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ABSTRACT

“The ideals and principles that have characterized Jesuit education for over 450 years are central to Georgetown’s mission and character…Students are challenged to engage in the world and become men and women in the service of others, especially the most vulnerable and disadvantaged members of the community.” This definition of Georgetown’s identity on the university’s website depicts Georgetown students’ call to service as a result of the Jesuit tradition of the university. Through exploring the question, “How did Georgetown’s involvement in the education of low-income children in Washington, DC change between 1819, with the construction of free schools run by the Visitation monastery and the Holy Trinity Parish, and 1964, with the establishment of the Georgetown University Community Action Program?” this thesis examines how the Jesuit tradition contributed to the University’s involvement in service work in the local Washington community.

In this thesis I argue that the piece of Georgetown’s modern identity which encourages student engagement in the service of others finds its roots not primarily in the Jesuit tradition of the university but rather in student involvement in the social movements of the 1960s. Through studying archival correspondence, manuscripts, and proposals, reading written histories of Georgetown, Visitation and Holy Trinity, and analyzing local and school newspapers, it became clear that students were not largely involved in service work in the community until the 1960s.
Prior to this, service in the community was viewed by students as a primarily religious task for a small subset of students, which created widespread apathy towards getting involved. This apathy was furthered by the predominantly-white student body which was largely disconnected from realities of racial injustice and economic inequity in Washington. In the 1960s secular student programs launched in response to the national civil rights and war on poverty movements. The language around these programs shifted to viewing service as a responsibility as a member of the Georgetown community. The programs that were born in the 1960s focused a significant amount on the education of poor youth in DC, which are programs that align with the Jesuit tradition, allowing them to be viewed as motivated by this tradition, even if they were not.
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INTRODUCTION

The ideals and principles that have characterized Jesuit education for over 450 years are central to Georgetown’s mission and character. Drawing from this tradition, Georgetown fosters an environment where students can develop their unique gifts and insights through reflection, service and intellectual inquiry. Students are challenged to engage in the world and become men and women in the service of others, especially the most vulnerable and disadvantaged members of the community. These values are at the core of Georgetown’s identity, binding members of the community across diverse backgrounds, faiths, cultures and traditions.1

The statement above, taken from Georgetown University’s website under the heading “Identity and Mission,” is complemented with marketing materials on the walkways across campus and the framing of conversations and events hosted by the University. As evident in this statement, Georgetown identifies its Jesuit tradition, and through that, living as men and women in the service of the most vulnerable and disadvantaged members of the community, as core to its identity. Our written history suggests an institutional memory which believes that our continued desire to engage in service is a product of our unique Jesuit history. Georgetown University promotes its Jesuit heritage, and the values and responsibilities that come with it, as a key component of the university that distinguishes it from peer institutions.

Some of this identity can clearly be traced to our Jesuit roots. For example, Georgetown’s founder, John Carroll, wanted to create an institution open to students of all faiths and economic classes. In a writing the “Proposals for establishing an Academy at Georgetown, Patowmack-River, Maryland” in 1787 Carroll wrote, “the Seminary will be open to students of every religious profession - They who in this respect differ from the superintendents of the Academy,

will be at Liberty to frequent the places of worship and instruction appointed by their parent.”

and “it will be calculated for every Clafs [sic] of Citizens.”

Carroll wanted students of diverse backgrounds, so the piece of our Jesuit tradition related to “binding members of the community across diverse backgrounds, faiths, cultures and traditions” can be traced to the early practices of the institution. However, this raises the question of how much the other pieces of our identity, which we attribute to the Jesuit tradition, are actually a production of this heritage.

Looking through early manuscripts reveals that as the Jesuits were developing Georgetown in the early 1800s, only a few members of university leadership saw it as their Jesuit responsibility to help educate low-income children in the DC community. It was not until the national social movements of the 1960s which mobilized student action on campus that a responsibility to service began to be a part of the widespread consciousness of the Georgetown community. Prior to the 1960s, only a small portion of the campus community was involved in service work, and it was primarily in the name of a religious duty through the organization the Sodality of Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In the 1960s, Georgetown saw a massive expansion of service opportunities on campus, engaging students more from the perspective of their educational privilege in the midst of the War on Poverty and the Civil Rights Movement right outside the front gates. For the first time, a responsibility to serving others, by nature of being Georgetown students, permeated campus beyond small religious corners. While this work certainly fit into the Jesuit tradition, it was not the direct result of being a Jesuit institution. In this thesis I argue that the piece of Georgetown’s modern identity which

\[\text{\footnotesize \cite{John Carroll, "Proposals for Establishing an Academy, at Georgetown, Potomac River, Maryland," Georgetown University Archives.}}\]
encourages student engagement in the service of others finds its roots not primarily in the Jesuit tradition of the university but rather in student involvement in the social movements of the 1960s.

**Methodology**

My work started with the question: *How did Georgetown’s involvement in the education of low-income children in Washington, DC change between 1819, with the construction of a “Poor School” run by Visitation nuns and the Jesuits, and 1964, with the establishment of the Georgetown University Community Action Program?*

I chose two specific dates based on my understanding at the time of significant changes in this relationship - the birth of the Poor School and the launch of the Georgetown University Community Action Program. This relationship started in 1787 when John Carroll purchased the land that would eventually be used for both Georgetown University and Holy Trinity Church. The relationship with Visitation started in the 1790s, as John Carroll attempted to persuade nuns to start a school for young girls. Additionally, through talking with historians and archivists at Georgetown and Visitation, I came to realize the information available on the Poor School is very limited, and would be challenging to do an in-depth analysis alongside later developments in service which have much more information available. Because of this, I chose to focus my research on the Jesuits’ involvement in the development of Visitation and Holy Trinity as entire entities, considering without these developments, the poor schools would likely not have existed.

My research on Visitation was done by working with the historian at Visitation, Sr. Madanne Gell, using the written history of the school in Eleanor Sullivan’s book *Georgetown Visitation since 1799*, and the historian’s own written works on the school’s history, which

I found my secondary sources, whether interviews, dissertations, or written histories to be particularly useful in identifying different types of archival material. I have also been able to use them to identify different tensions in memory, and guide my research through these tensions. For example, the secondary sources from Georgetown seemed to be proud of the relationship with Visitation, whereas Visitation was much more hesitant to give the Jesuits much credit for its development. Through recognizing differences in memory in these secondary accounts, I have been able to identify which moments in these outreach efforts were prioritized by the institutions, and what these efforts looked like from both the university’s side and those supposedly benefitting from them. This has helped me to dissect what our early community work actually was, how this compares to accounts of later efforts, and then analyze the differences between the two. Through this I came to recognize much of the earlier individual Jesuit connections that I found through my research as independently driven rather than representative of the University’s intention as an institution.

I hoped that Georgetown’s financial records from 1819 and the years following would allow me to see how much funding went towards the development of the school for the poor children. There was some information but unfortunately very minimal available. Additionally, much of Visitation’s archives were destroyed by a fire in the late-twentieth century, so my archival research from there was much less than initially expected, particular regarding early financial documents. I was able to use legal documents of property acquisition, letters of
correspondence, and articles from local papers to develop an understanding of the University’s involvement in both of these schools.

The other date I chose was the establishment of the Georgetown University Community Action Program, GUCAP, in 1964. The Hoya articles from October 1964 revealed this program as a new effort by the students to invest Georgetown’s resources in community schools. I was able to draw significantly from the Hoya archives, meeting bulletins, school newspapers, marketing materials, university catalogs, and outside newspapers to understand why this program came into existence and if it truly represented a deeper level of engagement in the wider DC community.

Primarily through an analysis of the change in student language around service efforts, I came to realize that there was a shift on campus driven primarily by forces outside the Georgetown institution. I came to see the role of the ongoing conversations about racial injustice, the Civil Rights Movement, and economic inequality in DC were all more pronounced on campus as a result of the force of the events in Georgetown’s backyard. This made me reconsider my earlier approach of analyzing how the institution has evolved and how different changes within the institution contributed to this, to also analyzing how external forces led to institutional changes that may have been later remembered as solely institutionally motivated. I initially believed that by choosing a second date which preceded the explosion of external forces in Washington, I would be able to understand the relationship as an independent development within the university. However, my research has revealed that it is the very exposure to these

conversations around injustice that caused this increase in support across the university, so the changes within the university could not be separated from these external forces.

This shift might appear subtle, but it allowed me to significantly refocus my research targets from solely within the institution, to also identifying the other external factors that could have caused these developments. To understand the Washington climate at the time, I then added to my research information on how community needs and actions in DC were received on the Georgetown campus. This understanding has significantly altered my overall framework for interpreting my other sources on the changes on campus at this time.

