

*Edward Pace: Pioneer Catholic Philosopher, Psychologist and Religious Educator
(1861-1938)*

John L. Elias, Fordham University

Abstract

Arguing against the thesis of Thomas Woods, the author contends that Edward A. Pace (1861-1938), was truly an innovative and progressive educator in his recommendations for the teaching of religion in Catholic Schools. Through an examination of his writings, archives, the reactions to his work in the Catholic community and other historians it details the main features of his theory and methods for religious education. The author concludes that Pace deserves more recognition in the history of religious education for his truly pioneering work.

Thomas Woods (2004) in his recent book *American Catholic intellectuals during the progressive era, 1900-1920* argues that these intellectuals strongly resisted the chief tenets of progressivism while adopting only minor elements in the progressive agenda. They held out for absolute truths of Catholic faith against the pragmatism of the progressives. In philosophy, sociology, education, and economics they maintained the purity of Catholic truths against the relativism and pluralism of the progressive spirit. They did, however, make use of those aspects of pragmatism and progressive thought that served their purposes of defending the true faith.

Prominent among of so called Catholic progressives Woods names are Thomas Shields and Edward Pace, both educators at Catholic University. In his view, while these two men adapted some of the methods of the progressives in psychology and education in proposing changes in Catholic education they held out against the radical teachings of progressive educators that would be harmful to the teaching of the Catholic faith..

Woods thesis is a clearly expressed present day polemic. In holding up the Catholic progressives of the early part of the century he contrasts them rather unfavorably with the Catholic reformers at Vatican II who, he contends, largely abandoned the absolutes of faith and philosophy for a relativism and pluralism that has led to widespread losses to the church and the disarray of American Catholicism. The heroes in his book are Catholic intellectuals together with Popes Pius IX and Pius X who were stalwarts in defending the Catholic faith against dangerous teachings of modern culture such as liberalism, relativism, and pluralism.

While this is not the place to argue with Woods broader agenda, I would like to state a contrary thesis about the early 20th century Catholic progressives, at least in the case of the Catholic educator Edward Pace. He along with his colleague Thomas Shields began an American Catholic educational endeavor which eventually led to noteworthy changes in Catholic education and especially in Catholic religious education. Though there is little direct link between their work and the emergence of the catechetical movement in Roman Catholicism in the 1960's, they began the trend of taking secular developments in science, psychology and education so seriously that future scholars, beginning at Catholic University and later extending to other universities, introduced considerable changes in the theory and practice of Catholic education. It is no accident that the department of Religious Education at Catholic University under the leadership of Gerald Sloyan, Berard Marthaler, and Mary Charles Bryce and their many graduates, most especially Gabriel Moran and Michael Warren, were highly influential in the Catholic educational renaissance. It is Bryce's(1978) view that while European scholars in the 1950's on "gave the movement a vocabulary, new insights, a kind of cohesion and an element of fresh excitement they were able to do so because of the foundations laid (S-57)" by men like Pace, Shields and others.

One needs to recall the situation in Catholicism around the turn of the century to put in perspectives the world of Pace and other Catholic intellectuals. The notorious *Syllabus of Errors* of Pius IX condemned all elements of modern liberal and progressive thought. Furthermore, American Catholics were charged in the papal condemnation of Americanism with an exaggerated adaptation of the Catholic faith to American culture. Pius X's encyclical against modernism led to outstanding intellectuals leaving the church and the suppression of serious intellectual work by many Catholic scholars (Mc Cool 1989; Appleby 2004).

It should be noted that in the early years of Catholic University a number of its professors were perceived by some Catholics as dangerous liberals and even materialists. Pace was almost barred from speaking in Green Bay, Wisconsin by Bishop Sebastian Messmer, who wrote to him that he would allot him to speak "only on the clear understanding that you will not treat or bring up any matter or questions in connection with your subject, which might give rise to dispute and unpleasant objections. We cannot allow any opinion or theory on our platform of the C.C.S.S. [Columbia Catholic Summer School] which would not be in full harmony with the commonly accepted Catholic Science" (Messmer 1896). Pace was also one of the three professors at Catholic University whom the Apostolic Delegate Cardinal Satolli was said to have recommended dismissal for their progressive and liberal views (McAvoy 1957, 143).

The purpose of this paper is to examine the contribution made by Edward Pace to the development of Catholic education, especially as relates to the teaching of religion in schools. It is my contention that he was in many ways a progressive educator and helped to pave the way for the catechetical renewal of the 1960s. This work supplements my treatment of his colleague Thomas E. Shields (Elias 2004).

