one in the Far West, and one in the South. And these institutions should be bound together by ideals of cooperation.¹⁷⁷

The second suggestion sought to improve the quality of the faculty in a Catholic graduate school. "A faculty that might competently do the work of collegiate or professional education is not by virtue of that fact competent to teach in a graduate school--and may be . . . unfit for graduate work."¹⁷⁸ Fitzpatrick linked his demand for a competent faculty with the demand for work from students indicative of graduate education. "Graduate work should be in all cases graduate work--not undergraduate work with something added."¹⁷⁹

Several problems in undergraduate education received Fitzpatrick's attention. Some Catholic colleges were more interested in the number of degrees granted than the quality of education. Fitzpatrick scorned "degree mongering" as "a betrayal of civilization; it is the great social tragedy of intellectual life."¹⁸⁰ Another problem was the dilution of collegiate education. "There has been a . . . dilution of education, particularly in the college years by the continuation of the high school spoon feeding and dependence upon the teacher."¹⁸¹ He blamed dilution on "training the unfit, the unprepared, and the unwilling. We are putting people in this particular education mill which was never intended for them. . . ."¹⁸²

¹⁷⁷[Edward A. Fitzpatrick], "A National Development of Catholic Higher Education," *Catholic School Journal* 32 (April 1932): 127.

¹⁷⁸Fitzpatrick, *Catholic College*, 254.

¹⁷⁹*Ibid.*

¹⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 247.

¹⁸¹E[dward] A. F[itzpatrick], "Fourteen Year Educational Sequence," *Catholic School Journal* 54 (December 1954): 326.

¹⁸²Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "The Fundamentals of a Philosophy of Higher Education," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 13-14 (1937-1938): 67.

To prevent dilution Fitzpatrick proposed a larger role for the student. "Some of the ineffectiveness of higher education is due to [the] neglect of the student as an *active* agent in the formal educational process, as a *co-operative* agent in administration, and as a *controlling* agent over student extra-classroom activities."¹⁸³ Other recommendations included curbing the multiplicity of program beyond the college's financial ability, abolishing inadequate libraries, and having better salaries for lay and religious faculty members.¹⁸⁴ He also asked Catholic colleges "to develop a capacity for self-criticism."¹⁸⁵

The Catholic college and the Catholic university should be equal to the non-Catholic institutions of higher learning.

The Catholic university or college must meet the standards not only of other universities, but must meet the standards conformable to the *ideal* of a university. . . . The Catholic college or university must not become a Catholic ghetto. It must have the range of a divine humanity and Catholics must understand this and support . . . institutions where [the ideal] is achieved.¹⁸⁶

Fitzpatrick's use of the phrase "Catholic ghetto" was important. Catholic higher education could not afford to avoid the world. Isolation would bring atrophy. Catholic higher education claimed possession of truth, but truth had to answer questions posed by the world. Fitzpatrick had a distaste for the "smugness, and pedantry, [the] metaphysical indolence . . . among Catholics and Catholic thinkers."¹⁸⁷

Graduates who attempted to unite faith and reason exemplified the strength of the Catholic college and Catholic university. "It does little good for Catholics as they so often do to condemn the contemporary culture as materialistic, mechanistic,

¹⁸³Idem, "The Administration Looks to the Student," *Catholic School Journal* 47 (November 1947): 302.

¹⁸⁴Fitzpatrick, *Catholic College*, 118-9.

¹⁸⁵Fitzpatrick, "Fundamentals," 80.

¹⁸⁶Fitzpatrick, "Catholic Ideal," 664.

¹⁸⁷E[dward] A. F[it]zpatrick], "The University and Man's Search for Knowledge: Columbia University's Bicentennial Editorial," *Catholic School Journal* 53 (November 1953): 275.

secularistic, or reverting to older words, barbarian, pagan, alien."¹⁸⁸ Catholics had a mission to the world, and Catholic higher education prepared students for the mission. The success or failure of Catholic higher education rested squarely on faculty and graduates.

All these things, encyclopedic knowledge, shrewdness in using ideas, discriminating appreciation and the finest skill--have meaning to the extent that they are related to the ultimate meaning of the social process and of the Universe. And it is on that that the Catholic college lays its distinctive emphasis, and it is on that [the Catholic college] must finally be judged.¹⁸⁹

Catholic higher education should instill a sense of principle. "[One's] knowledge must become a philosophy of life, and [one's] philosophy of life must make vertebrate [one's] character. . . . In facing the issues of our day, [one] must deal with them on the basis of principle."¹⁹⁰

The graduate of Catholic higher education

[has] a sense of values not changing with every wind of doctrine; a sense of values based on insight into the universe and not on [one's] personal feelings; a sense of justice toward labor and capital, insisting that with power must go moral responsibility; a sense of values based on realistic and not wishful thinking; a sense of values that comes from the Master of Life Himself.¹⁹¹

Fitzpatrick's vision of Catholic higher education was not naive. He admitted to difficulties in the reconciliation of secular knowledge with Christian faith. He understood that the natural sciences and other disciplines contained presuppositions that ignored, if not denied, religious implications.¹⁹² Yet he was confident in his conviction that the world has unity, purpose, and values. "The world is not merely a multitude of things and facts. It is permeated with values. And there is that most fundamental and highest of relationships, to the Maker of man and of things--God-

¹⁸⁸Fitzpatrick, *Catholic College*, 103.

¹⁸⁹Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Commencement Addresses*, Box 4. See the Address dated 11 June 1935.

¹⁹⁰Fitzpatrick, *Catholic College*, 53.

¹⁹¹*Ibid.*, 74.

¹⁹²*Ibid.*

-in which all these relationships and values find their ultimate meaning."¹⁹³ The strength of Catholic higher education depended on faculty and students to seriously consider the relationships between faith and reason, knowledge and values, values and action. To do less would diminish the purpose and possibilities of Catholic higher education.

Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education presented a comprehensive view of human existence. Catholic education was not an attempt to shun the world. He urged Catholic educators to be receptive to issues, questions, and developments in and outside education. The strength of Catholic education was the ability to accept the world and to direct the world to God.

Vatican Council II introduced many changes in the Catholic Church. The synod devoted attention to education. What are the differences and similarities between Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education and the synod's position on education? The question will be answered in Chapter Four.

¹⁹³Fitzpatrick, "The Aim of the Catholic Liberal Arts College," *Catholic School Journal* 35 (January 1935): 4.

CHAPTER 4

FITZPATRICK AND CONTEMPORARY CATHOLIC EDUCATION

Fitzpatrick's understanding of the Catholic school, the teacher, the formation of character, culture, and Catholic higher education were also matters addressed during and after Vatican Council II. An examination of the similarities and differences between Fitzpatrick and Catholic educational literature during and after Vatican Council II helps us to appreciate areas of common understanding and contrasting positions. A brief review of Fitzpatrick's positions will sharpen our focus.

Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education respected the integrity of the human being. The integrity of human existence was guaranteed by the spiritual element in human existence. The Catholic doctrine of the image of God as constitutive of human existence defined the spiritual element. A unity of body and spirit, human beings were religious in nature. The quest for values, meaning, and knowledge was the quest for transcendence, the quest for the Absolute. Aquinas's philosophy of education permitted Fitzpatrick to understand education as an approach to the guarantor of all truth, God.

Fitzpatrick believed that Aquinas's philosophy of education balanced the sacred and the secular. He accepted the proposition that "a theology which loves nature will produce a philosophy that is scrupulously respectful of the rights of nature."¹ Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education embraced all that was good for human existence because Christianity did not deny the value of human existence. A human being is a *being for God*, and God is found *in* the world.

¹A.C. Pegis, "Higher Education and Irrationalism," *Thought* 14 (March 1939): 119.

For Catholic education, the world is destined for a supernatural end. The vision of the supernatural made one's understanding of the world radically different from secular views. E. Harris Harbison used words from William James's book *The Variety of Religious Experience* (1902) to describe aptly the difference, "When we see all things in God, and refer all things to him, we read in common matters superior expressions of meaning."²

For Fitzpatrick, Catholic education was a means of ordering the world toward God. Catholic bishops supported Fitzpatrick's position in 1980. The bishops stated that creation is good because "it reflects its Creator. Human culture is good to the extent that it reflects the plan and purpose of the Creator, but it bears the wounds of sin. The Church wishes to make the Gospel of Jesus Christ present to the world and to every sector of humanity at every stage of history."³

Fitzpatrick's criticisms of curricular theories and philosophies of education should be understood from his philosophical perspective, a perspective that welcomed religion. Education provided a balanced life, an education of the *whole* person for *all* aspects of existence. The distinctive mark of Catholic education was the understanding of creation and human existence from a religious perspective. Christian doctrine and Christian morality formed the center of the curriculum. The Catholic school nurtured the student's ability to see the relationship between Christianity and life, faith and reason.

The teacher in Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education had an important role. Teaching was an apostolate, a way of directing one's life toward God. The teacher introduced the student to a particular way of life. The teacher had a two-fold

²E. Harris Harbison, "Liberal Education and Christian Education," in *The Christian Idea of Education*, ed. Edmund Fuller, vol. 1 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), 76.

³National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church in Nolan*, ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 4, 1975-1983, n. 6.

responsibility: to impart knowledge by using the best methods available and to provide a moral example. The teacher was an example of the relationship between knowledge and values. Education formed character. Values and knowledge could not be separated. Education sought to bring the student to see life as a whole. Education aided the student to form convictions. What one believed influenced one's actions.

Culture represented different ways of approaching God. God and the world were not in opposition. Culture conveyed the values and the aspirations of men and women. Christianity brought to fullness the values and the aspirations of men and women by interpreting them in a religious context. The Incarnation was God's pledge that human existence was not meaningless.

The Catholic college and the Catholic university had a special role in Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education. His criticisms of Catholic higher education were not the complaints of a bitter man. Thomas Aquinas and Ignatius Loyola were models of the Catholic educational ideal. He wanted faculty and students to mold themselves after the ideal. Because Catholic higher education accepted the principle of the relationship between faith and reason, Fitzpatrick urged graduates to use their talents and their knowledge for the benefit of society. Catholic higher education prepared one for service to the world.

On 28 October 1965 the synod of Vatican Council II released its position on education in the document, *Gravissimum Educationis* (Declaration on Christian Education).⁴ The document lacked both the influence and the excitement generated by *Lumen Gentium* (Dogmatic Constitution of the Church) and *Gaudium et Spes* (Pastoral Constitution of the Church), but it was an important statement.⁵ We now

⁴In *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter M. Abbott (New York: America Press, 1966).

⁵*Lumen Gentium* and *Gaudium et Spes* are in Abbott, ed. *The Documents of Vatican II*. The Declaration received the least attention from Catholics in the United States. The Declaration continued to suffer neglect during the years after Vatican Council II. One example of neglect is the omission of the Declaration on Christian Education

explore the similarities between Fitzpatrick, Vatican Council II, and literature after Vatican Council II.

The Catholic School

In *Gravissimum Educationis* the synod described the role of the Catholic school.

The Catholic school fostered personal development, faith, and Christian existence.

No less than other schools does the Catholic school preserve cultural goals and the natural development of youth. But it has several distinctive purposes. It aims to create for the school community an atmosphere enlivened by the gospel spirit of freedom and charity. It aims to help the adolescent in such a way that the development of his [or her] own personality will be matched by the growth of that new creation which he [or she] became by baptism. It strives to relate all human culture to the news of salvation, so that the life of faith will illumine the knowledge which students gradually gain of the world, of life and of [human existence]. . . . The purpose in view is that by living an exemplary and apostolic life, the Catholic graduate can become, as it were, the saving leaven of the human family.⁶

The Teacher

The document had much praise for teachers.

Beautiful, . . . and truly solemn is the vocation of all those who assist parents in fulfilling their task, and who represent human society as well, by undertaking the role of school teacher. This calling requires extraordinary qualities of mind and heart, extremely careful preparation, and a constant readiness to begin anew and to adapt.⁷

Teachers are apostles performing an "authentic service to society."⁸ Teachers "should . . . be trained with particular care so that [they] may be enriched with both secular and religious knowledge, appropriately certified, and may be equipped with an educational skill which reflects modern-day findings."⁹ Teachers gave "witness to Christ, the unique Teacher, by their lives as well as by their teachings."¹⁰

in Timothy E. O'Connell, ed. *Vatican II and Its Documents: An American Reappraisal*, Theology and Life Series 15 (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1986).