I focused my analysis on one specific piece Georgetown’s identity, “Women and Men for Others” which is defined on the university’s website under values that “make Georgetown such an inviting and distinctive educational community.” The website defines this value by saying, “Georgetown students engage in local, national and international service projects as well as community-based learning courses.”

Georgetown articulates other Jesuit values that are core to our identity but my research focuses explicitly on this value and the history behind its development. The University attributes these values completely to its Jesuit tradition as it states on its website, “As a Jesuit institution, Georgetown is grounded in a 450-year-old educational tradition inspired by St. Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus. Today, as a consequence of this long tradition, we can identify a number of characteristics or values that inspirit our University,” and then goes on to define “Women and Men for Others” as one of those

specific values born from the Jesuit tradition. The actual phrasing of “Men and Women for Others” was born in 1973 by the then-Superior General of the Society of Jesus, Fr. Pedro Arrupe, in which he established this as the core mission of a Jesuit education at the Tenth International Congress of Jesuit Alumni of Europe. My research is focused on identifying where in Georgetown’s history this idea of service at the core of education was born and how this relates to our Jesuit heritage, which our written history claims as the force behind these values.

Another crucial piece of my methodology is the way in which I define institutional priority. I looked at how much administrative and student support existed behind different initiatives, but relied primarily on the student experience with these efforts since this value is defined around student involvement in service. I compared both the numbers of participation in different decades and programs and the campus dialogue around these efforts. I looked at which sectors of the student population were participating, and why they were motivated to participate. I compared this to Georgetown’s modern marketing of service as a value from the Jesuit tradition that is a good in and of itself.

Literature Review

The existing literature in my field of study is separated into specific histories on different institutions. While these histories reveal connections between the institutions, they do little to examine the cause and the effects of the relationships between the institutions.

---


Eleanor C. Sullivan’s *Georgetown Visitation Since 1799* discusses the development of the Visitation convent and preparatory school for girls. Through this history, Sullivan highlights the role of the Georgetown Jesuits in the development of an education center for young ladies in Washington.7 This text discusses the central role of the Neale family, who include presidents and faculty of Georgetown University, in setting up Catholic education in Washington.8 While it focuses mostly on Leonard Neale who played a large role in the beginning of Visitation, the text also briefly discusses Francis Neale, who was an administrator and professor at Georgetown and started the Holy Trinity Church and school. Similarly, Lawrence J. Kelly’s *History of the Holy Trinity Parish, 1795-1945* was insightful on the development of Holy Trinity Parish and School, and provided insights on the relationship between the University and Parish over time. Though my research is focused on the role of the Georgetown in youth education in DC, which both of them are focused on to some extent, I look more specifically at “the most vulnerable and disadvantaged members of the community.” Both texts also briefly discuss the free schools connected to each of the institutions, but low-income local families and service to more vulnerable members of the community are not a focus point in these histories. Additionally, they each focus on the development of one particular institution, Georgetown Visitation or Holy Trinity Parish, and as a result, they pay attention to other institutions only insofar as they contribute to the development of their main institution.

---


8 Sullivan, *Georgetown Visitation Since 1799*, 43.
Robert Emmett Curran’s *A History of Georgetown University, From Academy to University 1789-1889* and *The Quest for Excellence, 1889-1964*, detail the development of the university from 1789 to 1964, including appendices with records of student demographics, student enrollment, building construction dates, and university leadership. This text is very helpful in understanding the construction of Georgetown’s own identity, particularly regarding its responsibility as a university and role in the community, but little is discussed about the implications of this development on the greater Washington community. Specific outreach efforts are discussed as a side note in the development of the university, but my research will focus on the intentionality of this outreach.

Similarly, Joseph Durkin’s *Georgetown University: The Middle Years*, has been helpful for understanding the financial challenges faced by the university in the late-nineteenth century as a result of the university’s expansion goals, but my research will look into how these challenges interact with the Jesuits’ role in the development of schools in the area, a relationship that has not been thoroughly analyzed in the existing literature.

William W. Warner’s *At Peace with All Their Neighbors* details the development of Maryland Catholics alongside the construction of the new American capital. This piece provided a unique insight on understanding the early relationship between the Georgetown leadership and the broader DC community. It discusses Catholic efforts to care for the vulnerable and disadvantaged throughout the nineteenth century and the early interactions of different Catholic

---

institutions in Washington. My research analyzes Georgetown’s involvement with service, through both Catholic organizations or other means, and dissects how this relates to student service programs in the mid-twentieth century.

Cameron Logan’s “Beyond a Boundary: Washington’s Historic Districts and Their Racial Contents” details the forces that led to neighborhood renovations in DC in the 1970s and how this involved the issue of race in Washington. It discusses the role of class dynamics in the debates of preservation and memory, which was helpful to my understanding of the role Georgetown’s identity plays in how the university’s community efforts are remembered. Similarly, Robert D. Manning’s piece “Multicultural Washington, DC: the changing social and economic landscape of a post-industrial metropolis” uses Washington as a “case study on the historical-structuralist perspective on the social, political, and economic forces that underlie contemporary patterns of US metropolitan inequality.” Both of these pieces are a part of the literature on the history of DC that provides an understanding of the factors that contributed to inequality in DC communities throughout the late-nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This literature is helpful in understanding the factors that contributed to Georgetown’s disconnect with many of the local children in Washington.

I will begin my argument by giving an overview of the development of Georgetown University in the first chapter, “The Origin Story” so that the intersection of the development of the Jesuit work in the United States and the development of the institution is clear. I will rely


heavily on Emmett Curran’s scholarship, as he is the premier historian of Georgetown University and this chapter is intended to provide an overview of Georgetown’s history in the context of how Georgetown fits into the greater American Jesuit mission. This chapter will focus on how the Jesuit’s work was implemented in Washington in the late-eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and the challenges that the Jesuits faced in developing Georgetown. These challenges will provide context for some of the decisions that were made by university leadership that may have caused them to prioritize efforts other than service work for disadvantaged community members.

The second chapter will be a discussion of how the Jesuits at Georgetown were involved in the early development of Holy Trinity and Visitation and the level of institutional support for these schools. I will explain the initial Jesuit involvement in building these schools through the property purchasing, recruitment of staff and funding donations, but then explain how this involvement did not translate into institutional responsibility. The chapter will explore the specific histories of each of these projects and I will identify patterns of Jesuit engagement in both efforts. This is the chapter in which I lay out why our community-wide motivations for service are not rooted in our early history, the first clause of my claim. While Holy Trinity had much more accessible archives for my use, Visitation had limited resources, so I will rely heavily on Eleanor Sullivan’s scholarship, a historian of Georgetown Visitation.

The third chapter will focus on Georgetown’s student engagement in the community before the 1960s, in order to demonstrate the existence of student apathy. I will discuss the work of one specific service organization, Sodality of Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and show how any interest in service work was based on fulfilling a spiritual need, rather
than a larger sense of responsibility as “women and men for others.” I will discuss how this work was done mostly by an isolated section of the community and how there was little institutional motivation to prioritize social justice in the larger student body. This chapter will demonstrate that in addition to the early Jesuit work with poor children not being sustained, there was continued student apathy for much of the first 150 years. This sets up the idea that if it did not come from Jesuits, as chapter two illustrates, and if it did not exist for much of our history, there must have been other factors at work in the creation of the language that we see as part of our institutional identity today.

The fourth chapter will discuss the disconnect between the predominantly white student body and the realities of racial injustice and economic inequity in Washington until the 1960s. I will talk about Georgetown’s historically southern demographic and the lack of diversity in the student body until the 1960s. At this point in time, the student body still lacked diversity but experienced an increase in women and the first black students. Chapter 4 will also reveal the lack of awareness of how to translate an understanding of injustice into action in their own community. Finally, I will show how university leadership struggled to resolve the disconnect in these years, further supporting the premise in chapter two that any Jesuit-driven efforts that did exist were not sustained throughout the Georgetown community.

The fifth chapter will be focused on the explosion of secular student programs in the mid-1960s. I will discuss how the shift in campus demographics, the civil rights conversation throughout the country, and demonstrations in Washington forced issues around racial injustice and economic inequity onto the campus. I will focus on how student efforts to respond to these conversations transformed service from an isolated religious act to an essential piece of being a
member of the Georgetown community. Additionally, I will show how this student-driven push forced the university to provide administrative support behind these efforts. This chapter serves to demonstrate the second clause of my claim, that it was external forces that caused the dramatic shift on campus in conversation, action, and support for service work and finally led to the institutionalization of service for others.