Biographical Sketch

Edward Pace was born in Starke, Florida in 1861. He studied for the priesthood at St. Charles College, Elliot City, Maryland and at the North American College in Rome. Ordained to the priesthood in 1885, he received a doctorate in theology in 1886. After serving as a pastor in Florida for two years he returned to Europe at the request of Cardinal Gibbons and the rector Bishop Keane to prepare for a teaching position at the newly established Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. He studied biology and psychology at the University of Louvain, the Sorbonne in Paris and at the University of Leipzig where in 1891 he received Doctor of Philosophy degree in experimental psychology, studying under the renowned psychologist Wilhelm Wundt. He was the first Catholic priest and third American to study under this pioneer German psychologist.

Pace became a professor of psychology at Catholic University in 1891 where he remained until his retirement in 1935. He was among the first American priests on the faculty, joining a distinguished group of European scholars (Neusse 1990, 92, 93). He was a professor of psychology from 1891 and professor of philosophy from 1893 until 1935. Pace taught courses in philosophy and established the first psychological laboratory at the University. He held many administrative positions at the University: dean of the School of Philosophy, director of studies, general secretary, and vice rector for 11 years. In his position as vice-rector Pace was deeply involved in the academic administration of the university. In his early days as dean of philosophy he argued for the expansion of the curriculum to include all branches of learning, pointing out that “the lack of instruction in Biology is a serious drawback to the investigation of fundamental problems in Philosophy, and without a department of History the efficiency both of the Divinity School and the School of Social Sciences is seriously impaired” (Pace 1896-1897, 32).

Pace’s first three years at the university were dedicated to teaching courses in psychology and establishing a laboratory for psychological experiments. While some of his early articles are reports on experimental work in the laboratory, most of his articles from this period were a defense of experimental psychology as a discipline in a Catholic university. Many religious persons viewed experimental psychology as necessarily committed to a philosophy of materialism which rejected spiritual realities. Pace argued, however, that religious believers could employ the methods of experimental psychology without committing themselves to an atheistic or agnostic philosophy. Through his membership in psychological associations and holding the position of editor of psychological journals and in developing the department of psychology Pace went a long way in establishing among Catholics throughout the world the legitimacy for the study of psychology. (Gillespie 2001, 32-36)

An active scholar in many fields Pace helped to establish several academic journals: the *Catholic University Bulletin*, the *Catholic Educational Review*, *New Scholasticism*, as well as *Studies in Psychology and Psychological Monographs*. He was president of the American Council of Education in 1924, where he was instrumental in establishing academic standards set for schools and colleges, including Catholic schools (Gleason 1995, 70, 72). Pace also worked with the Catholic Education Association, later the National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA), and the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC). Furthermore, serving served as the first president of the American Catholic Philosophical Association (ACPA), he addressed its first meeting to welcome “a new era in the Catholic life of our country” (In Gleason 1995, 136). He was elected a member of the American Psychological Association at its first meeting.

From the beginning of his academic career Pace had an active interest in education. He was a co-founder of Trinity College and deeply involved in the Catholic Sisters College at Catholic University. In many of his activities he worked with Thomas E. Shields, a professor of psychology and education at the same University. Shield’s biographer described the differences between the two men” “temperamentally, the two men were at opposite poles. Pace, though intelligent and thorough, was slow, ingrowing, plodding, as diffident in action, as hesitant in decision as Shields was rapid (Ward 1947, 111).” Pace was instrumental in bringing Shields to the University (Ward 1947, 120) and in helping him establish a Department of Education at the University. With Shields he wrote religion textbooks for children, Shields doing most of the work, according to Ward. Though their relationship became strained (Ward 1947, 136, 164, 165), they worked together in establishing the Sisters College at CUA since both thought that Catholic school teachers should be taught in a Catholic Normal school Ward 1947 186, 187).

Pace was a leader in the effort to provide for the education of teachers for Catholic schools. With Shields he lobbied the board of CUA for a department of education. Before this he was instrumental in establishing an institute for pedagogy in New York City, which began in 1902 but ended in 1904 when Pace was not able to find in New York adequate instructors for the institute. In 1907 the board of CUA gave approval for a department of education, which was headed by Shields until his death in 1921 (Nuesse 1989, 130).