⁶*Gravissimum Educationis*, n. 8.

⁷*Ibid.*, n. 5.

⁸*Ibid.*, n. 8.

⁹*Ibid.*

¹⁰*Ibid.*

The teacher was a minister.¹¹ In 1967 Catholic bishops in the United States reaffirmed the synod's position, "We . . . repudiate the false notion that the classroom teachers are less effective in the apostolate than our religious and laity engaged in other apostolic pursuits."¹² Teachers, especially teachers of religious education, should use methodologies "in a way suited to the [student's] age and circumstances, and . . . afford [students] spiritual assistance through programs which are appropriate under the prevailing conditions of time and setting."¹³ Teachers ministered to the student's progress in faith and toward salvation.¹⁴ Almost thirty years earlier, Fitzpatrick said, "To be permitted to teach religion is a sacred privilege, and demands that one do his [or her] utmost to live worthily of that privilege of coming closer to God through His grace and sacraments."¹⁵

In 1980 the Catholic episcopate in the United States reiterated the importance of teacher preparation programs in Catholic colleges and Catholic universities. Teacher preparation programs in Catholic colleges and universities should "provide Christian formation programs for educators who are evangelizers by call and covenant and mission. Only those teachers who have been formed theologically and spiritually can respond . . . to the call of professional ministry in Christian education according to the vision of Jesus Christ and His Church."¹⁶

¹¹Ibid., n. 7.

¹²*Statement on Catholic Schools* in Nolan ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 3, 1962-1974, n. 9.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Johannes Pohlschneider, "Declaration on Christian Education," trans. Ronald Walls in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 4, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler (New York: Herder & Herder, 1969), 34.

¹⁵Edward A. Fitzpatrick and Paul F. Tanner, *Methods of Teaching Religion in Elementary Schools* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1939), 186.

¹⁶*Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church*, n. 28. Pope John Paul II stated in 1986: "No matter what subject you teach, it is part of your responsibility to lead your pupils more fully into the mystery of Christ and the living tradition of the Church." (Pope John Paul II, "The Catholic Schools and Its Teachers," *Origins* 16 (December 11, 1986): 478.) See also the document issued in

Formation of Character

Gravissimum Educationis stressed the formation of character, an important point in Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education.¹⁷ Fitzpatrick and the synod shared a common understanding of character formation. A commentator explained the document's understanding of character formation. *Gravissimum Educationis* stresses the development of the individual. Christian education is extended to the individual person, destined to be molded to a mature sense of personal responsibility, to that full development of his [or her] own dignity, destiny, and ultimate goal as a man [or woman]. By personal choice and initiative, he [or she] is led to embrace moral conduct and righteous living . . . [H]e [or she] is to become more and more conscious of his [or her] baptized state and of the gift of faith, be aware of his [or her] heavenly calling . . . and give witness to it, especially through liturgical worship. The essence of all Christian education lies in these truths.¹⁸

Through the Incarnation, Christianity represented the fulfillment of the human struggle for meaning and values. Catholic education "form[ed] women and men for others, in imitation of Christ, the Word of God, the Man for others; . . ."¹⁹ Faith influenced one's actions and one's understanding of existence. *Gravissimum Educationis* insisted on

the integration of Christian education into the whole pattern of human life in all its aspects The Church states with utmost clarity that it has not the desire to remain away *from* the world in a form of isolation but that Christian education is *in* the world, and in a sense, *for* the world, since [Christians] must always work out [their] salvation in the concrete situation in which God has placed [them] and must achieve [salvation] not by protection but by contributing to the whole human community of which they are an integral and inseparable part.²⁰

1976 by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Teach Them in Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 4, 1975-1983, ed. Hugh J. Nolan, n. 29.

¹⁷Pohlschneider, "Declaration on Christian Education," 34.

¹⁸Teresa, Mary. "Study the Declaration on Christian Education," *Catholic School Journal* 66 (June 1967): 45.

¹⁹Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, *Assembly 1989: Jesuit Ministry in Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: Jesuit Conference, 1989), n. 13. Raymond Baumhart, S.J., president of Loyola University of Chicago, made the document available to the Loyola community.

²⁰See G. Emmett Carter's introduction to the Declaration in Abbott, ed. *Documents of Vatican II*, 635.

Catholic Education and Culture

The relationship between Catholic education and culture received attention in *Gravissimum Educationis*. One commentator noted that the "message of salvation is the organic principle of all human culture. All knowledge imparted to pupils through properly phased instruction . . . must be viewed and evaluated from the valid perspectives of Christian faith."²¹

In the document *Gaudium et Spes*, the synod defined culture in broad terms. According to *Gaudium et Spes*, culture

indicates all those factors by which [men and women refine] . . . and unfold [their] manifold spiritual and bodily qualities. [Culture] means [the] effort to bring the world itself under [their] control by [their] knowledge and . . . labor. [Culture] includes the fact that by improving customs and institutions [men and women] render social life more human both within the family and in the civic community. Finally, it is a feature of culture that throughout the course of time [humanity] expresses, communicates, and conserves in [its] works great spiritual experiences and desires, so that these may be of advantage to the progress of many, even of the whole human family.²²

Gaudium et Spes acknowledged that "the ideal of the 'universal [person]' is disappearing more and more."²³ Yet the document recalled the obligation "to preserve a view of the whole person, a view in which the values of the intellect, will, conscience, and fraternity are pre-eminent. These values are rooted in God the Creator and have been wonderfully restored and elevated in Christ."²⁴ In 1971 Pope

²¹Pohlschneider, "Declaration on Christian Education," 31.

²²*Gaudium et Spes*, n. 53.

²³*Ibid.*, n. 61.

²⁴*Ibid.* Four years after *Gaudium et Spes* was promulgated, James Collins issued a warning against the trend among philosophers to avoid issues or questions about a unified approach to life or matters of ultimate concern. Collins said, ". . . it is presently fashionable for philosophers to disclaim any burning interest in the grand problems of human destiny and any definite responsibility for the practical consequences of their theoretical analyses. . . . But historical experience shows that this disavowal does not tell the whole story, and it cannot sustain itself over a long period and with respect to all the main issues." (James Collins, *Crossroads in Philosophy* [Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1962; re-print, Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., Gateway Edition, 1969], 304 (page reference is to reprint edition)). Two recently published books pointed to the importance of wholeness. Christopher F. Mooney observed the need for universities to foster the sense of the wholeness of life. Mooney saw the need for wholeness to be most urgent in the study of ethics.

Paul VI spoke in the spirit of *Gaudium et Spes*, "Although the ideal of a universal culture is seen to be more and more unattainable for [men and for women] as a result of the extraordinary progress of technique, science, and knowledge, it is still the aim of all true education and instruction to form the whole [person]."²⁵ *Gaudium et Spes* encouraged "the faithful . . . [to] live in very close union with the men [and women] of their time. Let [the faithful] strive to understand perfectly their way of thinking and feeling as expressed in their culture."²⁶

"That the earthly and heavenly city penetrate each other is a fact accessible to faith alone."²⁷ The statement was not frivolous. The mystery of human existence was recognized. Human beings questioned the purpose and the meaning of existence, and Christian education was a means of providing an answer to the question. Vatican Council II affirmed that "only God, who created man [and woman] to His own image and ransomed [them] from sin, provides a fully adequate answer [to the question of the purpose of human existence]. . . . This He does through what He has revealed in Christ His Son, who became man. Whoever follows after Christ, the perfect man, be-

According to Mooney, "there is . . . [a] . . . burden on educators: to find ways to combine the teleology and stability that characterized traditional ethics with the compulsion of students to focus on immediate personal growth and freedom of choice. . . . It is this experience that is gradually coming to mediate between narrow self-interests and desires for greater connectedness with the world." (Christopher F. Mooney, *Boundaries Dimly Perceived: Law, Religion, Education, and the Common Good*, Notre Dame Studies in Law and Contemporary Issues, vol. 3 [Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989], 149). Robert Nozick's study of death, love, God, faith, authenticity, and other existential topics is an attempt to provide, as Nozick says, a *portrait* of life. While Nozick admits that reflection on human existence is not an appealing topic among philosophers, his introduction to the book argues for the necessity of moving beyond highly specialized philosophical research. See Nozick's book *The Examined Life: Philosophical Meditations* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1989).

²⁵Pope Paul VI, "Continued Instruction of Adults Is Urgent," *L'Osservatore Romano* [English] 19 [163] (13 May 1971): 5.

²⁶*Gaudium et Spes*, n. 62.

²⁷*Ibid.*, n. 40.

comes himself [or herself] more of a [person]."²⁸ Fitzpatrick and *Gaudium et Spes* reminded Christians of their responsibility to the world.

They are mistaken who, knowing that we have no abiding city but seek one which is to come, think that they may therefore shirk their earthly responsibilities. For they are forgetting that by faith itself [Christians] are more than ever obliged to measure up to these duties, each according to his [or her] proper vocation.²⁹

Catholic Higher Education

Gravissimum Educationis addressed Catholic institutions of higher learning. In Catholic colleges and Catholic universities, "individual branches of knowledge studied according to their own proper principles and methods, and with due freedom of scientific investigation."³⁰ Respect for the principles and methodologies of all disciplines engendered "an ever deeper understanding of these fields, and . . . [helped to understand] more profoundly how faith and reason give harmonious witness to the unity of all truth."³¹ Catholic higher education provided "a public, persistent, and universal presence in the whole enterprise of advancing high culture, [in order] that the students of [Catholic colleges and Catholic universities] may become men and women truly outstanding in learning, ready to shoulder society's heavier burdens and to witness the faith to the world."³²

Fitzpatrick and *Gravissimum Educationis* shared the same high regard for Catholic education, and they understood the purpose of knowledge from an identical perspective. The advancement of knowledge as the sole purpose of Catholic higher education was in education was insufficient.

Catholic [colleges and Catholic universities] in particular must not be nor become bastions of defense or fortresses of protection against the cold, cruel world; . . . No, they exist for service; they see 'the world' as an opportunity and object of charity and love because they see God's creatures. . . . Such . . . is the funda-

²⁸Ibid., n. 41.

²⁹Ibid., n. 43.

³⁰*Gravissimum Educationis*, n. 10.

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid.

mental challenge of the Church and all the People of God in the apostolate of education; it is the challenge of unselfish service.³³

Professional schools were also subject to Christian influence. *Gravissimum Educationis* acknowledged the legitimacy of professional schools of all types and urged Catholic teachers in professional schools to use their skills to develop a Christian influence.³⁴

Reflections on Catholic higher education from another source supported Fitzpatrick's philosophy of Catholic higher education. In a letter to Theodore Hesburgh, C.S.C., then president of Notre Dame University, dated 4 September 1965, Pope Paul VI described the modern university as

a city of the mind, . . . a laboratory of discovery and research, . . . containing . . . scholars and writers, a studio of artistic production, an endless conversation a meeting place for scholars and a house for students. Here [scholars] are intimately involved in the search for truth. University life is a commitment to study and thought if it is to remain faithful to what it really is. The university has a spiritual vocation as well as a cultural vocation which it proclaims and nurtures.³⁵

Pope Paul VI's recognition of the *spiritual* vocation of the university was significant. Human beings were more than material things. The Catholic university advanced the religious dimension in the pursuit of truth.

Scholars recently questioned the purpose of Catholic higher education. One scholar queried about the identity of Catholic colleges and Catholic universities. He concluded that "an answer satisfactory to all will be elusive. . . . Nevertheless, the very fact that the question is . . . being raised is a positive sign for the future of

³³Mark J. Hurley, "The Declaration on Christian Education," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 66 (December 1965): 225.

³⁴*Gravissimum Educationis*, n. 10.

³⁵Cited in Robert E. Tracy, *American Bishops at the Vatican Council* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1966), 220-1.