I do not wish to undermine or minimize the Jesuit history of Georgetown University. My research is intended to clarify how a specific piece of our current identity connects to our past and the broader past of the Jesuit tradition. By having a clearer understanding of the roots of our modern identity, our work today will only become more authentic. While this reflection on our history might produce new considerations for how we remember our past, it allows us to give better recognition to all the forces that played a role in developing our modern understanding of who we are. If you are part of perpetuating an identity, you should be able to justify where that identity came from, which is why this work is so important to me.
Chapter I: Georgetown Origin Story

After John Carroll first purchased property in Georgetown in 1787, he wrote in the initial prospectus that he intended to use it to create an academy “for every Class of Citizens [where] Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, the easier Branches of the Mathematics, and the Grammar of our Native Tongue will be attended to, no less than the Learned Languages.” This suggests that from the very beginning Georgetown was intended as an institution that would provide education to a diverse student population, but Carroll faced many challenges in developing the institution, which put at risk not only its ability to be accessible to different classes of citizens but also the entire existence of the academy.

John Carroll was the son of a prosperous Irish planter-merchant in Southern Maryland who was inspired by the French Catholic intellectuals in the Low Countries to enter the novitiate of the Jesuits in the Netherlands. After the Society of Jesus was suppressed by Pope Clement XIV, Carroll came back to America in the spring of 1774 where he served congregations in the Potomac Valley. British rule had poorly served Catholics in America as they had suffered religious discrimination in the colonies. As a result, Carroll became caught up in the American Revolution, seeing it as an opportunity to improve prospects for Catholics. In September 1783 Carroll wrote to Charles Plowden, a Jesuit who had studied with Carroll at English College at Brugge, expressing his immense desire to start an academy, as revealed in the following quote:

---


13 Curran, From Academy to University, 8.
An immense field is opened to the zeal of apostolical [sic] men. Universal toleration throughout this immense country, and innumerable R.Cats going & ready to go into the new regions bordering on the Mississippi, perhaps the finest in the world, & impatiently clamorous for Clergymen to attend them. The object nearest my heart is to establish a college on this continent for the education of youth, which might at the same time be a Seminary for future Clergymen. But at present I have no prospect of success.¹⁴

Because so much of his life had been determined by persecution, Carroll felt very strongly about creating an institution that upheld the values of universal tolerance. These early comments from Carroll suggest that at its founding Georgetown was intended to be a pluralistic Catholic institution, open to students of different socioeconomic and faith backgrounds. In Carroll’s pursuit of this institution, he became frustrated with the clergymen in Maryland, stating they “gave little or no thought to the larger world or the next generation,” and as a result of this frustration, he became primarily focused on finding a way to educate the American youth.¹⁵

Carroll led the effort to preserve the property owned by the Jesuits during the Jesuit suppression and to create an administrative structure for all the ex-Jesuits in America.¹⁶ He wanted to create an academy or college that could train students for an ecclesiastical seminary, which would help the Society preserve its tradition, if ever reinstated.¹⁷ Carroll was appointed superior in November 1784, at which point he had lost faith in the potential for a school and had

¹⁴ Curran, *From Academy to University*, 9.

¹⁵ Curran, *From Academy to University*, 9.

¹⁶ Curran, *From Academy to University*, 9.

¹⁷ Curran, *From Academy to University*, 9.
decided to refocus on expanding Catholicism in America in other ways.\textsuperscript{18} He wrote that Catholics in America were “too inconsiderable in point of wealth to erect and support a college and we Clergymen are too few to supply a sufficient number of masters for the entire education of youth, if even such a college existed.”\textsuperscript{19} This quote also highlights that while Carroll’s early intention was for the academy to be open to “every Class of Citizens,” as a Catholic institution, it relied on funding from American Catholics, who lacked considerable wealth at the time. If the institution was to succeed, it needed to expand its marketing and fundraising efforts to non-Catholic families who could afford a substantial tuition. Additionally, Carroll was enjoying a new experience of religious tolerance in America, and did not want to put this at risk by opening a school that caused Catholics to retreat from the newly available public institutions, such as those in Pennsylvania and Maryland.\textsuperscript{20} He wrote “being admitted to a [sic] equal toleration, must we not concur in public measures and avoid separating ourselves from the community?”\textsuperscript{21} As a result of this sentiment, Carroll compromised his interest in developing his own Catholic institution and instead encouraged Catholic professors to apply for positions on the faculty in the new public colleges in Pennsylvania and Maryland.\textsuperscript{22} He thought priests could potentially have a

\textsuperscript{18} Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 10.

\textsuperscript{19} Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 10.

\textsuperscript{20} Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 11.

\textsuperscript{21} Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 11.

\textsuperscript{22} Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 12.
house near the colleges and act as housemasters for young men interested in the priesthood. In this way he would still be establishing an avenue for students to be trained for an ecclesiastical seminary without forcing Catholics to retreat to their own isolated section of society.

Carroll had a change of heart in 1785 in which he decided to again pursue a separate academy. While it is unclear exactly why he changed his mind, there is some suggestion that he felt an increase in anti-Catholic sentiment and feared a return to the discrimination that had characterized the Catholics’ early experience in the colonies. Charles H. Wharton, a former Jesuit priest who had converted to the Protestant Episcopal Church published an anti-Catholic pamphlet which Carroll ferociously responded to in a lengthy rebuttal in 1784. Additionally, the Catholic population was growing in the new American territories so Carroll was feeling a larger pressure to provide them with a quality education, particularly those considering the ecclesiastical state. He came to believe that his academy would be “our main street anchor” meaning the “rock bottom support of a ship in crisis” for the American church.

In November 1786, the Jesuit clergy voted on three major resolutions at a meeting at White Marsh, which led to the birth of Georgetown College. With convincing from Carroll that a comprehensive academy was necessary because “the sooner the youths are put under virtuous

23 Curran, From Academy to University, 12.

24 Curran, From Academy to University, 12.

25 Curran, From Academy to University, 13.

26 Curran, From Academy to University, 13.
and careful hands, the less danger there will be of corruption in their morals and principles” the clergy voted on the following:

that the appropriate religious authority in the United States be a bishop, chosen by themselves and dependent on the Holy See only in those matters ‘universally acknowledged as its undoubted prerogative’; that a special committee consider the expediency of incorporating their property in the State of Maryland; and that they erect a school ‘for the education of youth and the perpetuity of the body of Clergy in this country.’

Their intention was for the school to be for the general education of youth, with also a nursery of future clergymen. The school needed the leadership of the bishop and funding from the Maryland property.

The founder of the Society of Jesus, Ignatius of Loyola, had always intended for Jesuit educational institutions to be open to students of all social and economic classes, but this had hardly become a reality. It is important to note that Georgetown’s depiction of the Jesuit tradition does not include the long-held criticisms that, up until at least 1773, this tradition was seen as “elitist, paternalistic, backward-looking, religiously bigoted.” Ignatius had wanted Jesuit schools to be endowed so that tuition did not need to be charged, but this vision of funding mechanisms has to date not been realized. Jesuit schools have long been criticized as catering to the rich, in part because they are structured around a humanistic curriculum which has not

27 Curran, From Academy to University, 14. This applies to the entire paragraph in which this quote is placed.


29 O’Malley, "How the First Jesuits."
appealed to many working or middle class families who desire a practical, skill-based education.\textsuperscript{30} Similarly, financing Georgetown College proved to be a much more difficult task than expected. The Catholic elite in America “did not consider financing the prospective academy its own best investment toward a learned and disciplined leadership in the next generation.”\textsuperscript{31} European sources turned up dry as well, as Plowden wrote to Carroll in June 1787, “I fear that your petition, however interesting it will be, will not be much countenanced by the few Caths. in this country, who have the means to support it…”\textsuperscript{32} European Catholics were more likely to donate to the Liege Academy or schools and chapels near them, rather than in America.\textsuperscript{33}

Carroll was eventually able to secure some funding from the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda and some individual benefactors, but the new institution had to rely primarily on revenues derived from their Jesuit property in Maryland.\textsuperscript{34} John Carroll turned against both an American and a Jesuit tradition of placing a school in an urban setting when he acquired a plot of

\begin{itemize}
\item [\textsuperscript{30}] O’Malley, "How the First Jesuits."
\item [\textsuperscript{31}] Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 17.
\item [\textsuperscript{32}] Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 17.
\item [\textsuperscript{33}] Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 17.
\item [\textsuperscript{34}] Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 19.
\end{itemize}
land overlooking the Potomac River outside of the village of Georgetown.\textsuperscript{35} Educational leaders saw the city as a place which distracted students from the necessary learning, and the small, but busy, river port of Georgetown seemed like just the place for Carroll’s academy.\textsuperscript{36} He cited “Choice of Situation, Salubrity of Air, Convenience of Communication, and Cheapness of Living,” as the principal reasons for choosing Georgetown.\textsuperscript{37} Costs in Georgetown were cheap compared to Baltimore, the fastest growing urban center at the time, and its location on a hill, helped to signify to the world that this school would have a “life larger than its own.”\textsuperscript{38} Although today Georgetown is able to credit much of its role on the international field to its position near the federal capital, this seemed to have had little influence on Carroll when he made the decision.