Pace’s corpus of writings is in four areas: psychology, philosophy, theology and education. Trained in experimental psychology he published numerous articles scientific journals. His philosophical contributions won him the reputation as one of the leading Thomistic philosophers of his time. To an enduring contribution of Catholic thought, the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, he contributed entries in theology, philosophy, psychology and education.

This paper will focus on the educational writings of Edward Pace. In the view of a prominent scholar of his day Pace was “a consistent and authoritative spokesman for Catholic education. He has spoken and written on such diverse aspects of our educational problems as: Religion and Education, The Seminary and the Educational Problem, The Present State of Education, The Place of the University in National Life, American Ideals and Catholic Education (Ryan 1932, 5).”

This article will describe and evaluate Edward Pace’s contribution to religious education utilizing his many articles and talks found in such journals as the *Catholic Educational Review*, *The Catholic World*, and the *Catholic University Bulletin*. The main thrust of Pace’s educational work was to bring the findings of psychology to the field of religious education. Pace was also a strong advocate for the inclusion of religion in the public school curriculum, which he made clear in an address to the National Council of the National Education Association in 1903. In this address he observed that “the child comes very quickly to look on the school as the place in which everything is taught that is worth knowing. The absence of religious instruction has for one of its effects ignorance of certain important truths (In Ryan, 1932, 7).”

Defense of Science: Experimental Psychology

One of the chief tenets of progressivism and pragmatism was a commitment to the scientific and experimental method. The use of this method in the natural sciences carried over into psychology and the social sciences. Many religious persons were threatened by this new approach to gaining knowledge. Darwin’s theory of evolution brought forth a negative reaction by many theologians and church leaders who considered the findings of the theory in contradiction to long held religious truths about the creation of the world and especially of humans. At the turn of the 19th century the new sciences of psychology and sociology engendered widespread distrust because of their perceived commitment to materialist and determinist world views.

Experimental psychology was especially suspect at this time by the Catholic Church. A number of adherents to the new psychology, notably the former priest Franz Brentano, had left the church. Experimental psychology seemed to go counter to the accepted rational psychology of Thomas Aquinas. The new psychology seemed to deny the existence of a spiritual soul. The implied materialism and acceptance of evolution of the new psychology appeared to go against accepted teachings of the Catholic Church (Misiak and Staudt 1954; Ross, 1994).

One of Pace's first intellectual tasks on returning to Catholic University upon completing a doctorate in experimental science was to defend this new discipline from attacks by Catholic theologians and philosophers. In various articles he defended the new discipline, contending that there was no logical connection between experimental psychology and materialism even though some psychologists were in fact materialists. In his view experimental psychology is not committed to any system of philosophy but is neutral in its theoretical assumptions. Pace also justified the use of psychometrics to understand human behavior, contending that such phenomena as sensation and perception lend themselves to statistical examination.

Pace answered the main charge against the new psychology, that it entailed the denial of existence of a spiritual soul. Pace rejected this conclusion by asserting that the existence of the soul is a metaphysical and not an experimental or scientific issue. Pace, however, does stress the importance of introspection for gathering psychological data all the while maintaining that even this method of gaining knowledge does not lead directly to truths beyond the physical.

Pace recognized that in his time there was hostility between scientists and philosophers. As one trained in both disciplines he tried valiantly to combat the prejudices and to point out the value of each discipline for the other. It was his view that the data supplied by psychologists could be valuable for the philosopher and theologian. It provided findings that both philosophers and theologians could speculate about. Psychology according to Pace provides data for major philosophical problems:

There are sizable philosophical problems concerning man; what precisely is his nature, what are the reasons for his acting in such a manner, how culpable is he for a particular action, and so forth. The discoveries of experimental psychology offer not only an aid to the solution of these problems but also provide indispensable knowledge for a better philosophical understanding of man. The more we know about the operations of man, 'the better we are prepared to speculate about his nature. (In Braun 1969, 71)

Pace went so far as to say that "no one today can pretend to an apprenticeship—to say nothing of a mastery—in philosophy, who has neglected his scientific training" (Pace July 1898, 349).

Pace also insisted that philosophy has much to offer science by providing indispensable ideas and concepts, including the important principle of causality. For him the findings of psychology cannot be in opposition to those of philosophy and theology. In fact psychology can help support a better understanding of human nature, especially human freedom and personality. For Pace psychology supports the scholastic axiom that all knowledge begins in the senses. Pace (1894) included in his work this strong suggestion to his fellow Catholics:

Either get hold of this instrument and use it for proper purposes, or leave it to the materialists and after they have heaped up facts, established laws and forced their conclusions upon psychology, go about tardily to unravel, with clumsy fingers, this tangle of error (535).