Catholic higher education."³⁶ Less optimistic was the comment from another member of the Catholic higher education community who noted that historically

the need for Catholic [colleges] and universities was an *assumption*-- . . . that arose from the consciousness on the part of Catholics that they were "different," a distinctive group whose needs could only be met by institutions that corresponded to their own unique character. . . . [T]he assimilation of the Catholic population and the acceptance of secular American norms by Catholic scholars and institutions of higher learning have eroded the social reality which made that assumption seem inevitable and right. Those who still believe that Catholic higher education is needed and valuable can no longer regard their belief as a premise of action whose validity is beyond question. Rather, they are required to bring their assumptions up to the level of . . . analysis, explicate them, and demonstrate their validity to the world.³⁷

Both statements overlooked an important point. Catholicism possesses a rich intellectual tradition, and the Catholic college and the Catholic university are integral parts of that tradition. "It is not part of the Christian ideal to produce the drilled response or the unthinking obedience of the automaton."³⁸ Fitzpatrick believed that Catholic higher education had the duty to engage the world and to coordinate faith and reason. Pope John Paul II echoed Fitzpatrick's conviction when

³⁶Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience* (Garden City, N.Y.: Image Books, 1985), 444-5.

³⁷Philip Gleason, "The Crisis of Americanization," in *Contemporary Catholicism in the United States*, ed. Philip Gleason. International Studies of the Committee on International Relations, University of Notre Dame (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), 27. See also Gleason's comment in "American Catholic Higher Education: A Historical Perspective," in *The Shape of Catholic Higher Education: A Historical Perspective*, ed. Robert Hassenger (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 53. There is another view. James Hennesey, S.J., suggested that the acceptance of government subsidies spurred the secularization of Catholic colleges and Catholic universities. According to Hennesey, "Reliance on tuition, low faculty salaries, large-scale exclusion of lay people from administrative positions, and the unpaid service of men and women members of religious communities staved off the inevitable for a time; but by the mid-sixties, the church's educational establishment had awakened to find that it had, in varying degrees and with some exceptions, secularized American Catholic higher education in return for government subsidy." (James Hennesey, *American Catholics* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1981], 283).

³⁸R.J. Henle, "Objectives of the Catholic Liberal Arts College," in *Christian Wisdom and Christian Formation*, eds. J. Barry McGannon, Bernard J. Cooke, and George P. Klubertanz (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1964), 35.

he said, "The whole living tradition of the Church teaches us this: faith seeks understanding and understanding seeks faith."³⁹

The Catholic college and the Catholic university accepted the world *as it is* and to directs the world to its religious fulfillment. Neil G. McCluskey's remark about the Catholic University of America applied to all Catholic universities, "The Catholic [u]niversity of today cannot be secular but it must operate in a secular society. To be Catholic the university must be inspired by Christ and His Word."⁴⁰ Fitzpatrick's understanding of Catholic higher education was part of a current of thought about Catholic higher education.

The aim of the Catholic college or Catholic university is to bring the entire range of reality into the Christian vision in each historical period. Each historical period had a specific understanding of what a human being was, and the understanding of human existence influenced education. "Each academic discipline within the realm of the humanities and social sciences, when honest with itself, is well aware that the values transmitted depend of assumptions about the ideal human person which are used as a starting point."⁴¹ Catholic higher education

does not exist to perpetuate Classical culture or Medieval culture or Renaissance culture or a culture of the Ages of Faith that never existed; it must be Catholic and modern. [Catholic higher education] is able to offer a *unique* fullness of culture to which all the past as well as the present is tributary.⁴²

Catholic colleges and Catholic universities should "not be nor become bastions of defense or fortresses of protection against the cold cruel world; . . . [Catholic colleges

³⁹Pope John Paul II, "Pope's Address to Students at the University of Leuven, Belgium," *L'Osservatore Romano* [English] 29 [894] (15 July 1985): 9.

⁴⁰Neil G. McCluskey, "Introduction: This is How It Happened," in *The Catholic University: A Modern Appraisal*, ed. Neil G. McCluskey (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1970), 27.

⁴¹Kolvenbach, *Assembly 1989: Jesuit Ministry in Higher Education*, n. 26.

⁴²R.J. Henle, "The Pluralism of North America and the Catholic University Today," in *The Catholic University: Instrument of Cultural Pluralism to the Service of Church and Society*, Proceedings of the International Federation of Catholic Universities, XIIth General Assembly (Paris: Permanent Secretary, 1979), 68.

and Catholic universities] exist to serve; they see 'the world' as an opportunity, an object of charity and love because they see God's creatures. . . ."43

Acceptance of the world offered unique opportunities.

There is no academic material, there are no human problems that remain foreign to a Christian perspective, because faith teaches us this: the mysteries of Creation, of the Incarnation and Redemption have transformed and enriched for ever the knowledge and wisdom of the human family, the science and culture of all [humanity].⁴⁴

Catholic institutions of higher learning

must not stop at *homo faber* (craftsman), at *homo socialis* (member of society), at *homo literatus* (man of culture); [Catholic colleges and universities] must make a leap of quality in all its expressions and in all its activities in order to draw the most profound meaning of human life regenerated by Christ.⁴⁵

Knowledge, values, and service to the world united Fitzpatrick's understanding of Catholic higher education to contemporary statements about Catholic higher education. Every graduate had something to contribute to society. The success of the Catholic higher education will "be judged by how well it helps the Catholic community to see the dignity of human life with the vision of Jesus and involve itself in the search for solutions to the pressing problems of society"⁴⁶ The Catholic college and the Catholic university trained lay men and lay women who

seek the kingdom of God by engaging in temporal affairs and by ordering them according to the plan of God. They live in the world, . . . in each and in all of the secular professions and occupations. They live in the ordinary circumstances of family and social life, from which the very web of their existence is woven.

They are called there by God . . . and being led by the spirit of the gospel they can work for the sanctification of the world from within, . . . In this way they can make Christ known to others, especially by the testimony of a life resplendent in faith, hope, and charity. The [laity] is closely involved in temporal affairs of

⁴³Mark J. Hurley, "The Declaration on Christian Education," 225.

⁴⁴William Wakefield Baum, "Characteristics which Must Distinguish the Catholic University," *L'Osservatore Romano* [English] 30 [844] (23 July 1984): 10.

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *To Teach as Jesus Did: A Pastoral Message on Catholic Education* (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1972), n. 10. Pope John XXIII called on schools to incorporate the Christian social doctrine in classrooms and activities outside the classroom in his encyclical *Mater et Magistra* (On Christianity and Social Progress). The encyclical is in Carlen, ed. *The Papal Encyclicals*, vol. 5, 1958-1981, nn. 226-32.

every sort. It is . . . [the laity's] special task to illumine and organize [secular] affairs in such a way that they may always start out, develop, and persist according to Christ's mind, to the praise of the Creator and the Redeemer.⁴⁷

There are differences between Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education and contemporary statements about Catholic education. The differences are rooted in the problems behind *Gravissimum Educationis*. The synod acknowledged

the diversity of conditions in the nations around the world; the vast differences in the operation of Catholic schools; even the problems of the definition of what a Catholic school really is; the fact of the excellent encyclical of Pius XI *On the Christian Education of Youth* in 1929; the Church-State problems in the nations of the world--these and other difficulties suggested at every stage the possibility of dropping the [Declaration on Christian Education] entirely in favor of a papal encyclical or of action by national conferences of bishops closer to the actual scene.⁴⁸

Despite the difficulties, the synod approved of *Gravissimum Educationis*.⁴⁹ The synod encouraged educators to apply the principles in the document to local situations.⁵⁰

Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education did not consider the possibility of differences within the Catholic educational system in the United States. None of Fitzpatrick's books or articles discussed Catholic education in non-Western cultures. Vatican Council II acknowledged diversity. Non-Western cultures and their contributions to Christianity were accepted by Vatican Council II. Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education had a limitation, a limitation that the synod hoped to correct. The synod hoped that "the Declaration [would] be accepted as a call to reject

⁴⁷*Lumen Gentium*, n. 31. See also *To Teach as Jesus Did: A Pastoral Message on Catholic Education*, n. 7.

⁴⁸Mark J. Hurley, *De Educatione Christiana: The Declaration on Christian Education* (Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1966), 16.

⁴⁹Accounts of the debates about the Declaration are in the following: *Preparatory Reports: Second Vatican Council*, trans. Aram Berard (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965); Henri Fesquet, *The Drama of Vatican II*, trans. Bernard Murchland (New York: Random House, 1967); Xavier Rynne [pseud], *The Third Session: The Debates and Decrees of Vatican Council II September 14 to November 21, 1964* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1964); Idem, *Vatican Council II* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1968); Robert E. Tracy, *American Bishop at the Vatican Council* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966); Vincent A. Yzermans, ed. *American Participation in the Second Vatican Council* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1967).

⁵⁰*Gravissimum Educationis*, n. 2.

the extreme and narrow parochialism that long has afflicted the work of Catholic education.⁵¹ During Fitzpatrick's association with Catholic education, few non-Catholics attended Catholic schools.

Fitzpatrick defended the understanding of Catholic education explained by Pope Pius XI in his encyclical. Secularism in American society and in American public education caused the Catholic Church and its schools to assume a defensive posture. Catholic schools defended religious values. Secularism and Christianity were enemies.⁵²

When the synod convened for Vatican Council II, the Church had changed its position from confrontation to dialogue with and service to the world. Catholic schools became part of the change. "[The Declaration on Christian Education] is preoccupied with service to young people and service to the world."⁵³ The difference between *Rappresentanti in Terra* and *Gravissimum Educationis* was the emphasis on personalism.⁵⁴ The student's growth in the Christian faith was primary. The Catholic school as part of a religious institution was secondary.

A final difference. Fitzpatrick's writings did not discuss what the Church could do for Catholics who did not attend Catholic schools. He addressed his comments to students and educators in the Catholic educational system. The synod's choice of the word *Christian* rather than *Catholic* was significant. The choice indicated that "Vatican [Council] II refuse[d] to consider the Catholic school as the only possible solution [to religious education], and . . . [the synod was] aware of the

⁵¹O'Neill C. D'Armour, "Vatican II and Christian Education," *Ave Maria* 104 (11 November 1966): 22.

⁵²Robert Wuthnow provided a valuable discussion of the role of Protestantism and Catholicism as defenders of religious values and re-ligious convictions in American society in his book *The Restructuring of American Religion* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988). Much of Wuthnow's book coincides with Fitzpatrick's career in Catholic education.

⁵³Paul Guyon, *Déclaration sur L'Éducation Chrétienne* (Paris: Casterman, 1966), 26.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*

large fact that many young Catholics are in secular schools."⁵⁵ *Gravissimum Educationis* extended the boundaries of Christian education. All schools were able to develop a Christian milieu, and Catholics could attend non-Catholic schools without fear for the loss of their faith. It is the responsibility of the individual Catholic to live his or her faith in non-Catholic environments.

Fitzpatrick was part of the Catholic tradition in education. His discussion of the Catholic school, character formation, teaching as an apostolate, culture, and Catholic higher education meshed with themes developed during and after Vatican Council II. The differences between Fitzpatrick and Vatican II cannot be easily explained because the differences point to shifts in theological perceptions. Reliance upon the Catholic school as an institution had diminished. Greater appreciation of non-Western cultures brought new possibilities to Catholic education in different parts of the world. In the United States, Catholic schools have the flexibility to adjust to different environments. More non-Catholic students are attending Catholic schools. Problems often accompany change, and Catholic education can no longer rely on authority and uniformity (real or imagined) as solutions.

The strength of Fitzpatrick's philosophy of education was the tradition from which it drew. The relationship between knowledge and values, service, moral formation, teaching as an apostolate, the quest for a unified vision of life, and the reality of the Incarnation as the model for human existence will continue to identify Catholic education. The tradition behind Catholic education is larger and offers more possibilities for solutions to the problems facing Catholic education than *one* may see. Fitzpatrick worked with the Catholic educational tradition as *he* knew it within *his* situation. What he did not anticipate and what he failed to see were the results of *his* limitations, not the limitations of his tradition. The Catholic educational tradition asks one to go beyond one's limitations, one's interests, and,

⁵⁵Henri Fesquet, *The Drama of Vatican II*, trans. Bernard Murchland (New York: Random House, 1967), 531.

sometimes, one's prejudices. The promotion of the Catholic educational ideal will require a collaborative effort. Advocates of Catholic education will be called to see education from a higher perspective. Our studies, our classrooms, and our lecture halls will be the opportunities for the meeting of time with eternity. All students and all faculty will be invited to participate in the promotion of the Catholic educational ideal.