As noted earlier, Carroll intended for Georgetown to be for “Students of Every Religious Profession” and “for every class of citizens.”\textsuperscript{39} It would provide a comprehensive curriculum in which students would learn both the classical and the practical, and students could enter the academy as young as eight years old. Many were concerned about combining a grammar school with a college, but Carroll continued on his mission. From the beginning, he wanted an elite

\textsuperscript{35} Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 20.

\textsuperscript{36} Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 21.

\textsuperscript{37} Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 23.

\textsuperscript{38} Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 23.

\textsuperscript{39} Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 26. This applies for the rest of this page.
institution, which is captured by his standards for a university president. He wanted someone “old enough to carry a considerable weight of authority and respect; experienced in the detail of government for such a place; capable of embracing in his mind a general and indeed universal plan of studies” and he did this to support the “reputation and permanency” of his plan.⁴⁰

From the beginning, Georgetown had students from beyond the Washington region, which was uncommon for the time. In its first decade, nearly one-fifth of the students came from outside the United States. Of those from the United States, four-fifths came from Maryland and Washington, and the rest were from Pennsylvania, Virginia, and New York. Eighty percent of the first generation of Georgetown students were Catholic, with a majority of English but significant minorities of French and Irish, at twenty-two percent and thirteen percent, respectively.⁴¹ In terms of religious diversity, Georgetown had nearly one-fifth non-Catholic students in its first ten years of operation.⁴²

The efforts to establish an economically diverse campus were challenged from the beginning, as the cost of a Georgetown education was then, as is still true now, expensive. The majority of students came from the rising middle class or the American Catholic gentry.⁴³ Tuition

---

⁴⁰ Curran, *From Academy to University*, 27.

⁴¹ Curran, *From Academy to University*, 35.

⁴² Curran, *From Academy to University*, 40.

⁴³ Curran, *From Academy to University*, 36.
and board were more than a laborer’s annual pay, and a fourth of an artisan’s.\textsuperscript{44} Students paid in brandy, oats, properties, flour, and even slaves, as they had no other means of affording the education.\textsuperscript{45} Although a Georgetown education had these barriers, the enrollment at Georgetown grew quickly, reaching 100 in 1796, which only a few other colleges had accomplished.\textsuperscript{46}

Because of Carroll’s desire to produce “the core of the enlightened and zealous American clergy,” priests often paid for individuals contemplating a career in ministry. In the first fifteen years of the academy, thirty-seven of the two hundred and seventy-seven students had their tuition paid for in some way by priests.\textsuperscript{47} However, in comparison to the growing institutions in New England, Georgetown was sending only a meager number of students into the ministry. Georgetown sent six percent of their students into the seminary or the novitiate, while New England schools sent roughly twenty-five percent of their students in these years.\textsuperscript{48}

In terms of Georgetown’s connection to educating students from Washington at the academy, most of the local students came from families of merchants or professional men, such as Benjamin Stoddert, Secretary of the Navy, Robert Peter, mayor of Georgetown, Robert Suter, Curran, From Academy to University, 36.
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owner of the Jolly Old Scotsman Tavern in Georgetown, and George Washington’s two
grandnephews. Efforts to connect to the local community did not focus on helping educate the
families struggling most in the Washington area, but rather on those who could afford to attend
the academy on their own. As mentioned in the introduction, today Georgetown’s website states
as part of its identity and mission, “The ideals and principles that have characterized Jesuit
education for over 450 years are central to Georgetown’s mission and character. Students are
challenged to engage in the world and become men and women in the service of others,
especially the most vulnerable and disadvantaged members of the community.” While this is a
stated goal of the university today, Georgetown’s early efforts to provide a wholesome education
were not largely focused around the disadvantaged members of the Washington community. This
suggests that the Jesuit principle of helping those struggling most was not always in place in
Georgetown’s work, at least not as far as its principle goal of education was concerned.

Georgetown continued to struggle financially in its early years. John Carroll decided to
expand facilities soon after instruction began in order to keep up with growing enrollment. The
plantations that were intended to pay for this construction did not end up covering the costs, and
wealthy Maryland Catholics offered little more than tuition, which forced the institution to cut
costs across the board, raise tuition and rent, and take a loan from a Baltimore bank.

49 Curran, *From Academy to University*, 40.
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These financial challenges continued throughout the end of the eighteenth century as Georgetown suffered from lavish spending from university leaders, particularly President William Louis DuBourg, as well as faculty expenditures and stagnant enrollment. President DuBourg resigned after much controversy over his leadership in December 1798, and the board named Leonard Neale president and his brother Francis Neale Vice-President. Their presidency was characterized by a focus on ecclesiastical seminary, tightening regulations and enforcement on students. The brothers were now competing with former President DeBourg who had opened a college at St. Mary’s. When St. Mary’s became open to all students in 1803, Georgetown saw a major decline in students from Baltimore, the West Indies, New York, Charleston, and the newly acquired Louisiana territory. In contrast to the earlier years, in the first four years of the nineteenth century Georgetown became a predominantly local school with eighty-three percent of the students coming from the District of Columbia and Maryland.

Georgetown continued to shrink in size as well, with only forty-five students in 1806. The Jesuit “intellectual migration” from Europe to American that began in 1806 helped to save the declining institution. In 1802, a group of ex-Jesuits petitioned John Carroll and Leonard Neale to solicit the Jesuit superior general in Russia on their behalf for permission to rejoin the
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Society.\textsuperscript{56} Carroll was hesitant at first, but after a second petition arrived in 1803 including some of his most promising seminarians, he and his coadjutor secured approval for American Jesuits to renew their vows and receive novices. The restored society helped build confidence in Carroll that those Jesuits could help with the struggling Georgetown College.\textsuperscript{57}

President Giovanni Antonio Grassi made adjustments such as constructing new dormitories and decreasing tuition and therefore significantly increased the portion of boarding students, helping to increase revenue.\textsuperscript{58} Unlike its earlier years, between 1805 and 1817 the school turned out more seminarians than the other two Maryland Catholic colleges combined, in some ways fulfilling Carroll’s initial purpose.\textsuperscript{59} In 1817 the College looked as if it was finally moving to a stable place, with rising enrollment, strong faculty, a federal charter, increasing reputation and financial stability. However, by the end of 1828, an alumnus wrote, “The college has not ten boarders, the ablest and best professors they have had among them have abandoned them year after year and they have no at this time a single member distinguished for literary or scientific attainments—there must be fault somewhere.”\textsuperscript{60} University leadership continued to
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receive pressure to close the institution during these tough years. The few Georgetown students that existed in the 1820s came from the local area, with nearly seventy-five percent of them coming from Washington and Maryland. A majority of the students came from the families of merchants and businessmen.

One positive development in Georgetown during this decade was the expansion of its land holdings. Francis Neale had continuously purchased properties in the area between 1798 and 1825 and in 1828 Francis Dzierozynski purchased seventy-six additional acres on the northern rim of the campus. These men held the property “solely as a trust for the society of Jesus” and intended to “administer it only with the approval of the superior general.”

The early years at Georgetown were largely characterized by financial struggles and marketing challenges, leading to potential closure many times. Likely a result of these challenges, Georgetown was not significantly engaged with the challenges of families in the District. The intended goal was to provide an educational opportunity for people of all backgrounds and to have a nursery for the seminary. The demographics of the student population reveal that the students that did come to Georgetown from the local area were the sons of politicians, merchants, or other professionals, and not those of the lower class families. Scholarship opportunities were available for those interested in the seminary, so the institution
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provided an opportunity for social and economic mobility for some young men, but not for a widespread population.