Though Pace was not a modernist in the theological sense of the word, his scientific training led him to wonder why for religious people being “modern” was considered as synonymous with being “evil” (Pace 1895, 8). Negative attitudes towards science in the academic world were not restricted to religious institutions but permeated many liberal arts faculties who viewed themselves as preservers of ancient traditions which they felt that the new natural and social sciences threatened (Rudolph 1962, 411, 413)

Pace’s defense of the scientific method as a legitimate but limited method of attaining knowledge stressed the inductive methods of science in contrast to the deductive methods of the philosophies and theologies of his time. He made clear that the realm of ethical, moral and religious values lies beyond the reach of the scientific method. Science deals with what can be observed, measured and quantified and “leaves untouched those deeper problems which can be approached only by metaphysical reasoning” (Pace 1895, 148).

Pace made important contributions to the acceptance of psychology among Catholics but did not remain in the field of psychology. In 1894 he named professor and dean of the school of philosophy, which first included psychology until the latter was given its own department. Pace fostered the field of psychology through his doctoral students, mainly Thomas Verner Moore, who became head of the department and contributed a number of important books to the field. As an administrator he made sure that psychology remained an important part of the curriculum. However, his interest in psychology continued to the last decade of his life when he was editor of *Studies in Psychology and Psychiatry* and the *Psychological Monographs of the Catholic University* (Hart, 1932, 3).

Pace the Scholastic Philosopher

Pace started to teach philosophy in 1894 and continued to do so till his retirement. He published extensively in philosophy and was considered one of the leading figures in the neo-scholastic movement in the United States. He was considered by his colleagues as “having done more than any living exponent of Thomism to bring before the American university world the strong points of medieval Scholasticism” (Ryan 1932, 2). As a student in Rome he shone in a disputation in the presence of Leo XIII, who led the Thomistic revival. In 1925 he was elected the first president of the American Catholic Philosophical Association. Pace’s work has been characterized as the principal impetus to an open and progressive form of Neo-Scholasticism at the Catholic University... [which contended] that Thomism could meet modern problems only if it was in touch with the findings of natural science” (Gleason 1995, 110-111). In Gleason’s view he was both progressive and liberal, not a usual alignment among Catholic philosophers (111).

Pace was particularly concerned with the role of philosophy in the undergraduate curriculum. He directed that students were to study all branches of philosophy but should also take courses in the sciences. Philosophy for him meant dealing with “the principal problems of the day, such as: the idea of God, the meaning of life, the building of character, evolution, agnosticism and so on (Pace, no date, 1-12).

For Pace as for Catholic educators of his time philosophy was the main unifying discipline in undergraduate education since it dealt with the basic principles of reality that were studied through other disciplines, including the natural and psychological sciences. Philosophy provides the tools by which students are able to think critically about what they learn in other disciplines. In his view Scholastic philosophy could determine the truth or false assumptions found in other disciplines. It also could counter the agnosticism that might be engendered by the sciences. Scientist that he was, Pace insisted that science be taught properly, especially when it came to evolution, concerning which it could safeguard the distinctive nature of the human as well as human freedom and well as avoid the pitfalls of materialistic determinism. The final advantage of philosophy was its ability to aid students in understanding divine revelation and “obtain a deeper insight into the divine teaching (Pace September 1950, 590).”

Pace was also interested in *the teaching of philosophy* in the college curriculum. He judged philosophy to be an extremely important subject in the college curriculum since it provided students with the wisdom of the past and developed their ability to think and criticize. He gave the pros and cons of teaching the philosophy courses at the beginning or end of the students’ education and spreading it out. He pondered whether logic should come first or rather other subjects that logic might later be applied to. For him a major function of philosophy was to provide students with a perspective in which they “shall see the relations that bind in one whole the facts of science, of history, of economic and social life, along with the products of literature and art---and see them from the viewpoint of philosophic principle (Pace March 1913, 111).” As to be expected Pace gave attention to method, discussing the advantages and disadvantages of lecture, recitation, disputations, single textbook or series of readings. For him teachers of philosophy should have knowledge of history and the physical sciences as well as the science and art of education.