The last chapter of my study summarizes Fitzpatrick's life and makes some final remarks about his philosophy of education. The chapter polishes the portrait of Fitzpatrick's life and his philosophy of education.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Edward Augustus Fitzpatrick carved his niche on public education in Wisconsin and Catholic education. His commitment to both educational systems was laudable. His preparation for service to education was excellent. Although little information about his academic record was in the archives of Marquette University and the archives of Mount Mary College, admittance to Columbia University, then the most important center for educational theory and educational practice in the United States, provided impressive credentials.

Credentials introduced connections. Fitzpatrick was not reluctant to join different organizations. His work for Charles McCarthy presented opportunities to establish relationships with individuals who proved to be foes and friends of legislation to improve public education in Wisconsin. Fitzpatrick's ascension to the position of secretary of Wisconsin's State Board of Education was remarkable. He was an outsider, a New Yorker who led an assault on Wisconsin's State Board of Education -- a board too comfortable with politicians to be effective.

Not content to conclude easy compromises, Fitzpatrick made his convictions clearly known. To his credit, Wisconsin's teachers received adequate compensation, and Wisconsin's citizens enjoyed increased opportunities for education. His convictions exacted a toll, but his departure from public education did not cool his zeal for education. Marquette University and Mount Mary College offered challenges that tested his philosophy of education and his administrative skills.

At Marquette University he accepted responsibility for leadership of the graduate school. Some recalcitrant faculty members caused tumult, but Fitzpatrick succeeded. Scholarship and doctoral programs became integral parts of the graduate

school. The university then allowed Fitzpatrick to direct its undergraduate program. During the course of his career, he established a network of colleagues in the Catholic educational system.

Samuel Knox Wilson of Loyola University of Chicago was one of his colleagues. Wilson and Fitzpatrick recognized weaknesses in Catholic higher education, and they were not afraid to criticize and to suggest improvements. One suggestion resulted in a policy for accreditation applicable to all Catholic colleges and Catholic universities in the United States. In their own ways, Wilson and Fitzpatrick contributed to the growth and maturity of their institutions and to Catholic higher education.

Fitzpatrick's control of Mount Mary College was an exceptional case. Simultaneous responsibility for two institutions exemplified Fitzpatrick's unfailing energy. At Marquette University and at Mount Mary College, he confronted problems that ordinarily taxed the attention of one person at one institution. Mount Mary College was in a precarious financial situation. Fitzpatrick's dedication saved the college. During his presidency Mount Mary College was the laboratory for Fitzpatrick's understanding of the Catholic liberal arts college and the haven in which he wrote and reflected on Catholic higher education. Honorary degrees from four Catholic institutions of higher learning and his association with various associations, Catholic and non-Catholic, indicated that others found his efforts worthy of applause and attention.

He was an advocate of Aquinas's philosophy and philosophy of education. Fitzpatrick argued that Catholic education was receptive to the world. The student was encouraged to develop his or her potential to the fullest measure. The student's self-activity in the process of learning was as important to Catholic education as it was to public education. The difference rested on the religious interpretation of human existence. The fullness of human existence was a fullness that ordered all life towards God. God was the complement of human existence. The teacher

participated as the minister between God and student. Catholic education fostered the student's responsibility to himself or herself and to the world.

Thomism was a living philosophy, ready to embrace the world and to answer questions. Fitzpatrick was a disciple of Pope Leo XIII. Late in his career in Catholic education, Fitzpatrick made the following statement,

We have always rejected the Catholic ghetto idea and the merely defensive attitude and . . . self-gratification. Catholic education is a great enterprise, as inclusive as the word education without the adjective. What concerns us is education in terms of a comprehensive and ultimate view of human nature.¹

His statement aimed at the heart of Catholic education. Christianity claimed ultimacy because of a historical person. Christianity's tradition preserved the relationship between faith and reason. Faith was never an excuse for ignorance. Henri De Lubac, S.J., elucidated the relationship between faith and reason: "For if the mind must submit to what is incomprehensible, [the mind] cannot admit what is unintelligible, and it is not enough for [the mind] to seek refuge in an 'absence of contradiction' by an absence of thought."²

Desire to improve religious education placed Fitzpatrick in a group of individuals who recognized the need for change. Memorization, then the primary methodology for teaching the *Baltimore Catechism*, was considered inadequate. Reflection on the relationship between doctrine and life, the understanding of Christianity as a *response* to a loving God, the Incarnation as the standard for the fullness of human existence, and the effort to sharpen the laity's appreciation for symbol and for liturgy were different strains in catechetical education aimed at instilling the vigor of Christianity in the lives of young believers.

As an antidote to memorization of theological formulas, Fitzpatrick focused on the child's self-activity in the process of learning. Memorization ignored the

¹E[dward] A. F[it]zpatrick], "Both Catholic and Catholic," *Catholic School Journal* 54 (June 1954): 196.

²Henri De Lubac, *Catholicism*, trans. Lancelot C. Sheppard (New York: Longman's, Green, 1950), 178.

child's ability to understand and to internalize the teachings of the catechisms. Learning, Fitzpatrick believed, led to changes in behavior. Self-activity promoted the child's ability to relate the teachings of Catholicism to his or her life. The child was trained to see the relationship between Catholicism and its cultural expressions.

Two series of textbooks for religious education underscored Fitzpatrick's wish to place the best of contemporary thought in the hands of teachers and pupils. Each series aimed at the child's ability to live and to understand the Catholic faith. The child's growth as a Catholic was paramount.

[Catholic educators] can never make the Christian by merely learning the words of catechisms nor repeating theological formulas. [Catholic educators] can never make the Christian by a school education that does not permeate the entire life of the individual. [Catholic educators] can never make the Christian unless we take him [or her] where he [or she] is morally and spiritually and he [or she] then directs himself [or herself] by progressive steps higher and higher--even to sainthood. [Catholic educators] can never make Christians unless we can induce motives stronger than the 'old Adam,' which is in all of us.³

Fitzpatrick knew that the child's development had to be balanced with the best of scholarship in religious education. One appreciates Fitzpatrick's effort by comparing his approach to a recent complaint about catechetical instruction. Sharon Davis Rives described her experience as a teacher for a Confraternity of Christian Doctrine class. To her disappointment, Ms. Rives found that the *God Is With Us* program of religious education relied too much on psychology and failed to link Catholic doctrine to personal development.⁴

Self-activity was the cornerstone for teaching all disciplines. Emphasis on the child required properly trained teachers and an appreciation for methodology. "Teachers ignorant of the child's nature and subject matter have no place in Catholic

³E[dward] A. F[itzpatrick], "What Education Will Make the Christian?" *Catholic School Journal* 45 (September 1945): 184.

⁴Sharon Davis Rives, "The Catechesis of Relativism," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 60 (December 1989): 12-21. At the end of her article there is complete citation to the program's title.

schools. Teachers, not . . . adequately trained, . . . should not be given the responsibility for teaching Catholic children."⁵

At Mount Mary College Fitzpatrick formulated his understanding of the Catholic liberal arts college. Liberal education, when combined with theology, produced a Christian humanism. The Catholic liberal arts college emphasized seeing life as a whole and relating Catholicism to all aspects of life. Fitzpatrick was part of the rich Christian intellectual tradition, a tradition that continues to identify Catholic higher education. In 1980 Catholic bishops in the United States urged Catholic colleges and Catholic universities

to preserve and strengthen the teaching of the liberal arts in undergraduate and pre-professional education. Particularly in professional and graduate programs, the faculty and students should address human and religious issues that are intrinsic to humane education. An institution's Catholic identity is largely expressed in a curriculum that shows how the values of the Judeo-Christian view of life illuminate all fields of study and practice.⁶

Liberal learning led to theology. Theology was meaningful because human beings are religious in nature. There was no compromise on the role of theology in liberal education, "If [men and women are] spiritual being[s], genuine liberal education is possible; if not, not."⁷

Pope Leo XIII believed that scholasticism was a corrective to secularism and the foundation for social ethics.⁸ Fitzpatrick shared Leo's belief. Thomism was Fitzpatrick's link to encyclicals calling for charity and justice. Fitzpatrick emphasized the Christian's obligation of service to the world. The Christian is called upon to make his or her contribution. The alleviation of social problems was a

⁵Fitzpatrick and Tanner, *Methods of Teaching Religion in Elementary Schools*, 167.

⁶*Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church*, n. 19.

⁷Fitzpatrick, "Liberal Education and Other Worldliness," 36.

⁸Gerald A. McCool, *Catholic Theology in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Seabury Press, 1977), 246.

responsibility shared by all Christians. Catholic education could not ignore the call for each person to accept his or her responsibility for the world.

Fitzpatrick attempted to improve Catholic education in numerous articles in the *Catholic School Journal*. Soon after he assumed the editorship of the *Catholic School Journal*, Fitzpatrick announced his intention to introduce to readers the latest research in educational methodology. He invited non-Catholic educators to contribute to the *Journal*. His call for Catholic education to be worthy of Catholic children meant that he prepared to chart a new direction for Catholic education. His philosophy of education was ready to incorporate new ideas. The call for Catholic education to be receptive to new ideas and critical evaluation found contemporary expression. In 1968 Catholic bishops in the United States exhorted Catholic educators to "experiment . . . [and] . . . to concentrate on areas of research and learning for which they have special abilities, to engage in open and frank dialogue with their associates in other sectors of American education and to submit even their best endeavors to rigorous objective evaluation."⁹ Although he admitted that Catholic education did not achieve its potential, Fitzpatrick tried to make the *Catholic School Journal* an instrument for change.

His reflections on Catholic higher education revealed participation in a tradition that was reinforced during and after Vatican Council II. Knowledge and values were the fruits of higher education intended for society's prosperity. Catholic colleges and Catholic universities could not ignore questions of value and religion's role in the curriculum. Catholic graduates were encouraged to seek ways of uniting faith and reason in their personal and professional lives.

⁹National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *A Statement on Catholic Schools in Nolan*, ed. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 3, 1962-1974, n. 19.

The sacred and the secular were intertwined. Walter Ong, S.J., described how the Incarnation is the foundation and guarantee of the relationship between faith and reason.

If through the Incarnation the Church is committed to cosmic history, by the very same token she is committed to secular learning, for secular learning is not a thing apart from cosmic history, something superadded to it, but rather something within that history which develops in articulation with events in the same history, to protract and fulfill them.¹⁰

Fitzpatrick's understanding of Catholic higher education was an extension of Pope Pius XI who accepted the autonomy and validity of other disciplines. Pius believed that the "true Christian does not renounce the activities of this life, he [or she] does not stunt his [or her] natural faculties; but he [or she] develops and perfects them, by coördinating them with the supernatural."¹¹

Vatican Council II introduced the understanding of the Church as the People of God and the Church's role as servant to the world. Catholicism, in its hierarchial and in its institutional aspects, was deemphasized. Philosophical and theological pluralism runs concurrent with ecclesiastical pronouncements. Christianity no longer dominated public discourse. During Fitzpatrick's lifetime, Christianity considered itself to be the bedrock of American morality, and Catholic bishops perceived social problems to be the result of "the weakening of religion as a constructive force [in society]."¹²

Contemporary scholarship recognizes the historical limitations to our knowledge and the constant revision of our knowledge. Thomism's fall from dominance in the Catholic Church brought an end to what one scholar called the "uniquely Catholic view of things."¹³ Thomism is no longer understood as providing

¹⁰Walter J. Ong, *American Catholic Crossroads: Religious-Secular Encounters in the Modern World* (New York: Macmillan, 1959), 138-9. See also 151.

¹¹Pope Pius XI, *Rappresentanti in Terra*, n. 98.

¹²*Religion Our Most Valuable Resource*, n. 15.

¹³Halsey, *The Survival of American Innocence*, 15.

all answers to all questions. No one philosophical or theological system is now recognized as able to withstand the stress and strain of contemporary questions. Catholic education, especially Catholic higher education, in the United States reached a critical point.¹⁴

Although the complexity of the problem is great, from Fitzpatrick's philosophy of Catholic higher education three points emerge. First, a philosophical basis needs to be developed. Then the relationship of the philosophy to higher education must be explicated. Catholic higher education should continue the effort to balance the findings of modern research with its commitment to Christian faith and to the Christian life.