The service that Georgetown was providing at the time in the name of establishing a strong Catholic foothold in America was done while adapting to the culture in the surrounding area. The practice of adaption for Jesuits goes back to their founding in which Ignatius believed in “adapting to diversity, to accommodate the culture that the missionary address in order to make the Gospel - and the Spiritual Exercises - more accessible to the hearer.”\(^{64}\) Ignatius’s famous expression “Enter through the door of the other so as to make them leave through our door” exemplifies this idea.\(^{65}\) Adaptation to the local culture helped the Jesuits to pursue the goals of their mission when they had no political, cultural, or economic capital.\(^{66}\)

In Washington, the local culture meant an economy undergirded by slave labor. As a result, in Georgetown, the desire to develop a strong Catholic institution and the continual threat of closure from financial instability outweighed greater questions of institutional values at time. The strongest example of this is the decision of Mulledy, Ryder and McSherry, three Jesuits active in University leadership to abandon the Society’s plantations in Maryland. They were convinced that the costly upkeep of the plantation and the nearly four hundred slaves were
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hurting their ability to expand the College.\textsuperscript{67} They believed they needed to sell the land and the slaves in order to invest the money in banks and provide capital to further develop Georgetown.\textsuperscript{68} Most of the continental Jesuits and the older American Jesuits were completely appalled by this idea. For example, Father Dzierożynski argued that the land and the enslaved peoples on them were not an economic investment, but rather “children whose care and wellbeing has been given to us by God.”\textsuperscript{69} In response to such criticism of university leadership, Rome sent a Special Visitor to determine the state of the plantations, and whether or not “there was both a moral and financial necessity to sell off the planation along with their slaves” and “use their revenue for other things.”\textsuperscript{70} Even before the Special Visitor had completed his investigation, Rome had opted for the Jesuits not to take any actions with the plantations, suggesting that any such action would be “imprudent.”\textsuperscript{71} Despite such opposition to his financial plan, Mulledy continued to build. The financial challenges only worsened as the depressed economy of the 1830s led many families to default on tuition, and Andrew Jackson’s war against the Bank of the United States made it
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harder to find investors interested in real estate on the outskirts of Washington. Mulledy ignored the extent of the financial debts, as he continued to see the proposed sale of the plantations and the families living on them as a major hope for rescuing the College.

Many Jesuits protested the sale as it would break the bonds that existed between the Jesuits and the black families, but Superior General Roothaan approved a general sale of the slaves in December 1836. With the sale came significant controversy, causing Mulledy to escape to Europe. Additionally, the market value of the sale was significantly decreased by the Panic of 1837, so the sale did not even provide the financial relief that Mulledy had anticipated.

Georgetown’s role in the United States changed as the antebellum period brought hundreds of new colleges, and thirty-one new Catholic colleges and literary institutes. This caused a decline in enrollment at Georgetown, but allowed the Jesuits to develop a collegiate network of Catholic and Jesuit universities that they had long desired. In some locations, such as Washington, these colleges continued to provide a pluralistic Catholic education, while in
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others, the schools catered to only the rising Catholic middle class. The schools all shared the same basic curriculum, traditions, and even Jesuit faculty.\textsuperscript{77}

It is clear that throughout the first century of Georgetown’s existence, the Jesuits were focused on establishing a strong Catholic network in the United States, and as a result needed to develop a strong Catholic clergy. They wanted to create a space for Jesuit education, but language around social justice, or care for the poor was not at the heart of the mission of what Georgetown was setting itself up to do. Georgetown barely stayed open at times because of financial hardships, making it even harder to be an institution facilitating social mobility, except for students interested in the clergy who could receive scholarships. Early leadership was concerned with keeping the institution open for Catholic families and being a leader in this capacity, but there was little sense of responsibility for specifically helping the poor or most disadvantaged members in the local Washington community. In fact, the institution continued to enable the structures which kept the most vulnerable members of the Washington community, the slaves, in this disadvantaged position. Georgetown’s connection to helping the poor families of Washington were done through other schools in the area, which the following chapter will focus on.

\textsuperscript{77} Curran, \textit{From Academy to University}, 130.
Chapter II: Georgetown’s involvement in the Birth of Holy Trinity and Visitation

Although Georgetown College was largely concerned with the institution just surviving in its early years, Catholic efforts to educate poor children in the neighborhood were going on by other means. It was common among Jesuit missions in Europe to establish churches alongside schools.  

Similarly, the Jesuits who founded and led Georgetown College were instrumental in establishing the Trinity Church Parish, which developed a free school for boys, by the Georgetown campus. Additionally, one Jesuit, Leonard Neale, led the efforts alongside pious women to develop the Visitation monastery, which established the Georgetown Academy for Young Ladies, and which also provided a free education for poor children in the area. Through understanding how individuals from the Jesuit community were involved in other educational efforts, we can more clearly discern the extent to which this involvement was motivated by the goals of the institution or by the efforts of individuals alone. This will allow us to understand how much the value of women and men for others was prioritized in the early years of the institution.

While John Carroll was heavily involved in stabilizing Catholicism in America, his focus in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century was on education through the Georgetown Academy and later the development of a uniquely American Catholic Church, not on the development of parishes in the area.  

The property of Trinity Church, the first Catholic Church in the Washington area, was held by John Carroll in name but he had little direct involvement in the development of the Church. After the property was purchased in his name in 1787, there was
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insignificant movement in the development of the chapel until 1792, at which point he brought Francis Neale to Georgetown and there is documented evidence of construction.\textsuperscript{80}

Francis Neale, the son of a prominent Maryland family and brother to three priests, came to Georgetown to serve as pastor of the proposed chapel. He came to Georgetown at the same time as the first group of students arrived at the College, and so he was involved very early in the development of both the church and the College.\textsuperscript{81} William Warner writes, “the nominal pastor of Trinity was therefore immediately put to work for the college as well, since it was the sole source of his board, lodging and salary.”\textsuperscript{82} Francis Neale was made the treasurer of the College while simultaneously managing efforts to fundraise for the chapel at Trinity.\textsuperscript{83} Beyond teaching at the College, Francis Neale went on to serve as Vice-President for 10 years and President twice. He was a successful fundraiser for Trinity, leading to the complete construction of the chapel in just two years. In 1805 Francis purchased a property with a house across from the church with the intent of turning it into a school for $550. In 1818, the Holy Trinity school opened with no tuition charged, as Ignatius had imagined.\textsuperscript{84}

Francis Neale was not the only member of the college to serve double roles between the church and the parish. Father McElroy and other faculty members from the College taught in the
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parish school during the week and in Sunday school.\textsuperscript{85} The Parish also served as the location of graduation ceremonies and literary exercises for the College until 1832, and students attended the “more solemn functions in the church” such as the Holy Week ceremonies.\textsuperscript{86} This involvement of faculty from the College suggests that part of the connection between the parish and the College at the time was the result of faculty and administrators needing to serve in double roles. It reveals an interest on the part of the College in sustaining the parish, and eventually the school, in the name of American Catholicism and Catholic education.

The involvement of leadership from the College in the founding of Holy Trinity is further evidenced by the property deeds which started Trinity Church. The Holy Trinity Archives includes a set of correspondence from 1909 to 1911 regarding ownership over the Holy Trinity property. This set includes property deeds and a map produced in 1910. On this map, which details the purchase of the different property locations by the Jesuits, it is written:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Lots 76, 77, 78 were originally College property, now Church property, but still in name of College, holding it for the pastor of Trinity Church
  \item Lot 72 was purchased by Francis Neale on June 15, 1796
  \item Lot 73, 74, 75 was purchased by Francis Neale on March 28, 1810
\end{itemize}
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December 10, 1877. Stonestreet, Clarke K Curley, successors of Fr. Neale deeded these lots 72, 73, 74, 75 to Georgetown College. 76, 77, 78 was in name of College (Deed) for pastor of Trinity church (agreement). 87

Additionally, in Archbishop Ambrose Marechals's diary from 1818 there is a map of the lots that Francis Neale was involved in acquiring. On these the Archbishop notes, “bt. again by Mr F Neale with his own money with the positive intention that he should serve the church.” 88 This suggests that while Father Neale was brought to Washington as a result of John Carroll’s request, he was very much personally invested in the opening of Trinity Church. Additionally, at the time that these properties were purchased, Father Neale was not yet a member of the Society, so he was able to own private property, again suggesting his individual interest and attention to this institution, rather than that of the Society at large. 89 Father Neale’s personal contributions to the development of the parish forces the question of whether the College’s relationship with low-income students was an institutional priority or the work of a few interested, prominent parties.
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The school on this property, served 100 boys, both Protestant and Catholic when it opened in 1818. Had this free school been a core mission of the College, one might expect generous payments from the College to help support its mission of free education. The Free Male School account records from 1831 to 1833 indicate, however, that the college was not a significant monetary supplier for the free school. The records show that in the account record from July 29, 1832, “the gentlemen of the College” provided $35, their associated parents paid $42.50, and various associated citizens paid $45, which sums to $122.5. In comparison, the Georgetown Corporation, pastors of the church, parents and various associated citizens with Trinity paid $300 towards the operational costs that year. A separate set of accounts records for the Free Male School from 1831 to 1833 show the gentlemen of the College contributing $50 towards the operational costs, and Francis Neale personally contributed $10. The records do not show significant monetary support from the College, but they do reveal the investment of the individual leaders, specifically Francis Neale, shared by the College and the Church. This lack of significant financial support could be due to the College’s own financial hardship at the time, but regardless of the reason it is clear that the College was helping Trinity with the Poor School, but it was not central to the education of the students. Georgetown administration and faculty
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demonstrated an interest in keeping the parish and the school open, but there is not a clear connection between the work of Georgetown and the maintenance of the Poor School.

