

## WHY NOT ARTS ?

We, the student engineers at St. Dunstan's, often have been asked why we chose engineering. Our first answer is that we believe that is our vocation. Then we are asked, what about a general education? Why not take Arts first, or at least, delay specialization? Then we answer, money. Then, more often than not, the questioner draws the conclusion that we are materialists, caring for nothing but "the root of all evil." Not so, we have reasons behind our concern over money; besides it isn't that bad anyway.

First, let us consider the financial problem. Most of the student engineers receive financial aid from their parents. This means that their parents, in many cases, must sacrifice to educate them. Then when another member of the family enters college the burden becomes almost insupportable. But in engineering a partly trained technician can earn a relatively high wage for his summer work.

Or, let us suppose the student borrows much of the money necessary for an Arts education. Then, the time element comes in strongest. Not only is the student later in obtaining his engineer's degree, but he has also lost time in which to pay his debts. This time lost is of tremendous value. In this modern world, time is the most valuable element.

Then again, just what would the engineer-to-be get in an arts education if he paid the price in time and money? He would not acquire very much direct knowledge, but rather, the ability to acquire such knowledge. He would learn how to read and how to think. But can't he learn to think and read without an arts education? I think so.

This method of acquiring a liberal and technical training at the same time is not very involved. It can consist in acquiring a taste for good literature and taking an additional year at college. The reading of good books is, I believe, the essence of a liberal education. At least it is what Prof. Hutchins of Chicago University, a leading American authority on education, believes. As for correct reasoning, the extra year, which would add a B. Sc., would contain some training in logic. There is the ground work, the student has only to continue throughout his life.

Now, what about the money? Engineering is a lucrative profession. Money, like almost everything else, is only as good or bad as the man who uses or perverts its use. Money can aid culture. A good arts education should instil an appreciation for good literature, music and painting or sculpture. Then certainly the man with money can improve himself through records, books and pictures.



Then too, there is the moral "angle". Certainly a man cannot give too much to his church and other worthy causes. Then, in that respect, is money evil? Or should not a man educate his children, if he is blessed with them? Or others who are too poor? Or aid his kin in times of necessity? I think you must agree that money indeed can be good. A man must do his duty financially as well as morally. Again time enters the picture, time is money and money can mean time. Money can mean time to study. Or it can mean time to guide the lives of ones children or to work for worthy organizations.

These are our reasons for taking the Pre-engineering course without an Arts course first. It is not avarice but necessity that forces us to leave out an Arts course.

J. M. REDDIN, '59.

---

### THE "CHANGES"

---

In St. Dunstan's, as in every University, hardly a day goes by without a group of students getting together in a room and hearing a "good old college bull session." Many and varied are the topics which are torn apart, venerated, put together and stamped underfoot at those bull sessions, and religion, being what it is, occupies a prime position among the list of topics. Needless to say, it is not torn apart or stamped underfoot; it is venerated. Another aspect of our religious arguments is that the fundamental doctrines of our faith are not argued about, but only those aspects, such as evolution, which lend themselves to argumentation.

Recently, following the announcement of the changes in the liturgy of Holy Week, the opinion was expressed that the church is affecting too many changes in its rubrics and liturgy in the past several years. "Changes follow changes", the argument went, "First there were the changes in regard to fasting before Communion, then the changes in the rubrics of the Divine Office and the Mass, and now the innovations with regard to the liturgy of Holy Week. What is the Church trying to do? Isn't She supposed to be the "unchanging church?"

To answer this argument, which, I am sure, we have all thought about, it is necessary to examine the essentials of our religion. A mere glance shows that they have not changed one iota. Only some of the externals of the Mass have changed, not the essential act; changes in regard to fasting before Communion do not change the essentials of that great Sacrament, rather it shows the