Given the diversity of opinion in any Catholic college or university, an attempt to provide a philosophical foundation will demand great effort from many people. The effort is necessary. Fitzpatrick and Vatican Council II rejected the "Catholic ghetto" mentality. In 1969 the International Federation of Catholic Universities stated its conviction that Catholic higher education cannot survive if distrustful of contemporary culture,

Catholic [higher education] of the future, (indeed of the present), cannot be aggressively polemical; it cannot prepare Catholics for the world by 'protecting' [students] and opening out only 'safe' ideas, by giving [students] a rigidly sound

¹⁴The relationship between Catholic higher education and culture becomes more complex when one considers non-Western cultures. In 1959, in his encyclical *Princeps Pastorum* (On Missions), Pope John XXIII stated, ". . . the Church . . . does not identify itself with any one culture, not even with European and Western civilization, although the history of the Church is closely intertwined with it; for the mission entrusted to the Church pertains chiefly to other matters. . .to matters which are concerned with religion and the eternal salvation of men [and women]. The Church. . .is willing. . .to recognize, welcome, and even assimilate anything that redounds to the honor of the human mind and heart, whether or not it originates in parts of the world washed by the Mediterranean Sea, which, from the beginning of time, had been destined by God's providence to be the cradle of the Church." (John XXIII, *Princeps Pastorum* (On Missions) in Carlen, ed. *The Papal Encyclicals*, vol. 5, 1958-1981, n. 19).

and traditional exposition of the Faith and of Catholic culture, by putting students into a paternalistic discipline created by external regulations and practices.¹⁵

In 1979 Pope John Paul II defined the relationship between research and the Catholic university,

Research at the University level presupposes all the loyalty, the seriousness and, . . . freedom of scientific investigation. . . . Dedicated to . . . research and teaching, [Catholic universities] have also . . . the role of witness and an apostolate without which the Church could not fully . . . evangelize the vast world of culture. . . .¹⁶

Second, Fitzpatrick's philosophy of higher education reminds us that one's contribution to society is as important as what one learns. His point received confirmation from three quarters. One's contribution to society was a point in the pastoral letter, *Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church*.¹⁷ The Christian cannot ignore the call for alleviating social ills. Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., noted that the pastoral dimension is as important as the intellectual dimension and should pervade the college or university.¹⁸ In 1985 Pope John Paul II said, "The university community must . . . know how to incarnate its faith within its own culture in a daily, existential way, with important moments of reflection in order to recall the foundations of its own faith, hope, and charity."¹⁹

Last, Fitzpatrick's philosophy of Catholic higher education attempted to make explicit the contributions of Catholic higher education to American society. His advocacy of Catholic higher education neither condemned nor castigated opposing views. He explained the uniqueness of Catholic higher education within the matrix

¹⁵International Federation of Catholic Universities, *The University in the Modern World*, 8th General Assembly (Paris: International Federation of Catholic Universities, 1969), 190.

¹⁶Pope John Paul II, "Address to Members of the International Federation of Catholic Universities and Rectors of the Catholic Universities of Europe about an Apostolate of Culture," *L'Osservatore Romano* [English] 10 [571] (5 March 1979): 5-6.

¹⁷*Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church*, nn. 37-41.

¹⁸Kolvenbach, *Assembly 1989: Jesuit Ministry in Higher Education*, n. 31.

¹⁹Pope John Paul II, "Pope's Address to Students at the University of Leuven, Belgium." *L'Osservatore Romano* 29 [895] (22 July 1985): 9.

of questions during his life-time. His example was instructive. Questions have been raised about the purpose of Catholic higher education by members in the Catholic academic community. Answers to today's questions are as important as they were in Fitzpatrick's time. "Christians must take part in any ideological and philosophical struggles which give shape to educational policies. . . . Furthermore, [Christians] must, whenever circumstances permit, make their colleagues and public opinion understand what specific service Catholic [colleges] and universities intend to render to society."²⁰

A critic and a defender of Catholic education, Fitzpatrick spoke and wrote about his convictions. When he perceived Catholic education to be a sleeping giant, he tried to awaken the giant. He was a philosopher and an administrator who carried the double burden of making Christian education receptive to new ideas while defending the meaning and integrity of Christian education against critics. He answered questions forthrightly. He spoke the truth as he understood it. He was a Catholic educator who possessed the strengths and weaknesses that any person possesses.

John Courtney Murray, S.J., no stranger to Catholic education, reminded us of the balanced view toward Catholic education. Murray admitted that the

failures of Christian education are normally multitudinous, sometimes scandalous, and occasionally spectacular. Even at its best a school is only a school, one milieu of influence among others, able to do only what a school can do. What

²⁰Hervé Carrier, *Higher Education Facing New Cultures* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1982), 149. Contemporary reflection on the role of the Catholic college or Catholic university produced two attempts to answer the question. Walter Krolkowski, S.J., argued that one can no longer think in terms of an "essence" of the Catholic college or Catholic university. He focused on the faith dimension within higher education. The Catholic college or Catholic university is a community of faith moving in the world of culture and ideas. See his article "The Protean Catholic University," *Thought* 48 (Winter 1973): 465-73. David Hassel, S.J., presents an extended philosophical analysis of the Catholic university in his book *City of Wisdom: A Christian Vision of the American University* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1983).

matters in every age is the idea that inspires its efforts, and integrity of these efforts.²¹

Edward Augustus Fitzpatrick was inspired, and he was a man of integrity.

²¹John Courtney Murray, "The Christian Idea of Education," in *The Christian Idea of Education*, ed. Edmund Fuller, vol. 1 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), 162.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baum, William Wakefield. "Characteristics which Must Distinguish the Catholic University." *L'Osservatore Romano* [English] 30 [844] (23 July 1984): 9-10.
- Beales, A. C. F. *Education Under Penalty*. London: Athlone Press, 1963.
- Bigo, Pierre. *La Doctrine Sociale De L'Église*. Paris: Presses Universitaires De France, 1965.
- Bonansea, Bernadino M. "Pioneers of the Nineteenth Century Scholastic Revival in Italy." *New Scholasticism* 28 (January 1954): 1-37.
- Brennan, R. E. "Troubadour of Truth." In *Essays in Thomism*, ed. Robert E. Brennan, 1-23. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1972.
- Bruehl, Charles. Review of *St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum*. In *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 34 (March 1934): 60.
- _____. "The Social Testament of Pius XI." *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 39 (May 1939): 785-94.
- Bryce, Mary Charles. "Religious Education in the Pastoral Letters and National Meetings of the U.S. Hierarchy." *American Benedictine Review* 10 (Summer 1973): 249-63.
- _____. *Pride of Place: The Role of Bishops in the Development of Catechesis in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1984.
- _____. "Four Decades of Roman Catholic Innovators." In *Enlightening the Next Generation: Catholics and Their Schools 1830-1980*, ed. F. Michael Perko, 221-42. New York: Garland, 1988.
- Buetow, Harold A. *Of Singular Benefit: The Story of Catholic Education in the United States*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1970.
- Bull, George. "The Function of the Catholic Graduate School." *Thought* 13 (September 1938): 364-80.
- Burke, W. J., and Will D. Howe. *American Authors and Books, 1640-1940*. New York: Gramercy Publishing Co., 1943.
- Carmody, Charles J. "The Roman Catholic Catechesis in the United States 1784-1930: A Study of Its Theory, Development, and Materials." Ph.D. diss., Loyola University of Chicago, 1975.

Carrier, Hervé. *Higher Education Facing New Cultures*. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1982.

"Catechetical Instruction (Decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council on the Promotion of Catechetical Instruction.)" *Catholic School Journal* 36 (January 1936): 1-5.

Cattell, J. McKeen, ed. *Leaders in Education*. New York: Science Press, 1932.

Cattell, J. McKeen, Jaques Cattell, and E. E. Ross, eds. *Leaders in Education*, 2d ed. New York: Science Press, 1941.

Cattell, J. McKeen, and E.E. Ross, eds. *Leaders in Education*, 3d ed. Lancaster, Pa.: Science Press, 1948.

Christ, Frank L., and Gerard Sherry, eds. *American Catholicism and the Intellectual Ideal*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Colleran, Joseph M. *The Treatises De Magistro of Saint Augustine and Saint Thomas*. New York: Paulist Press, 1945.

Collins, James. *Crossroads in Philosophy*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1962; reprint, Chicago, Henry Regnery Co., Gateway Edition, 1969.

_____. "Leo XIII and the Philosophical Approach to Modernity." In *Leo XIII and the Modern World*, ed. Edward T. Gargan, 181-212. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961.

Committee on Accreditation. "Report of the Committee on Accreditation of the College Department." *National Catholic Education Association Bulletin* 31 (August 1935): 1-14.

Conway, Pierre H. *Principles of Education: A Thomistic Approach*. Washington, D.C.: Thomist Press, 1960.

Cook, Robert C., ed. *Who's Who in Education*. Vol 2. New York: Robert C. Cook, 1928.

Cook, Robert C., and Eleanor Carroll. *Who's Who in American Education*, 16th ed. Nashville: Who's Who in American Education, 1953-4.

Corbishley, Thomas. "St. Thomas and Educational Theory." *Dublin Review* 212 (January 1943): 1-13.

Cunningham, William. *The Pivotal Problems in Education: An Introduction to the Christian Philosophy of Education*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1940.

Curti, Merle, and Vernon Carstensen. *The University of Wisconsin: A History 1848-1925*. 2 vols. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949; reprint, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1974.

D'Armour, O'Neil C. "Vatican II and Christian Education." *Ave Maria* 104 (1 1 November 1966): 20-2.

Davidson, Thomas. *A History of Education*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1900.

Delcuve, G. *Où en Est L'enseignement Religieux*. Tournai: Éditions Casterman, 1937.

- _____. "How the Manuals Fit in with the Catechism." *Lumen Vitae* 5 (October 1950): 582-3.
- Dolan, Jay P. *The American Catholic Experience*. Garden City, N.Y.: Image Books, 1985.
- Dondeyne, Albert. *Contemporary European Thought and Christian Faith*. Duquesne Studies, Philosophical Series no. 8. Translated by Ernan McMullin and John Burnheim. (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University, 1958.
- Donohue, John W. *St. Thomas Aquinas and Education*. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Dufault, Lucien. "The Aristotelian-Thomistic Concept of Education." *New Scholasticism* 20 (July 1946): 239-57.
- Editorial Staff at the Catholic University of America. *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1967. S.v. "Fitzpatrick, Edward Augustus," by E. Kevane.
- Eells, Walter Crosby, and Ernest V. Hollis. *Administration of Higher Education*. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1960.
- Ellis, John Tracy. *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life*. Chicago: Heritage Foundation, 1956.
- Fesquet, Henri. *The Drama of Vatican II*. Translated by Bernard Murchland. New York: Random House, 1967.
- Fitzel, Gerard F. "Some Historical Backgrounds of the Encyclical *Aeterni Patris*." *Nuntius Aulae* 38 (July 1956): 135-55.
- Fitzpatrick, Edward A. *The Educational Views and Influence of De Witt Clinton*. Contributions to Education, no. 44. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1911; reprint; New York: Arno Press & New York Times, 1969.
- _____. "The Foundations of St. Mary's College." *Catholic Educational Review* 27 (March 1929): 129-34.
- _____. "Editorial Announcement." *Catholic School Journal* 29 (September 1929): 196.
- _____. "What Is It to Be a Child?" *Catholic School Journal* 29 (September 1929): 165.
- _____. "Catholics in American Educational History." *Catholic School Journal* 29 (November 1929): 328.
- _____. "Children or Wild Animals?" *Catholic School Journal* 29 (November 1929): 301-2.
- _____. "The History of Education." *Catholic School Journal* 29 (November 1929): 328.

_____. "Education and the Incarnation." *Catholic School Journal* 29 (December 1929): 365-6.

_____, ed. *The Foundation of Christian Education*. Marquette Monographs on Education, No. 5. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1930.

_____. "Advanced Training of Sisters." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (January 1930): 35.

_____. "Our Government and Education." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (January 1930): 1-3.

_____. "Romance and the Catechism." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (February 1930): 68.

_____. "Child-Centered Education." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (March 1930): 81-4.

_____. "The Christian Educational System." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (April 1930): 119-22.

_____. "Self-Education." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (May 1930): 180-1.

_____. "The Spirit of Catholicism." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (May 1930): 157-60.

_____. "The Imagination in Education." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (June 1930): 213.

_____. "Motives and Will." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (June 1930): 212.

_____. "Wanted: A New Catechism." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (June 1930): 195-6.

_____. "For Whom Is the Catechism?" *Catholic School Journal* 30 (August 1930): 291.

_____. "School Discipline, Religion, and Character." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (September 1930): 309-11.