Pace and Religious Education

When it comes to educational writings there appears to be two Paces. There is the dogmatic Pace who wrote the article on education for *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, published in 1903 as well as in other articles. There is also the rather progressive or liberal Pace who wrote on education in 1915 for the ecumenical Christian publication, *The Constructive Quarterly*.

In the *Catholic Encyclopedia* article Pace gives an outline of the Catholic position at the end of what is a comprehensive statement on the history of education among the ancients and Christian education. First, intellectual education should be connected with moral and religious education. Attention to the intellectual without attention to morality and religious is dangerous for the individual and society. Second, religion should be an essential part of education, the center around which all subjects are taught. The failure to do this leads to an incomplete education in school and lessens the importance of religion in the mind of students. Third, sound moral instruction must be connected with religious education. Religion provides the best motives for good conduct, being not merely doctrinal instruction but also practical training of the will through religious practices. Fourth, such an integrated education strengthens the home and family and prepares students for civic duties. Thus the welfare of the state benefits in having members who respect its laws through the practice of virtue. Fifth, advances in educational method increase the need for such an education. The church welcomes advances in the sciences that make the work of the school more efficient. Sixth, Catholic parents are obligated to provide for the education of children either at home or in schools. They should do this through their example and through direct instruction. (Pace 1913)

Pace began to carve out his own distinctive approach to the teaching of religion at a meeting of the Catholic Educational Association in Milwaukee in 1907. In his summary of a number of talks given by members he stressed that attention should be given not just to the content of teaching or the personality of the teacher but also to the method by which teachers taught. Method for him meant the accommodation of teaching to the growing mind of the child. He urged the members of the association to devote more attention to method. At a meeting of the association the following year in Cincinnati he defended the religion series which he and Thomas Shields, his colleague at Catholic University, wrote by pointing out that the texts made use of the methods of Jesus and the Church in the liturgy. Some members of the association objected to the fact that the books did not stress memorization of answers from the catechism. (Ward 1947, 137, 143, 144)

In the first issue of the *Catholic Educational Review*, which he edited with Thomas Shields, Pace (1911) contributed an essay on the papacy and education in which he mentioned no particular pope nor quotes any papal document. He described the Church with papal leadership as a teaching and educational institution whose task is to teach a definite body of religious truth designed in order to achieve practical effects. It has also followed the best principles of applied psychology. The teaching of religion uses the same methods used in other subjects. For Pace education is a process of adjustment in which the mind adjusts itself to objective truth or reality. Religion is not merely a subjective attitude since the full life of faith demands works and the spirit of obedience to laws. The Catholic school aims at the training of the will no less than cultivating the intelligence. Pace rejects the idea that religion is merely a life and consists only in doing. While belief in a body of truths is essential, religion also needs the concreteness that the liturgy and ritual gives it. One sound psychological principle that the church appeals to is the imitation of Christ.

In the first volume of Catholic Educational Review Pace also contributed two articles on the educational value of the liturgy. It was his contention that “the Church has shown a profound insight into the needs of the human social and anticipated in her practice the formulation of some important psychological laws which are now generally accepted” (1911 March, 239). These principles include an appeal to the senses and imagination, adaptation to the developing mind, and the value of imitation. In these articles Pace anticipated some of the insights of later psychologists about children development from a concrete stage to a critical stage and to abstract stage as well as how the teaching of religion should be adjusted to these changes. He also recommended what has come to be called the spiral curriculum wherein in educating the child “at each stage of development a new presentation of the same truths should enable him to find that meaning ever richer and deeper. (1911 March, 243).”

In an article “The Seminary and the Educational Problem” Pace (September 1911) gave a rather full exposition of his views on education. He argued that seminaries should take account of modern education, which includes new theories, methods, and ideas. Vitality entails adjustment to new developments. Much can be learned from modern education about how to better education. Education for him is the “development of intellectual and volitional power or the training of the mind or the imparting and acquiring of culture (580).” Persons are educated who have acquired a certain amount of knowledge, the ability to think, the power to express thought through at least the essential means, such as the languages to pursue studies of a higher sort. Pace expresses some dissatisfaction with the current vocational educational movement but sees some value in the elective system in colleges/

Pace described modern education as a certain way of looking at things, perceiving their relations, connecting new ideas with old, stimulating and sustaining interest, translating thought into action and consolidating action into habit. It is the particular way of working or functioning which characterizes the mind’s development and makes other modes of thinking either difficult or impossible. It is not so much a content that has been acquired as a form into which all later acquisition is cast; not primarily a settled and definite store of information but rather a power to grasp and put to use such knowledge as later experience may offer. Though Pace is not totally convinced by this rather Deweyan approach to education, he advises educators to be aware that students in schools, including Catholic schools are being taught this way. Thus in teaching religion, educators should adapt to these modes of thought by shaping their message to the needs of students. He described Jesus’ teaching method as one of adaptation to the needs and modes of people. He believed that teaching religion demands using the same methods that are used in other subjects.