As Holy Trinity Church attempted to provide a free education for boys in the area, up the street the Visitation monastery was working on providing a Catholic education for girls. Before the College ever opened, John Carroll contemplated bringing religious women to America for the education of female youth.93 However, it was not until Francis’ brother, Bishop Leonard Neale came to Georgetown in 1798, and became president of the College that this became a reality.

When John Carroll returned to the United States from his consecration in England, he was happy to have nuns in the United States, but he was frustrated that the first nuns to arrive in the United States, the Maryland Carmelites, would not be teachers.94 He recognized that just as Maryland Catholics needed an established education system for their sons, they also needed a place for their daughters. However, the Maryland Carmelites believed that their role was to “pray for the American missions, for the church, and for the clergy, and they elected to remain in seclusion on the farm provided them near Port Tobacco.”95 In response, Bishop Carroll wrote to Plowden:

They have multiplied themselves considerably and give much edification by their retirement and total seclusion from the world, and I doubt not the effectiveness of their prayers in drawing down blessings on us all, but they will not concern themselves in the
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business of female education, though the late Pope, soon after their arrival, recommended it earnestly to them…

Carroll’s deep desire to find a way to provide education for young girls is evident, but the Carmelites refusal to abandon their charism left Carroll with the need to find another group of religious women.

Following the Maryland Carmelites, the next religious women to arrive in the United States where the French Poor Clares. Mother Marie de la Marche, Sister Celeste le Blond de la Rochefoucault and Sister Luc had been expelled from their convent at the beginning of the Reign of Terror in 1792. Initially bound for Charleston, South Carolina, they ended up sailing to Baltimore were they were welcomed by Carroll in 1793. The nuns did not speak English, and as a result were unable to start schools in Baltimore, so they headed to New Orleans where they could use their French to teach. They lived for two years in New Orleans with the Ursulines and then decided to return to France as the Reign of Terror had ended. On the journey home, their ship stopped in Havana, where a Sulpician priest, Father Badad, strongly advised they return to Baltimore. After arriving in Baltimore, they headed south to Georgetown because the president of Georgetown at the time, William Dubourg, was also French. They settled near the college, rented a house, and in 1798 opened the Georgetown Academy for Young Ladies.
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In 1798 Father Leonard Neale also came to Georgetown. After he became president of the College, he sent for a devout young woman, Alice Lalor, who he had known from his time in Philadelphia. She was joined by two widows, Maria Sharpe and Maria McDermott, and Neale arranged for them to live with the Poor Clares.\(^99\) In 1800, Neale purchased a house for them next to the one owned by the Poor Clares, as he felt that “the austere life of the Poor Clares, with their coarse, gray-brown woolen robes, their feet shod only with sandals, winter and summer, and their meatless diet was inappropriate for the needs of the church in this new country.”\(^100\) Neale purchased the building with Maria McDermott’s dowry.\(^101\) Although as the president of Georgetown Neale helped to establish the Georgetown Academy for Young Ladies, which might suggest the institution was a priority for the College, few other members of the College community besides Neale were involved in the development or maintenance of the monastery, and Georgetown money was not invested in the project.

After they were settled, the pious ladies continued to use the Poor Clares chapel and Sullivan writes, “it appears likely, then, that the Poor Clares and the pious ladies cooperated in running the school.”\(^102\) After Mother de la Marche passed away in 1804, the other Poor Clares decided to return to France. Neale purchased the property that the Poor Clares had bought and
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the other properties connecting to the house he had purchased for the pious ladies, revealing Leonard Neale’s continued desire to keep the institution intact.103

Leonard Neale then developed a modified version of the rule of St. Ignatius for the ladies; they lived in community, had fixed hours and times for meditation, prayer, services, and other religious activities.104 In fact, Leonard Neale’s vision is what directed the early days of Visitation. One of his biographers writes:

Their numbers had increased, their usefulness had become...generally acknowledged and appreciated, but they had no rules of government, further than what emanated from his pious direction and what were of an unstable character...The bishop determined to introduce the institutions of the Visitation, founded by St. Francis de Sales, as best suited to the spirit of the age and the peculiar duties proposed for their secular occupation...It consistent mainly of the education of young females, and their proper instruction in religion and virtue.105

While St. Francis de Sales had initially envisioned a religious order in which the sisters spent part of their time working among the sick and the poor of the community, what was approved for the Order of the Visitation was a “community with solemn vows in strict enclosure.”106 However, the sisters conducted boarding schools in nearly all of their foundations. Sullivan writes, “So,
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obviously, membership in the Order of the Visitation would not preclude involvement in the very necessary and desired work of educating female youth here in America.”

After his second term as president of Georgetown College, Leonard Neale formalized the status of the pious ladies as the Sisters of the Visitation and turned over all of the property in a deed dated 13 September 1808 which states:

…and whereas the said Neale has established on the premises a community of ladies whom he stiles [sic] Sister of the Visitation of the Virgin Mary, devoted by voluntary engagements to perpetuate a regular education of the youth of their sex, particularly those of the poorer classes…particularly with a view of securing the aforesaid community a suitable and sufficiently extensive plan to carry into effect the aforesaid system and plan of education and also for the consideration of one dollar to him in hand paid had granted, bargained and sold… and confirm unto Alice Lalor, Maria McDermott, and Mary Neale (being members of the aforesaid community)…

The pious ladies became responsible for the further development of the school. As other women slowly joined the group, they regarded themselves as members of the Order of the Visitation and Bishop Neale agreed, but they had no approval from the order or any higher church authority because of complications in communication and the closing of Visitation Monasteries across Europe from the Reign of Terror. After challenges or opposition from the ladies to joining different orders, they finally took simple vows in 1814. When Leonard Neale became Archbishop of Baltimore following John Carroll’s death in 1815 he immediately worked to get
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the Pope to approve them as a monastery of the Order of the Visitation and made it possible for
the ladies to take their solemn vows. Archbishop Neale’s role in the establishment of Visitation is
further evidenced in his letter to Annecy in March 1817 in which he writes:

It pleased the Divine Providence to inspire some pious women who were under my
direction, to unite and consecrate their abilities and time to the education of young
females. Their views were purely religious…directed to form a permanent Religious
establishment, whence the inestimable advantages of a correct education might be
derived from the female youth not only of the present day, but also to those of future
generations as they might succeed in the progressive lapse of time.\textsuperscript{110}

Neale goes on to explain that the suggestion for this school had come from God, and his request
was received with warmth from the Visitation sisters.\textsuperscript{111} Neale received a warm, generous and
prompt response to his letter, and the Georgetown group was welcomed to the community of
Visitation sisters.\textsuperscript{112}

Leonard Neale was president of the Georgetown College between 1798 and 1806, during
which Visitation was developing, which might normally suggest that his actions are
representative of institutional priorities. However, his efforts to help develop Visitation were
driven by personal interest. Sr. Mada-anne Gell, the Visitation historian noted that Leonard
Neale’s actions were not reflective of the entire Georgetown community or the Jesuit community.
He was “the one Jesuit” who helped Alice Lalor in establishing the monastery and there was
barely any relationship with the other Jesuits.\textsuperscript{113}
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In 1819, Father Cloriviere was sent by Archbishop Maréchal, Neale’s successor, to take over the Visitation convent. He was dedicated to building and expanding the campus, which included a new academy building and a chapel. Laity’s Directory, a small booklet wrote in 1822, “although the property and humility of these good ladies have not permitted them to erect very fine buildings for themselves, their establishment is now conspicuous by the erection of an elegant chapel, with a tower and steeple, built in style, which, together with a clock and a chime of bells, adds considerably to the improvement of the town.”

Through this construction, Visitation became a more established component of the Georgetown neighborhood. Additionally, Cloriviere’s contributions to Visitation went beyond expanding and improving the physical presence of the monastery. Sullivan notes that he was able to significantly improve the methods of teaching, and even taught French at the academy himself.