_____. "Religious Curriculum and the Aim of Education." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (October 1930): 351-3.

_____. "Objectives of Religious Education: The Spiritual Destiny of Man." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (November 1930): 393-4.

_____. "American Catholic Education History." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (November 1930): 417.

_____. "Constructing a Religion Curriculum." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (December 1930): 437-8.

_____. "The Encyclopedia Britannica." *Catholic School Journal* 30 (December 1930): 436.

- _____, ed. *A Curriculum in Religion*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1931.
- _____. "Our Catechism." *Catholic School Journal* 31 (January 1931): 24-5.
- _____. "Educational Significance of the Spiritual Exercises." *Catholic School Journal* 31 (May 1931): 159-61.
- _____. "Laymen Part of the Church." *Catholic School Journal* 31 (May 1931): 183.
- _____. "Richer Textbooks in Religion." *Catholic School Journal* 31 (May 1931): 182.
- _____. "The Lives of Saints." *Catholic School Journal* 31 (July 1931): 263.
- _____. "Method in Teaching Religion." *Catholic School Journal* 31 (September 1931): 340-1.
- _____. "Textbooks, Big in Size, because Rich in Content." *Catholic School Journal* 31 (October 1931): 366.
- _____. "Catholic Action and American Education Week." *Catholic School Journal* 31 (November 1931): 401.
- _____. "Enriched Teaching in Religion." *Catholic School Journal* 31 (November 1931): 400.
- _____. "The Catechism." *Catholic School Journal* 31 (December 1931): 448-9.
- _____. "A National Development of Catholic Higher Education." *Catholic School Journal* (April 1932): 127.
- _____. "Religion in Elementary Grades." *Commonweal* 18 (30 June 1932): 238-9.
- _____. "Do Not Teach What Needs to Be Unlearned." *Catholic School Journal* (June 1932): 204-5.
- _____. "Are Catholic Colleges Orphans?" *Catholic School Journal* 32 (August 1932): 256.
- _____. "Doctrine and History." *Catholic School Journal* 32 (November 1932): 333.
- _____. "The Fundamental Principle of the Liturgy." *Catholic School Journal* 32 (November 1932): 333.
- _____. "Prayers for Children: Dribble!" *Catholic School Journal* 32 (November 1932): 332.
- _____. "School Reader or Religious Text?" *Catholic School Journal* 32 (November 1932): 332.

- _____, ed. *St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum*. McGraw-Hill Education Classics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933.
- _____. "Articulation of Teaching Religion." *Catholic School Journal* 33 (January 1933): 8.
- _____. "Self-Activity in Religious Education." *Catholic School Journal* 33 (January 1933): 9.
- _____. "No Teaching without Learning." *Catholic School Journal* 33 (January 1933): 8-9.
- _____. "Doctrine and Christian Character." *Catholic School Journal* 33 (March 1933): 69.
- _____. "Religion in Education." *Catholic School Journal* 33 (June 1933): 143.
- _____. "Religion in Elementary Grades." *Commonweal* 18 (30 June 1933): 238-40.
- _____. "An Apostleship of Education." *Catholic School Journal* 33 (August 1933): 175-7.
- _____. "The Catechism Is a Lesson; The Gospel Is a Story." *Catholic School Journal* 33 (October 1933): 232.
- _____. "Apologetics and Teaching Religion." *Catholic School Journal* 33 (October 1933): 233.
- _____. "Memoriter Teaching of the Catechism." *Catholic School Journal* 33 (October 1933): 232.
- _____. "The Cultural and the Practical." *Catholic School Journal* 34 (January 1934): 12.
- _____. "Socrates and the Catechism." *Catholic School Journal* 34 (January 1934): 13.
- _____. "Catechisms in Teaching Religion." *Catholic School Journal* 34 (April 1934): 83.
- _____. "Knowledge and Religious Education." *Catholic School Journal* 34 (April 1934): 83.
- _____. "Development of Key Institutions." *Catholic School Journal* 34 (July 1934): 152.
- _____. "The Aim of the Catholic Liberal Arts College." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (January 1935): 1-4.
- _____. "The Aim of the Catholic Liberal Arts College." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (February 1935): 32-5.
- _____. "The Child and the Catechism." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (February 1935): 38.

_____. "Dramatization in Religious Education." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (March 1935): 68-9.

_____. "The Curriculum in Education: A Preview." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (April 1935): 97.

_____. "Religious Practices: A Preview." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (May 1935): 121.

_____. "Religious Education." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (June 1935): 138.

_____. "Religious Textbooks." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (June 1935): 138-9.

_____. "Catholic Professional Schools." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (August 1935): 209.

_____. "A Catholic Educational Policy--I." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (September 1935): 234.

_____. "The Catholic Mind in Education." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (September 1935): 235.

_____. "A Catholic Educational Policy--II." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (October 1935): 264.

_____. "Religion in Education." *Catholic School Journal* 35 (October 1935): 265.

_____. "Development of Catholic Universities." *Catholic School Journal* 36 (April 1936): 95.

_____. "The Co-operation of Catholic Colleges in the Interest of Better Textbooks." *Catholic School Journal* 36 (June 1936): 144-5.

_____. "Accreditation of Catholic Schools." *Catholic School Journal* 36 (July 1936): 190-1.

_____. "A Challenge to the Institute." *Mid-America N.S.* 7 (July 1936): 156-4.

_____. "The 'Highway to Heaven' Series." *Journal of Religious Education* 37 (February 1937): 525-30.

_____. "The 'Highway to Heaven' Series: Part II. The Underlying Educational Ideas." *Journal of Religious Education* 37 (March 1937): 606-10.

_____. "The 'Highway to Heaven' Series: Part III. Special Features." *Journal of Religious Education* 37 (April 1937): 720-30.

_____. "Guidance: Educational as Well as Vocational." *Catholic School Journal* 37 (February 1937): 35-6.

_____. "Pontifical Academicians." *Catholic School Journal* 37 (February 1937): 44-5.

- _____. "Committee on Educational Problems and Research: A Personal Statement Recommending Establishment." *National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin* 33 (August 1937): 92-6.
- _____. "What Is Teaching?" *Catholic School Journal* 37 (September 1937): 235-7.
- _____. *I Believe in Education*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1938.
- _____. "The Fundamentals of a Philosophy of Higher Education." *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 13-14 (1937-1938): 65-84.
- _____. "Lay Teachers in Catholic Colleges." *Catholic School Journal* 38 (February 1938): 48.
- _____. "Needed Research in Teaching Religion in the Elementary School." *Catholic School Journal* 38 (June 1938): 157-9.
- _____. "Needed Research in Teaching Religion on the Elementary School Level." *National Catholic Education Association Bulletin* 35 (August 1938): 465-72.
- _____. "It Is Naturalistic--It Is Materialistic." *Catholic School Journal* 38 (December 1938): 297.
- _____. , ed. *The Autobiography of a College*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1939.
- Fitzpatrick, Edward A., and Paul F. Tanner. *Methods of Teaching Religion in Elementary Schools*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1939.
- _____. "Pope Pius XI and Education." *Catholic School Journal* 39 (April 1939): 103-8.
- _____. "Self-Education." *Catholic School Journal* (May 1940): 150-1.
- _____. "Catholic Ideal in Education." *Sign* 19 (June 1940): 663-4.
- _____. "Eminence of Catholic Education." *Catholic School Journal* 40 (September 1940): 226.
- _____. "Social Competence." *Catholic School Journal* 40 (September 1940): 227.
- _____. "The Scholastic Self: Mental Health of Students." *Catholic School Journal* 40 (November 1940): 287-90.
- _____. "A Teacher Must Translate a Curriculum into Life Activity." *Catholic School Journal* 40 (November 1940): 300.
- _____. "Mass Education and the Capacity of the Individual." *Catholic School Journal* 41 (January 1941): 13.
- _____. "Catholicism and American Culture." *Catholic School Journal* 41 (November 1941): 295-8.

_____. "Lay Teachers and Religious Perfection." *Catholic School Journal* 14 (December 1941): 341.

_____. "Training the Student in Liturgy." *Catholic School Journal* 42 (January 1942): 16-8.

_____. "Training the Student in Liturgy." *Catholic School Journal* 42 (February 1942): 47-8.

_____. "Training the Student in Liturgy." *Catholic School Journal* 42 (March 1942): 86-8.

_____. "Teachers Should Work." *Catholic School Journal* 42 (March 1942) 72-3.

_____. "The Catholic Colleges and Universities--1941-1942." *Catholic School Journal* 42 (April 1942): 103-6.

_____. "Training the Student in Liturgy." *Catholic School Journal* 42 (April 1942): 124-5.

_____. "Training the Student in Liturgy." *Catholic School Journal* 42 (May 1942): 163-4.

_____. "Higher Degrees for Teachers." *Catholic School Journal* 42 (June 1942): 183.

_____. "Training the Student in Liturgy." *Catholic School Journal* 42 (June 1942): 191-3.

_____. "Thoughts at the Beginning of the School Year." *Catholic School Journal* 42 (September 1942): 203-4.

_____. "Education of Illiterates." *Catholic School Journal* 43 (January 1943): 13.

_____. "Education's Opportunities." *Catholic School Journal* 43 (January 1943): 12-13.

_____. "Our Children Must Know What Has Been Happening." *Catholic School Journal* 43 (September 1943): 194.

_____. "Coeducation in Catholic Education and in Russia." *Catholic School Journal* 44 (January 1944): 12.

_____. "Three Statements from *Osservatore Romano*." *Catholic School Journal* 44 (February 1944): 38.

_____. "Father William J. McGucken." *Catholic School Journal* 44 (June 1944): 173.

_____. "Idolatry and Education." *Catholic School Journal* 44 (September 1944): 189-91.

_____. "The Church and Secular Education." *Catholic School Journal* 44 (October 1944): 224.

_____. "Russia and Coeducation Again!" *Catholic School Journal* 44 (December 1944): 287.

_____. "What the Catholic Citizen Should Be." *Catholic School Journal* 54 (February 1945): 36.

_____. "Training Teachers." *Catholic School Journal* 45 (April 1945): 100.

_____. "The Success of Nazi Education." *Catholic School Journal* 45 (June 1945): 158.

_____. "What Education Will Make the Christian?" *Catholic School Journal* 45 (September 1945): 184.

_____. "Deferment of Theological Students." *Catholic School Journal* 46 (January 1946): 6.

_____. "Thoughts about Education for 1946." *Catholic School Journal* 46 (January 1946): 1-2.

_____. "Education: Science, Philosophy, and Theology." *Catholic School Journal* 46 (April 1946): 109-11.

_____. "Just How Good Are Our Schools?" *Catholic School Journal* 46 (April 1946): 120.

_____. "The Challenge of Christian Education." *Catholic School Journal* 47 (September 1947): 219-21.

_____. "Theology in Educational Theory." *Catholic School Journal* 46 (September 1946): 221-3.

_____. "Some Thoughts on the New School Year." *Catholic School Journal* 47 (September 1947): 232.

_____. "Religion in Public Education." *Catholic School Journal* 47 (October 1947): 272.

_____. "The Administration Looks to the Student." *Catholic School Journal* 47 (November 1947): 299-302.

_____. "Theology and Some Educational Implications." *Catholic School Journal* 47 (December 1947): 333-5.

_____. "Liberal Education and Other Worldliness." *Catholic School Journal* 48 (February 1948): 35.

_____. "Theology of Education in the Encyclical on Christian Education." *Catholic School Journal* 48 (February 1948): 73-8.

_____. "Theology of Education in the Encyclical on Christian Education." *National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin* 44 (February 1948): 6-26.