Pace also counseled that especially those priests being trained to be superintendents of schools should know all about modern education for the sake of the schools and in order to take part in public discussions. In what was originally a talk given to the seminary department of the Catholic Educational Association Pace advised that a course on education should be given in all seminaries.

In another address given to before the Catholic Educational Association Pace (November 1911) criticized the reformulation of religion as a general subject. He seems to be countering the liberal Protestant view of religion and the ideas of the prominent educator William T. Harris, whom he does not name. Pace contended that “education must be religious and religion must be educational (770).” In this article religion is clearly the Catholic Religion, the religion of revelation. Pace also opposed the view of natural morality in connecting morality to revelation. He stressed the relationship with God as the basis of religion. On method he argued that methods in religion should be the same as methods in other subjects, as some, including Catholics have suggested. He contended that if religion is understood in the general sense, then “he does not stand for that kind of religious education nor any alliance between the school and religion or between the Church and the school (776).” This is a position which he softened in a later article.

In another article, “The Seminary and Education”, Pace (1912) cautioned against materialistic evolution. He stressed the value of philosophical education. He saw some value in self-activity as a method but put rational psychology before experimental psychology. He assigned value to laws of mental development, adjustment, or adaptation as long as they are not interpreted in a materialistic or determinist sense. In this vein Pace criticized recent books in philosophy of education “in which the definition of education is drawn after a study of its various aspects, the biological, physiological and sociological aspects being presented before the psychological and the philosophical (74).” This is where he sees the dangers of materialistic evolution. For him the human mind is not simply a later development of the brute’s consciousness. In this article as in all his work he adheres to the traditional faculty psychology of rational psychology. Philosophy must decide on the value of the findings of experimental psychology. However, he gives few examples or illustrations.]

In his article in the Constructive Quarterly Pace made the case, which few Catholics of his time were doing, for the teaching of religion in the public schools. For Pace the construction of a better society entails extensive attention to the teaching of religion in the schools. Education is valuable for making Christian unity permanent and also for the transmission of the spiritual inheritance of Christianity. He takes it for granted that there will be courses in religion at colleges and universities. But he also calls for “a primer of religion” to be prepared “in strictly scientific form and adopted as the final enrichment of the curriculum. It would do no more harm, certainly, than Aesop or Homer (Pace 1915, 588).” Pace gives a psychology reason for including psychology in the curriculum arguing that for religion to exert any influence on conduct it must be correlated with other subjects, lifted up into the mental structure and properly assimilated.

Pace recognized that the religion to be taught in public schools must be more than knowing the things that are to be believed or holding fast the article of faith. His description of religion approximates what liberal Protestant religious educators were proposing in the pages of *Religious Education*:

Religion is a life, not merely an assent to set forms of belief; but it is a human life and it therefore involves man's entire being. It needs the guidance of the intellect and the effort of the will. It does not spend itself in feelings nor does it seek to strangle the emotions, but to purify them and make them allies of the reasoning powers. Its center is within the soul, but it radiates through word and work, through the outward forms of worship and the fulfillment of the duties that are owed to God, the fellowman, society and country. (1915, 590)

Given this description of religion Pace goes on to describe religious education as

The imparting of religious truth, but it is something more: it is a training of sense and feeling and will to such purpose that action in conformity with the Divine Law will result. Of necessity it is at once intellectual and moral, ideal and practical. Its truths are sacred and for them it demands reverence; but their sanctity permeates all other knowledge and their value is great in proportion as they quicken everyday thought and deed, the commonplaces of existence. (590-591)

Pace does not think that the weekly instruction in Sunday school is enough to provide the kind of religious education children need, though it is "an indispensable adjunct of the church and a necessary supplement to the instruction given in the everyday school" (591). Not all Catholic educators were as positive about the Sunday school movement. Perhaps it was his own public school education in Florida that influenced his thinking on this matter. Pace's problem with the Sunday school was its isolation from the rest of schooling. He was insistent that religion be taught in conjunction with or in correlation with other school subjects.