However, the financial challenges faced by the College in the early nineteenth century were experienced by Visitation as well. While Cloriviere spent both his personal money as well as the sisters’ funds, the combination of expansive building and the increasing number of sisters made the financial situation at Visitation precarious. Visitation was able to survive this financial panic with a significant increase in boarders from 16 in 1820 to 80 in 1826, as well as the help of a wealthy New Yorker who paid tuition for his two daughters several years in advance.
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On top of Visitation’s own struggles, through the mid-nineteenth century Washington faced significant unemployment, poverty and high rates of mortality. Laborers brought in to work on the government buildings came in large numbers with low wages. Wages were inconsistent as projects would be suspended when Congress went home without any funds to carry them on in their absence. The Sisters of Visitation identified the problems of poverty, pauperism, orphans, criminals and the insane, and saw that Washington was ill-quipped to handle them. In response, they maintained a school for orphans and local poor families. This free school, called the “Benevolent School” was built by Father Cloriviere. The Georgetown Directory of 1822 writes, “They have a day school for the poorer class, where upwards of a hundred girls receive instruction, those only who are able, making a very moderate return, and all without distinction of fortune or religion, experiencing the same tender care which distinguishes these pious sisters of St. Francis de Sales.” Similarly, the Georgetown Directory of 1830 writes, “A benevolent school is attended by the Sisters where they educate gratuitously three or four hundred females annually, clothe sixty or seventy and afford of subsistence to thirty or forty
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daily.” Both of these accounts reveal the impressive size of the student body and the concern for holistic care for the wellbeing of the children. The Visitation website suggests that they were also open to teaching slaves in their free school.

The school was eventually moved to the parochial school built by Holy Trinity parish. Beyond this information, little is known about the Sisters’ work with poor children in Washington. These efforts by Visitation again demonstrate a concern for the helping to educate the poor in Washington, but from the information that is accessible, the Jesuits had little direct involvement in carrying out and maintaining these efforts. While a few prominent members of university leadership were involved in establishing the Holy Trinity Parish and Visitation Monastery, there was little, if any, student, faculty or administrative involvement in the poor children’s education. The relationship with Visitation and the establishment of the Holy Trinity Parish were part of the Jesuit mission of expanding Catholic educational opportunities in America, rather than cultivating a Georgetown student population focused on serving the poor.

Catholic outreach to the poor in Georgetown went beyond the efforts by Visitation and Holy Trinity. Catholics were heavily responsible for the care of orphans in Washington in the
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nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{125} The Catholics of Georgetown were an organization concerned with “the indignant condition of a large number of Catholic children” in Washington who were going to be deprived of the “inestimable blessing of religious education.”\textsuperscript{126} According to a pamphlet of the constitution and bylaws of the “Young Catholic Friend’s Society of Georgetown, District of Columbia,” the organization partnered with St. Joseph’s, which was the girls free school, in 1872 to provide the poor Catholic children of Washington a “sound Catholic education.”\textsuperscript{127} Georgetown College was tangentially involved in the efforts as the president of Georgetown College and the pastor of Holy Trinity church were to serve as ex-officio officers and members of the Board of Managers of the organization. This again reveals some level of commitment from university leadership to this education, but again not a widespread involvement of students or faculty. Additionally, this is focused on spreading Catholic educational opportunities rather than cultivating a student body to serve the disadvantaged, as the current mission statement describes.

There were few public schools in the city prior to the Civil War but the population continued to increase in the new capital. Washington became a cross-section of “the rich, the poor, the well-educated, the pan-handlers, the bums, the established self-assured families of
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Maryland and Virginia and representatives from new states on the frontier.”¹²⁸ Sullivan claims that at the time Washington provided a unique environment absent from the fierce antagonism that was present in other cities across the country. She claims that “there was little social exclusiveness or religious bigotry” and cites Visitation as an example of a place in which girls from all religious backgrounds could attend. Supporting this vision of Washington, the *Washington Star* published an article in October 1859 that read, “Nowhere else in this country is equal intellectual and social society within the reach of any and all respectable persons as here, if anywhere else in the world…Here, the lock is off and the door stands wide open for any to enter who may be so intelligent, entertaining, and well-behaved to prove an agreeable acquaintance.”¹²⁹ Visitation hoped to reflect this opportunity by being a melting pot for girls of different backgrounds and providing them an educational opportunity that was rarely offered anywhere else for girls at the time. Jesuits remained connected with the school through presiding at daily religious services for both the Sisters and the students. This is evident in one manuscript, “An Account of the Reestablishment of the Society of Jesus in the US” which details the daily life of Leonard Neale. The author John McElroy writes:

The Pastor, Francis Neale occupied the room opposite the elapsed door, and his brother, the Bishop, lived in the room which was contained the whole college library. The bishop slept in a press-bed which was unfolded every night and enclosed in its case every morning. He arose daily at four o clock, made his meditation very regularly, then went to


the Ladies’ Academy to say mass. He observed indeed a very strict poverty and austere manner of living.  

Holy Trinity also attempted to protect children from the negative consequences of the economic inequity in the city by providing a free school. The Jesuits stayed involved at Holy Trinity also through religious services and teaching. At the Trinity School, Kelly explains, “Brother, and afterwards Father, McElyor and some of the scholastics from the college assisted in the teaching on week days and in the Sunday school.” In the case of both Visitation and Holy Trinity, individual Jesuits showed responsibility to the children of Washington beyond their roles at Georgetown College. Evidently, a few Georgetown leaders were involved in the effort to start and maintain these institutions in the early years, but it seems that the university leadership had little long-term involvement in the actual curriculum or efforts of the schools to reach out to poor children in Washington. There seemed to be no move to involve the student body in these efforts in any meaningful way.
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Chapter III: The Catholic Apathy

“Georgetown educates men and women to be reflective lifelong learners, to be responsible and active participants in civic life and to live generously in service to others.”\(^{132}\)

This statement, a section of Georgetown University’s mission statement, reveals how service to others is part of the discussed institutional identity of the University. It is written on banners covering the walkways around campus, it is heard in the dialogue of classrooms and it is seen in the work of the Center for Social Justice today. However, this responsibility to action was not always a central priority in the Georgetown education or a widespread sentiment among students. Emmett Curran writes, “extra-curricular societies, which had come to be such a vital part of education early in the nineteenth century, began to really flourish in the years just before the Civil War, although at Georgetown they did not, as elsewhere, represent the cutting edge of curricular development or an alternative educational opportunity but rather a complement to the formal educational ideals of Jesuits as teachers.”\(^{133}\)

In the years between the early founding of the university and the mid-twentieth century, Georgetown experienced significant growth, adding the School of Medicine in 1851 and the Law School in 1870.\(^{134}\) With an increasing focus on history and the natural sciences, the curriculum was geared towards attracting wealthy Catholics, as evidenced by a 1913 letter from a Jesuit to

---
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Rome which stated, “I am fully convinced that we cannot hope to get to Georgetown the sons of
the wealthy Catholics if we insist on Greek.”

Georgetown continued to struggle financially, with little funding towards the endowment and continued budget deficits in the early years of the twentieth century. It was not until 1907 that the university sought advisement and assistance in fundraising from alumni, which was late compared to their “elite private counterparts.”

Discussions of service on campus came primarily in the form of support for United States war efforts for both World War I. Referring to the end of the 1920s, Curran writes, “As the decade neared its end, Georgetown, while able point to many positive developments over the past eleven years, still seemed in need of some stimulus to move it forward along the several fronts that comprised its educational mission.”

Through Nevils presidency, the university moved closer towards its educational mission. Extracurricular activities expanded in the 1920s, with 23 student clubs on campus by 1929. The clubs ranged from debate societies to newspapers and pre-career organizations, with a focus on activities for students to do together on campus. Curran notes:

Nevils had left marks both transient and permanent on the life of the university. In a world in which image was becoming more and more of a determinant of one’s status, Nevils
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skillfully promoted the university’s image, largely through the elaborate ceremonies he staged. His unprecedented extramural outreach to the various segments of Washington gave the university on an unprecedented scale a presence in the larger society, even if it did not long survive his departure.  

While Nevils certainly reoriented the university to look outward, outreach to the communities of Washington at this time meant to the political, diplomatic, ecclesiastical and intellectual communities of Washington, rather than the local poor families or schools, as the university claims to do today. Additionally, Nevils joined the Knights of Columbus and suggested a retracing of the origins of the university to the beginnings of the Maryland colony in 1634, asserting Georgetown as the oldest institution of higher learning in the United States. Curran attributes these actions to Nevils attempting to position Georgetown at the very root of the American Catholic experience. Curran writes, it was “an audacious effort to privilege the institution historically in a rather blatant appeal to status-minded Catholics.” While these efforts show a notable shift in University leadership, in both a return to Catholic appeal and an outward looking focus for the University, they do not show an outward looking effort to the underprivileged communities in Washington, or an effort to teach students “to be women and
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men in the service of others, especially the most vulnerable and disadvantaged members of the community” as the website history states.\textsuperscript{143}

The 1959-1960 Undergraduate Catalogue of the Arts and Sciences noted “social consciousness” as one of the specific ideas Georgetown sought to cultivate in its students, particularly, “the value of service to the community as an expression of Christian democratic ideals.”\textsuperscript{144} Despite the presence of this language, there was still a notion on campus and amongst other institutions of higher learning that the student population at Georgetown was rather apathetic towards service.