_____. "A Bad Start." *Catholic School Journal* 48 (March 1948): 96.

- _____. "Knowledge of God and about God." *Catholic School Journal* 51 (February 1951): 42.
- _____. "The Need for Catholic Studies in the History of Education." *Catholic School Journal* 51 (April 1951): 148-9.
- _____. "Is Progress Inevitable? No!" *Catholic School Journal* (April 1951): 149.
- _____. "Mind and Soul." *Catholic School Journal* 51 (June 1951): 190-3.
- _____. *Great Books: Panacea or What?* Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1952.
- _____. "Are Parochial Schools 'Divisive'?" *Catholic School Journal* 52 (January 1952): 18.
- _____. "Public Criticism of Schools." *Catholic School Journal* 52 (February 1952): 42.
- _____. "The Mission of a University." *Catholic School Journal* 52 (April 1952): 117.
- _____. "What Is Environment?" *Catholic School Journal* 52 (June 1952): 171-3.
- _____. "Spiritual Heroism." *Catholic School Journal* 52 (September 1952): 203-6.
- _____. "Criticism of Education." *Catholic School Journal* (November 1952): 289.
- _____. "Religion and the Study of Subjects." *Catholic School Journal* 52 (November 1952): 275-6.
- _____. *Philosophy of Education*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1953.
- _____. "The Instant Need of Things." *Catholic School Journal* 53 (March 1953): 76.
- _____. "Theology and the Theology of Education." *Catholic School Journal* 53 (March 1953): 98-100.
- _____. "Frank M. Bruce: 1885-1953." *Catholic School Journal* 53 (April 1953): 105-6.
- _____. "The Church and the Laity." *Catholic School Journal* 53 (June 1953): 182.
- _____. "Parents and Education: A Word to Parents." *Catholic School Journal* 53 (September 1953): 201-3.
- _____. "The University and Man's Search for Knowledge: Columbia Bicentennial Editorial." *Catholic School Journal* 53 (November 1953): 274-5.

_____. *The Catholic College in the World Today*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1954.

_____. "The Aim of Religious Instruction: Are We Really Teaching Religion? No. 1." *Catholic School Journal* 54 (February 1954): 46-7.

_____. "Issues of Human Life as the Foundation for a Philosophy of Education." *Catholic School Journal* 54 (April 1954): 109-13.

_____. "The Catechism: Are We Really Teaching Religion? No. 2." *Catholic School Journal* 54 (May 1954): 158.

_____. "Both Catholic and Catholic." *Catholic School Journal* 54 (June 1954): 196.

_____. "Teaching Apologetics: Are We Really Teaching Religion? No. 3." *Catholic School Journal* 54 (June 1954): 196.

_____. "'Life Adjustment' and Catholic Education." *Catholic School Journal* 54 (October 1954): 258.

_____. "Fourteen Year Educational Sequence." *Catholic School Journal* 54 (December 1954): 326.

_____. "Meeting the Educational Needs of American Youth." *Catholic School Journal* 54 (December 1954): 326.

_____. "God in the Discussion of Education (No. 2): The Bishops' 1954 Statement--No. 1." *Catholic School Journal* 55 (February 1955): 44.

_____. "Father Daniel A. Lord, S.J. (1888-1955)." *Catholic School Journal* 55 (March 1955): 94.

_____. "General Value of Educational Processes in the Religious Life." *Catholic School Journal* 55 (March 1955): 94.

_____. "Materialism Is the Enemy: The Bishops' 1954 Statement--No. 2." *Catholic School Journal* 55 (March 1955): 94-5.

_____. "The Student in Modern Education." *Catholic School Journal* 55 (April 1955): 122-3.

_____. "Road Blocks to Educational Improvement." *Catholic School Journal* 55 (June 1955): 192-3.

_____. "The Catholic College of the Future." *Catholic School Journal* 55 (October 1955): 255-8.

_____. "Is Criticism of Catholic Education Welcome?" *Catholic School Journal* 55 (December 1955): 340.

_____. "Teaching Religious Truths in Public Schools." *Catholic School Journal* 56 (March 1956): 88.

_____. "The University and the Professions (University Editorial No. 4)." *Catholic School Journal* 56 (June 1956): 182-3.

- _____. "What Is the Quality of Catholic Education?" *Catholic School Journal* 56 (June 1956): 182.
- _____. "The Making of Textbooks." *Catholic School Journal* 56 (November 1956): 279-80.
- _____. "Thomism--Not So Bad after All." *Catholic School Journal* 57 (January 1957): 10.
- _____. "The Great Books Once More." *Catholic School Journal* 57 (February 1957): 42.
- _____. "American Philosophy of Education: What Crimes Are Committed in Thy Name!" *Catholic School Journal* 57 (May 1957): 153-4.
- _____. "A North American Confers with Brazilian Educators." *Catholic School Journal* 57 (June 1957): 177-9.
- _____. "New Earthly Paradise." *Catholic School Journal* 57 (September 1957): 203-5.
- _____. "Honorary Degrees: Theory and Practice. Honorary Degrees Editorial No. 2." *Catholic School Journal* 57 (November 1957): 288.
- _____. "The Pastor and the School." *Catholic School Journal* 57 (December 1957): 57-9.
- _____. "The Right to Educate." *Catholic School Journal* 58 (March 1958): 29.
- _____. "Catholic Education in Colonial America." *Catholic School Journal* 58 (October 1958): 26-9.
- _____. "Federal Government and the Schools." *Catholic School Journal* 59 (March 1959): 67-9.
- _____. "John Baptist De La Salle: Great Educator." *Catholic School Journal* 59 (June 1959): 23-7.
- _____. "Reconstruction of Catholic Education: No. 1. Recent Proposals." *Catholic School Journal* 60 (September 1960): 40-1.
- _____. "Educating for American Citizenship." *Catholic School Journal* 60 (October 1960): 31-2.
- Fortman, Edmund J. *Lineage: A Biographical History of the Chicago Province*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1987.
- Gargan, Edward T. "The Loyola Leo XIII Symposium." *Mid-America N.S.* 42 (October 1960): 231-43.
- Gaudium et Spes* (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World). In *The Documents of Vatican II*. Edited by Walter M. Abbott, 183-316. New York: America Press, 1966.

- Gawrysiak, Kenneth John. "The Administration of Albert C. Fox, S.J.: A Portrait of Educational Leadership at Marquette University, 1922-1928." Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 1973.
- Gilson, Etienne. "The Eminence of Teaching." In *Truth and the Philosophy of Teaching*. McAuley Lectures 1953, 1-11. West Hartford, Conn.: St. Joseph College, 1957.
- Gleason, Philip. "American Catholic Higher Education: A Historical Perspective." In *The Shape of Catholic Higher Education*, ed. Robert Hassenger, 15-53. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- _____. "The Crisis of Americanization." In *Contemporary Catholicism in the United States*, ed. Philip Gleason. International Studies of the Committee on International Relations, University of Notre Dame, 3-32. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- Gmeiner, John. "Leo XIII and the Philosophy of St. Thomas." *Catholic World* 46 (December 1887): 367-76.
- Gravissimum Educationis* (Declaration on Christian Education). In *The Documents of Vatican II*. Edited by Walter M. Abbott, 634-55. New York: America Press, 1966.
- Gulley, Anthony D. *The Educational Philosophy of Saint Thomas Aquinas*. New York: Pageant Press, 1964.
- Guyon, Paul. *Déclaration Sur L'Éducation Chrétienne*. Paris: Casterman, 1966.
- Guzie, Tad W. "St. Thomas and Learning Theory: A Bibliographical Survey." *New Scholasticism* 34 (July 1960): 275-96.
- Halsey, William M. *The Survival of American Innocence: Catholicism in an Era of Disillusionment, 1920-1940*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980.
- Hamilton, Raphael N. *The Story of Marquette University*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1953.
- Harbison, E. Harris. "Liberal Education and Christian Education." In *The Christian Idea of Education*, vol. 1. Edited by Edmund Fuller, 60-78. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Harris, Maria. *Women and Teaching: Themes for a Spirituality of Pedagogy*. 1988 Madeleva Lecture in Spirituality. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.
- Hassel, David J. *City of Wisdom: A Christian Vision of the American University*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1983.
- [Hecker, I.T.] "Leo XIII." *Catholic World* 46 (December 1887): 291-8.
- Henle, John. "Regional Report for North America." In *The Catholic University in the Modern World*. 181-228. Proceedings of the International Federation of Catholic Universities, 8th General Assembly. Paris: Secrétariat Permanent de la F.I.U.C., 1969.

- Henle, J. "The Pluralism in North America and the Catholic University Today." In *The Catholic University: Instrument of Cultural Pluralism to the Service of Church and Society*. 60-80. Proceedings of the International Federation of Catholic Universities, 12th General Assembly. Paris: Permanent Secretariat, 1979.
- Hennesey, James. "Leo XIII's Thomistic Revival: A Political and Philosophical Event." *Journal of Religion*, Supplement (1978): 185-198.
- _____. *American Catholics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Herbert, Miranda C., and Barbara McNeil, eds. *Biography and Genealogy Master Index*. Vol. 1. Detroit: Gale Research Co., 1980.
- Hitchcock, James, and Daniel J. O'Brien. "Dialogue: How Has American Catholic Intellectual Life Changed over the Past Thirty Years?" *U.S. Catholic Historian* 4 (Spring 1985): 176-87.
- De Hovre, Franz. *Catholicism in Education*. Translated by Edward B. Jordan. New York: Benzinger Bros., 1934.
- _____. "A Catholic Educational Thinker: Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick." *Catholic School Journal* 49 (June 1949): 184-5.
- _____. "The 'Catholic Viewpoint of Education' in the Works of Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick." *Catholic School Journal* 54 (June 1954): 199-201.
- Hurley, Mark J. "The Declaration on Christian Education." *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 66 (December 1965): 224-27.
- _____. *De Educatione Christiana: The Declaration on Christian Education*. Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1966.
- In the Service of God*. Translated by Sister Mary Caritas. Edited by E. A. Fitzpatrick. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1938.
- Jacobsen, Jerome V. "The Jesuit Institute of Loyola University: Its Organization." *Mid-America* N.S. 7 (July 1936): 148-153
- Pope John XXIII. *Princeps Pastorum* (On Missions). In *The Papal Encyclicals*. Vol. 5, 1958-1981. Edited by Claudia Carlen, 43-58. Raleigh, N.C.: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981.
- _____. *Mater et Magistra* (On Christianity and Social Progress). In *The Papal Encyclicals*. Vol. 5, 1958-1981. Edited by Claudia Carlen, 59-90. Raleigh, N.C.: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981.
- Pope John Paul II. "To Catholic University Students." *L'Osservatore Romano* [English] 8 [569] (19 February 1979): 5.
- _____. "Address to Members of the Council of the International Federation of Catholic Universities and Rectors of the Catholic Universities of Europe about an Apostolate of Culture." *L'Osservatore Romano* [English] 10 [571] (6 March 1979): 5-6.

- _____. "Address to Students at the University of Leuven, Belgium." *L'Osservatore Romano* [English] 29 [894] (15 July 1985): 9-10.
- _____. "The Catholic School and Its Teachers." *Origins* 16 (11 December 1986): 477-9.
- Johnson, George. "Papal Pronouncement on Education Explained." *N[ational] C[atholic] W[elfare] C[onference] Review* 12 (March 1930): 7-9.
- _____. "The Need for a Catholic Philosophy of Education." In *Aspects of the New Scholastic Philosophy*, ed. Charles A. Hart, 292-303. New York: Benzinger Bros., 1932.
- Jordan, Edward B. "Catholic Education: Its Philosophy and Background." In *Essays on Catholic Education in the United States*, ed. Roy Joseph Deferrari, 3-24. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1942.
- Kane, William. *Some Principles of Education*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1938.
- Kolvenbach, Peter-Hans. *Assembly 1989: Jesuit Ministry in Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: Jesuit Conference, 1989.
- Krolikowski, Walter P. "The Protean Catholic University," *Thought* 48 (Winter 1973): 465-73.
- Le Beau, Dennis, ed. *Author Biographies Master Index*. Vol. 1. Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1978.
- Lamers, William A. *The Public Services of Edward A. Fitzpatrick: A Biography*. Milwaukee: By the author, 1937.
- _____. "Requiescat in Pace: Edward A. Fitzpatrick." *Catholic School Journal* 60 (October 1960): 22-4.
- Lawson, W. "Neo-Thomism." In *Education and the Philosophic Mind*, ed. A.V. Judges, 43-59. London: George G. Harrap, 1957.
- Pope Leo XIII. *Aeterni Patris* (On the Restoration of Christian Philosophy). In *Papal Encyclicals*. Vol. 2, 1878-1903. Edited by Claudia Carlen, 17-28. Raleigh, N.C.: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981.
- _____. *Rerum Novarum* (On Capital and Labor). In *Papal Encyclicals*. Vol. 2, 1878-1903. Edited by Claudia Carlen, 241-62. Raleigh, N.C.: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981.
- Lindworsky, Johannes. *The Training of the Will*. Translated by Arpad Steiner and Edward A. Fitzpatrick. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1929.
- Loyola University of Chicago Archives, *Convocations of Loyola University*.
- _____. *Papers of Samuel Knox Wilson*.
- De Lubac, Henri. *Catholicism*. Translated by Lacelot C. Sheppard. New York: Longman's, Green, 1950.