Pace identified method as the central question when it comes to the teaching of religion. Teachers of religion should have the same degree of preparation as teachers of other subjects. He decried the fact that improvements in methods of teaching had not sufficiently influenced the teaching of religion. He identified a vicious circle: "religion is kept away from general education; it is not taught by proper methods; it fails of its promise to form upright men and women; therefore, it is a superfluous sort of knowledge for which the school has neither time nor place" (593). The proper methods for teaching religion and other subjects come from a study of the mind and its development provided by psychology.

Like Thomas Shields, his colleague at Catholic University, Pace contended that the principles of method of modern education are essential those methods that Jesus employed and that are used in the liturgy of the churches. Jesus was a great teacher not only because of what he taught but also because of how he taught. He drew from the common experiences of his listeners. His use of parables manifests profound psychological and educational principles, for example "the law of association, which serves both to get the doctrine assimilated and to secure its recall whenever the scene of the parable and its homely items recur in later experiences" (596).

The value of method in education was a theme in his educational writings throughout his career. In an early article Pace (1910) connected method in education with the truths of psychology and philosophy. Taking issue with the philosophy of materialism, which Pace often does in his educational pieces, he stresses that education progresses by developing the mental capacities of the mind and soul. Teachers need to know about the mental life and its processes through which teachers can come to a grasp of the ends and means of education. Proper training enables a teacher to know not only that a method is good but why it is good. A principle of method that he recommended was apperception-connecting what is learned with what is already known, which to be accomplished through the process of self-activity. Pace was insistent that proper method entailed that education be adapted to each of the stages through which development passes, a knowledge of which is essential for the educator. Pace concludes this article by pointing out the importance of the teacher's philosophy of education:

The teacher is not called on to philosophize at every step, or to have a dictionary of philosophical terms constantly open on his desk. None the less, education is the working out in practice of some one's ideals, and therefore of some one's philosophy. It lies within the teacher to decide whether he shall serve as an instrument for the application of principles which, perhaps, he could not accept—or, by shifting the true from the false, become the master of his method and the owner of himself. (825)

Pace saw an illustration of the progressive principle of learning-by-doing in liturgical rituals where participants are influenced more by things as than words. Jesus and his followers stressed that doing the word was more important than preaching and teaching the word. The liturgy also appeals to the dramatic and imitative instinct which is a feature of children.

Pace also gave attention to moral education, recognizing the growing call for some sort of moral training in the schools, even one that saw religion as a necessary factor. Though he contended that moral training is best done on a religious basis, in contrast to many Catholic educators he accepted the value of a broad moral education not connected to religion. For him religion has a place not only in individual conduct but also in the life of society.

For Pace the mission of the school is “to shape the development of the individual with a view both to his personal growth in virtue and to the discharge of his social obligations....to retain what is of value in individualism and yet avoid its narrowness by emphasizing the social element’ (1915, 601). In words reminiscent of John Dewey Pace contended that the then current stress on social importance of the school was a hopeful symptom and a guide for constructive effort in society. He ended the essay on the optimistic note that

Education is returning to the deepest of all the questions that concern human life and destiny; and it only remains to be seen whether with our advance in knowledge and our psychological research we have gained a deeper insight into man's spiritual needs or a more thorough understanding of his social relations than was shown by Christ and the Church which He founded. (1915, 602)

Conclusion

We return to the Woods thesis, presented at the beginning of this paper, that Pace and his colleague were not true progressives in that they staunchly defended the truths of the Catholic faith and merely adopted some of the methods of the progressives in their proposals for educational practice in the teaching of religion.

It is true that Pace was no modernist who attempted to formulate a progressive or liberal approach to Catholicism. He was thus not a religious educator in the mode of the liberal Protestant educators Clayton Brower, Sophia Fahs and George Coe. He knew of the Religious Education movement and its association but did not participate in it. In his article on Education in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* he applauded their advocacy of moral education in the public schools. His colleague at Catholic University Thomas Shahan did address an early convention.

But what Pace advocated in stating the aims and methods of religious education was truly progressive and liberal. Negative reactions to his work and that of Shields is indicative of this as well as the judgment of historians like Mary Charles Bryce and Philip Gleason, cited in the paper.