- Lucker, Raymond A. *The Aims of Religious Education in the Early Church and in the American Catechetical Movement*. Rome: Catholic Book Agency, 1966.
- Lumen Gentium* (Dogmatic Constitution of the Church in the Modern World). In *The Documents of Vatican II*. Edited by Walter M. Abbott, 9-106. New York: America Press, 1966.
- McCluskey, Neil G. "Introduction: This Is How It Happened." In *The Catholic University: A Modern Appraisal*, ed. Neil G. McCluskey, 1-35. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1970.
- McCool, Gerald A. *Catholic Theology in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Seabury Press, 1977.
- McGucken, William J. "The Renaissance of Religion Teaching in American Catholic Schools." In *Essays on Catholic Education in the United States*, ed. Roy Joseph Deferrari, 329-51. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1942.
- McVay, Leo L. Review of *St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum*. In *Catholic Historical Review* 20 (July 1934): 217.
- Maritain, Jacques. *Education at the Crossroads*. Terry Lectures 1943. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943.
- Marquette University Archives, *Graduate Faculty Minutes*.
- _____. *Fitzpatrick, Dr. Edward A., Dean of Graduate School, 1884-1960*.
- _____. *Fitzpatrick, Dr. Edward A., Dean of Graduate School, Letter of Resignation*.
- _____. *Publicity Publications, 1924-1934*.
- Mayer, Mary Helen, trans. *The Philosophy of Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Marquette Monographs on Education. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1929.
- Monroe, Paul. *A Textbook in the History of Education*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1918.
- Moody, Joseph N. "Leo XIII and the Social Crisis." In *Leo XIII and the Modern World*, ed. Edward T. Gargan, 65-88. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961.
- Mooney, Christopher F. *Boundaries Dimly Perceived: Law, Religion, Education, and the Common Good*. Notre Dame Studies in Law and Contemporary Issues, Vol. 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Mount Mary College Archives, *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Clippings*.
- _____. *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Commencement Addresses*.
- _____. *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Dr. Fitzpatrick's Contact with Public Education*.
- _____. *Faculty Minutes, Vol. 2, (1939-1949)*.
- _____. *Faculty Memoranda, Vol. 1, (1932-1944)*.
- _____. *Faculty Memoranda, Vol. 2, (1945-1947)*.

- _____. *Faculty Memoranda, Vol. 3, (1948-1950).*
- _____. *Faculty Memoranda, Vol. 4, (1951-1954).*
- _____. *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Obituary.*
- _____. *Edward A. Fitzpatrick.* Pamphlet announcing Fitzpatrick as president of Mount Mary College.
- _____. *Edward A. Fitzpatrick.* Pamphlet announcing Fitzpatrick's affiliation with the Brothers of Christian Schools.
- _____. *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Personal Correspondence.*
- _____. *Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Pictures.*
- _____. *Edward A. Fitzpatrick.* Record of articles published by Edward A. Fitzpatrick.
- Murray, John Courtney. "The Christian Idea of Education." In *The Christian Idea of Education*, vol. 1. Edited by Edmund Fuller, 152-63. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church.* In *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*. Vol. 4, 1975-1983. Edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 401-16. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, 1983.
- _____. *The Child: Citizen of Two Worlds.* In *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*. Vol. 2, 1941-1961. Edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 97-105. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, 1983.
- _____. *The Crisis of Christianity.* In *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*. Vol. 2, 1941-1961. Edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 28-35. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, 1983.
- _____. *God's Law: The Measure of Man's Conduct.* In *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*. Vol. 2, 1941-1961. Edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 138-45. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, 1983.
- _____. *Religion: Our Most Vital National Resource.* In *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*. Vol. 2, 1941-1961. Edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 148-67. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, 1983.
- _____. *Pastoral Letter of 1919.* In *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*. Vol. 1, 1792-1940. Edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 272-333. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, 1983.

_____. *Statement on Catholic Schools. In Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops. Vol. 3, 1962-1974.* Edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 110-5. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, 1983.

_____. *Statement on Man's Dignity. In Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops. Vol. 2, 1941-1961.* Edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 164-71. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, 1983.

_____. *Statement on Secularism. In Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops. Vol. 2, 1941-1961.* Edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 74-81. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, 1983.

_____. *Teach Them. In Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops. Vol. 4, 1975-1983.* Edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 148-56. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, 1983.

_____. *To Teach as Jesus Did. In Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops. Vol. 3, 1962-1974.* Edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 306-38. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, 1983.

National Cyclopedia of American Biography, 1967, S.v. Fitzpatrick, Edward Augustus.

National Union Catalogue, Pre 1956. Vol. 174.

Lists all books and pamphlets bearing Fitzpatrick's name.

Nozick, Robert. *The Examined Life: Philosophical Meditations.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1989.

O'Connell, Timothy E., ed. *Vatican II and Its Documents: An American Appraisal.* Theology and Life Series 15. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1986.

O'Daniel, V. F. "Leo XIII. and St. Thomas Aquinas." *Catholic Quarterly* 39 (April 1914): 255-73.

O'Donnell, Harold J. "The Lay Teacher in Catholic Education." In *Enlightening the Next Generation: Catholics and Their Schools 1830-1980*, ed. F. Michael Perko, 254-66. New York: Garland, 1988.

O'Neil, Una. "Memorization in Catechesis." *Living Light* 16 (Summer 1979): 209-16.

Ohles, John F., ed. *Biographical Dictionary of American Education, Vol. 1.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1978.

Ong, Walter. *Frontiers in American Catholicism: Essays on Ideology and Culture.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1957.

_____. *American Catholic Crossroads.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1959.

Pegis, A.C. "Higher Education and Irrationalism." *Thought* 14 (March 1939): 113-9.

- _____. "Catholic Education in American Society." In *Disputed Questions in Education*, 7-15. New York: Doubleday, 1954.
- _____. "Teaching and the Freedom to Learn." In *Truth and the Philosophy of Teaching*. McAuley Lecture 1953, 13-24. Westport, Conn.: St. Joseph College, 1957.
- Philibert, Paul J. "The Promise and Perils of Memorization." *Living Light* 17 (Winter 1980): 299-310.
- Pope Paul VI, "Continued Instruction of Adults Is Urgent." *L'Osservatore Romano* [English] 19 [163] (13 May 1971): 5-6.
- Pope Pius X. *Acerbo Nimis* (On Teaching Christian Doctrine). In *Papal Encyclicals*. Vol. 3, 1903-1939. Edited by Claudia Carlen, 29-38. Raleigh, N.C.: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981.
- Pope Pius XI. *Casti Connubii* (On Christian Marriage). In *Papal Encyclicals* Vol. 3, 1903-1939. Edited by Claudia Carlen, 391-414. Raleigh, N.C.: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981.
- _____. *Quadragesimo Anno* (On the Reconstruction of the Social Order). In *Papal Encyclicals*. Vol. 3, 1903-1939. Edited by Claudia Carlen, 415-44. Raleigh, N.C.: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981.
- _____. *Rappresentanti in Terra* (Christian Education of Youth). In *Papal Encyclicals*. Vol. 3, 1909-1939. Edited by Claudia Carlen, 353-72. Raleigh, N.C.: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981.
- Pope Pius XII. "Sanctus Ioannes Baptista De La Salle, C., Omnium Magistrorum Pueris Adulescentibusque Instituendis Patronus Caelestis Praecipuus Constituitur." *Acta Apostolica Sedis* 42 (29 September 1950): 631-2.
- _____. "Patron of Teachers." *Catholic Mind* 48 (August 1950): 511-2.
- _____. "Patron of Teachers." *Catholic School Journal* 50 (September 1950): 212.
- Pohlschneider, Johannes. "Declaration on Christian Education." In *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol 4, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler, trans. Ronald Walls, 1-48. New York: Herder & Herder, 1969.
- Politella, Joseph. *Religion in Education: An Annotated Bibliography*. Oneonta, N.Y.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1956.
- Power, Edward J. *A History of Catholic Higher Education in the United States*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1958.
- Preparatory Reports: Second Vatican Council*. Translated by Aram Berard. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.
- Redden, John D., and Francis A. Ryan. *A Catholic Philosophy of Education*. rev. ed. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1956.
- Regis, M. *Catholic Bookman's Guide*. New York: Hawthorne Books, 1962.

- Rives, Sharon Davis. "The Catechesis of Relativism." *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 60 (December 1989): 12-21.
- Roohan, James E. "American Catholics and the Social Question, 1865-1900." *Historical Records and Studies*. 43 (1955): 3-26.
- Daniel-Rops, H. *A Fight for God: 1870-1939*. Translated by John Warrington. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1966.
- Rynne, Xavier [pseud]. *The Third Session: The Debates and Decrees of Vatican Council II September 14 to November 21, 1964*. New York: Farrar Straus & Giroux, 1964.
- _____. *Vatican Council II*. New York: Farrar Straus & Giroux, 1968.
- Shanahan, Edmund T. "The Leadership of Leo XIII." *Catholic University Bulletin* 8 (July 1902): 263-75.
- Shannon, G. J. "Aquinas on the Teacher's Art." *Clergy Review New Series* 31 (June 1949): 375-85.
- Siry, Steven. *De Witt Clinton and the American Political Economy: Sectionalism, Politics, and Republican Ideology, 1787-1828*. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Slavin, Robert J. "The Essential Features of the Philosophy of Education of St. Thomas Aquinas." *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 13 (December 1937): 22-38.
- _____. "The Thomistic Concept of Education." In *Essays in Thomism*, ed. Robert E. Brennan, 311-31. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1972.
- Teresa, Mary. "Study the Declaration on Christian Education." *Catholic School Journal* 66 (June 1967): 44-5.
- Tracy, Robert E. *American Bishop at the Vatican Council*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.
- Unsigned. Review of *The Philosophy of Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas*. In *America* 41 (29 June 1929): 287.
- Unsigned. Review of *The Philosophy of Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas*, by Mary Helen Mayer. In *New Catholic World* 130 (October 1929): 126.
- Unsigned. Review of *St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum*. In *American Ecclesiastical Review* 90 (March 1934): 324-5.
- Unsigned. Review of *Exploring a Theology of Education*, by Edward A. Fitzpatrick. In *Thomist* 16 (January 1953): 148.
- Van Ackeren, Gerald F. *Sacra Doctrina*. Rome: Officium Libri Catholici, 1952.
- Wade, Frances C. "Saint Thomas Aquinas and Teaching." In *Some Philosophers on Education*, ed. Donald A. Gallagher, 71-85. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1956.
- Who's Who in America*. Vol. 32, 1962-1963. Chicago: A. N. Marquis, 1963.

Who Was Who in America. Vol. 4, 1961-1968. Chicago: Marquis-Who's Who, 1968.

Wuthnow, Robert. *The Restructuring of American Religion.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Yzermans, Vincent A., ed. *American Participation in the Second Vatican Council.* New York: Sheed & Ward, 1967.

VITA

Ronald Edmund Rutkowski was born in Chicago, Illinois. He received a Bachelor of Arts degree with concentration in theology from De Paul University and a Master of Arts degree in educational foundations from Marquette University. Prior to completing requirements for a doctoral degree, he taught in the Chicago Catholic school system, and he worked for a major financial institution in Chicago, Illinois. He resides in Arlington Heights, Illinois.

DISSERTATION APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Ronald Edmund Rutkowski has been read and approved by the following committee:

**Dr. Walter P. Krolikowski, S.J., Director
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University of Chicago**

**Dr. Gerald Gutek
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University of Chicago**

**Dr. F. Michael Perko, S.J.
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University of Chicago**

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signiature which appears below verifies tthe fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

28 Nov 90

Date

W P Krolikowski

Director's Signature