What made him progressive were his emphasis of the fostering critical thinking and self activity, and his advocacy of methods that fostered questioning on the part of students. He was opposed to purely rote catechetical training. Teaching religion in his proposed manner would logically and practically foster a more questioning attitude towards religious doctrines and dogmas. While his opponents seemed to sense this, he himself does not appear to have done so. His commitment to the scientific method from his studies in experimental psychology and his attempt to reconcile scholasticism with modern science implied an approach to knowledge, learning, and education that questioned the rigidity of established dogmas. The time would come in the 1960s when Catholic religious educators, following the lead of theologians and philosophers, would develop a truly progressive and liberal form of religious education, which has been at the center of controversy for the past few decades. For conservative writers like Woods, Pace and Shields represent bulwarks against the secularization of Catholic education. For many religious educators they should be recognized as adventurous pioneers who laid the foundation for a more enlightened approach to Catholic religious education.

References

- Appleby, R. Scott. 2004. *Creative intellectualism: American Catholic intellectual tradition*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Press.
- Braun, William P. 1969. *Monsignor Edward A. Pace: Educator and Philosopher*. Doctoral Dissertation, the Catholic University of America.
- Bryce, Mary Charles (1973). Four decades of Catholic innovators. *Religious Education* 72, 5-S, S-36-S57,
- Gillespie, C. Kevin. 2001. *Psychology and American Catholicism: From confession to therapy?* New York: Crossroad Publishing Co.
- Gleason, Philip. 1995. *Contending with modernity. Catholic higher education in the twentieth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Misiak, H, and V. M. Staudt. 1954. *Catholics in psychology: Historical survey*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McAvoy, Thomas T. 1957. *The great crisis in American Catholic history, 1895-1900*. Chicago: Regnery.
- McCool, Gerald A. 1989; 1977. *Nineteenth century scholasticism: The search for a unitary principle*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Messmer, Sebastian. 1996. Edward A. Pace Papers, Messmer to Pace, Green Bay, Box 20, 1896.
- Neusse, C. Joseph. 1990. *The Catholic university of America: A centennial history*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Pace, E. A. No date. Report to the academic senate. Unpublished manuscript, Catholic University of America Archives, 1-12
- Pace, Edward. A. July 1894. Growth and spirit of modern psychology. *American Catholic Quarterly Review* 29.
- Pace, Edward A. January 1895. Relations of Experimental Psychology. *American Catholic Quarterly Review* 22, 523,
- Pace, Edward A. July 1895. Our theological seminaries. *The Catholic University Bulletin* 1, 8.
- Pace, Edward A. 1896-1897. Annual Report of the Rector.
- Pace, Edward A. July 1898. The college training of the clergy. *The Catholic University Bulletin* 4, 393ss.
- Pace, Edward A. 1910. Education, Development, and Soul. *The Catholic World* 91, 812-825.
- Pace, Edward A. January 1911. The papacy and education. *The Catholic Educational Review* 1, 1-9.
- Pace, Edward A. March 1911. Lessons from the liturgy. *The Catholic Educational Review* 1, 239-246.
- Pace, Edward A. September 1911. The seminary and the educational problem. *The Catholic Educational Review* 2, 576-592.
- Pace, Edward A. November 1911. Religion in education. *The Catholic Educational Review* 2, 769-776.
- Pace, Edward A. 1912. The seminary and education. *The Catholic Educational Review*, 3, 70-79.

- Pace, Edward A. 1913. Education. *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Second Edition.
<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05295b.htm>
- Pace, Edward A. May 1913. The teaching of philosophy in the college. *The Catholic Educational Review* 6, 110-119.
- Pace, E. A. September 1915. Education and the constructive aim. *The Constructive Quarterly* 3, 590.
- Ross, Bruce. 1994. Development of psychology at the Catholic university of America. *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 82, 3, 133-159.
- Rudolph, Frederick. 1962. *The American college and university*. New York: Knopf.
- Ryan, John H. 1932. Edward Aloysius Pace, Philosopher and educator. In Charles A. Hart. ed. 1932, *Aspects of the new scholastic philosophy*. By the associates and former pupils of Dr. Edward A. Pace. New York: Benzinger.
- Ward, Justine. 1947. *Thomas Edward Shields: Biologist, psychologist, educator*. New York: Scribner,
- Woods, Thomas E. Jr. 2004. *The church confronts modernity: Catholic intellectuals and the progressive era*. New York: Columbia University Press.