There was one Catholic student organization, the Sodality of Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, that had been involved in service since at least 1810. Curran writes that Sodality “was the most important collegiate organization for developing the character and spiritual life of the Christian scholar in a Jesuit school.”\textsuperscript{145} A record book of the program noted that there were fourteen students admitted to the program in 1810, six students in 1811, ten students in 1812, nine students in 1813, and ten students in 1815.\textsuperscript{146} Considering around 256 students total attended Georgetown between 1812 and 1817, this shows that student participation
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in the work was consistent but not particularly widespread.\textsuperscript{147} Curran notes that Sodality was popular in the 1830s due to the significant support from university leadership. By the 1850s, “the Jesuits were becoming concerned about both the declining numbers and diminishing prestige of the Sodality.”\textsuperscript{148}

After the Civil War, Sodality saw an increase in student participants, which Curran attributes to the poverty and defeat experienced by the school’s largely Southern population.\textsuperscript{149} Sodality became the most popular organization on campus, which had previously been held by the debate societies. However, Sodality was restricted to only Catholics, and only 57 percent of Georgetown was Catholic. So while nearly half of the Catholics in the school participated, this reveals that the work of Sodality was not intended to be a core component of the Georgetown education.\textsuperscript{150} With many students unable to even access this spiritual and character development, it certainly cannot be seen as an institutional priority even in its most popular years.

While Sodality continued to be present on campus into the 1960’s, it also maintained its position as an organization for a limited segment of the student body, seeking internal spiritual development. The Maryland Province Sodality Report of 1962 reports that Georgetown Sodality
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has the lowest mortality rate among modalists, meaning those that have begun then cease to continue, with ten to twenty percent, compared to fifty percent at institutions such as Wheeling and Loyola. The same report showed that fifty percent of the program’s participants at Georgetown were drawn from the upper half of the class, with “not many” personal problems and “rarely” athletic leaders participating. In response to the question “What means of restoring a Christian social order are most within the actual capabilities of your sodalists?” Georgetown reported, “concentration on intellectual apostolate.” These survey results show that the students involved in this kind of service from Georgetown were from a specific demographic on campus and saw their role in service work as primarily an intellectual one. In Fall of 1962, Pierce S. Corden, prefect to Rev. Edward Bunn, wrote in the Report of the College Resident Sodality that “the past semester has been the most active in recent years,” with the group of candidates now at sixty. Considering the student population in the 1960s was at least 7000, Sodality remained a small sector of campus into this time period. The students who were involved appear to be very dedicated compared to students at our peer institutions, but this does not appear to be an organization that had a central presence throughout campus.

The spiritual development facilitated by Sodality’s work was sometimes sought through doing service work, but continual service for the poor was not the core purpose of the organization. When the service was done, it was not for the good of the service itself, but rather
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to help improve a Christian’s relationship with God. In the *Bulletin of the Undergraduate Sodalities* from March 1963, the piece advertises the work of the organization in a posting that reads:

> Most any talent that God has given you can be put to good use in the work- and the field is so vast that whatever time you can give will be gratefully received. Once a week? Twice a month? Once a month? Whatever it may be, God will certainly reward you and we do urge every one of our sodalities to give it some consideration.154

This posting shows that the notion of service work on campus was to serve God and be rewarded by God. Serving others was not seen as a mission and a responsibility in and of itself. It is a contrast from our current understanding of being women and men living a life in the service of others, which puts service to others at the core of Georgetown’s purpose and as a good in and of itself.

Despite the presence of this organization on campus since nearly the founding of the University, it is very clear from the references above that there was not widespread student engagement with the work of this group. This may have been because the group was focused primarily on religious duty rather than service, and because the activities of the group were much more limited to particular excursions into the community rather than having a consistent presence in the wider Washington community. The type of experiences is evidenced by the description of Sodality’s Thanksgiving drive in the October 1960 Sodality Bulletin which stated:

> Remember the two-fold aim of the Solidarity: we increase our own spiritual lives each day and whenever the opportunity arises we endeavor to activate ourselves in some apostolic work. True, circumstances limit our work in the external line here at school, but this is one opportunity in which everyone can share… On
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Thanksgiving Day as you go to sit down with your dinner and offer a prayer of gratitude to God for the gifts He has sent you, you will feel ever so much better for the work you did here for our drive for the Little Sitters and their great work.\cite{155}

By stating “whenever the opportunity arises” it is clear that while the group did dedicate time to service work, the work was not a consistent activity for the organization. Sodality was primarily concerned with activities such as clothing drives, Thanksgiving drives, raising money for individuals with cerebral palsy, and blood drives.\cite{156} This quote also shows that external service was not central to the organization but rather it was seen as a mechanism for internal personal and spiritual development.

Sodality’s recruitment techniques provide further evidence of the inward development that the group was focused on. A Sodality Bulletin talking about the need for expansion and greater recruitment from September 27, 1960, states, “An organization thrives on the new blood it acquires - each and every one of you should be circulating and advertising the Sodality. Show them the great personal advantages to be reaped from membership in our organization…Personal contact - that’s important.”\cite{157} Again, the focus is on how the organization can help one’s own faith and development. It is not advertising itself as a way of connecting with others and is certainly not suggesting a responsibility to look outwards.
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As the racial and socioeconomic tensions rose across the country and throughout Washington in the 1960s, the ongoing service work at Georgetown proved to be disconnected from many of the needs of the Washington community. On October 11, 1962 the president of the College Democrats, Joseph A. Fallon, wrote that Georgetown students need to “speak out… against the immorality of segregation and for the protection of minority rights.”158 Fallon expresses frustration that the Hoya editorial board had previously taken an inappropriate position in opposing the involvement of federal troops in integrating the University of Mississippi. According to Fallon, the editorial board expressed no concern with the moral issue of the black student trying to go to College and having his constitutional rights taken away in the name of state’s rights.159 There was no specific call to action in Fallon’s piece but his article shows that as racial tensions were rising nationwide there was a growing desire on campus to be involved in working with communities outside of Georgetown, yet no direct means of engagement.

This frustration was followed in November 1962 when Nandor Fournier wrote a piece in the Hoya titled, “The Problem with Georgetown.” He described his growing frustration with the apathy of Georgetown’s students, on which he blamed the structure of the university. He wrote, “The unctuous intonations of ‘Gentlemen of Georgetown’ and ‘great traditions of Catholic education’ lost their meaning very rapidly and gave way instead to the observations that follow a
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reflection on our divorce in academic life from all that is remotely real.” He blames the structure of academics at Georgetown for suppressing student curiosity and disagreement from what is taught, thereby leading them to be completely inactive members of the community. Claiming that the problem is getting worse, he writes, “perhaps after grabbing his diploma the student can still play a useful role in the community,” revealing how a Georgetown education was separate from being an active citizen in the community. In a fatalistic tone pushing for a call to change, Fournier states:

We cannot play a dynamic role in the modern world because we have rejected that world-have occupied ourselves with the empty disputations of an imaginary realm instead of the infinitely more serious problems of our personal and national life. We have allowed a spurious tradition to lead us into a premature senility, never really preserving the significant contributions of the past, never bringing forth anything new.

Fournier’s description of students being occupied in “an imaginary realm instead of the infinitely more serious problems of our personal and national life,” reveals a desire to connect his education with the issues going on at the current time, but again, not having access to do that through his Georgetown education. The academic teaching and Catholic heritage appears to have been very distant from any ideas of students spending their time in service of others outside of
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Georgetown. Catholic teaching and a Jesuit humanistic education may have been a consistent priority for Georgetown, but translating these teachings into being “women and men in the service of others” does not appear to have been at the core of what students were learning. Fournier shows a recognition of injustices present in the institution’s own backyard, and a frustration that there no avenues existed for students to engage with them and use their education productively. In his conclusion he writes:

Our daily life presents many openings for this kind of learning: a walk through the Washington slums or a contact with the federal bureaucracy, a talk with a student from Africa or a refugee from the Iron Curtain. These are the things which set the mind moving, cause it to reflect and elaborate in a constructive manner, and lead it to some decision or action—that is, if the University provides it with a little time, encouragement, sympathy.¹⁶⁴

Fournier knows that students have access to opportunities to connect their Catholic education with realities of injustice, but shows that pursuing such opportunities was not something many students were doing or were pushed to do. Although Sodality existed, it does not seem to have created a culture or avenue through which all students could develop a life in the service of others.

This sentiment around Georgetown’s responsibility for the lack of community engagement and apathetic student body was increasingly present on campus. In April of 1963, Francis E Kearns, an English professor at Georgetown wrote a piece in the Commonweal magazine on student apathy at Georgetown.¹⁶⁵ He referenced an incident at a diner in Arlington
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on February 12, 1963 where three Georgetown students were kicked out because one of them was black. Fifteen students returned the next day, including the original group, and they were told that they would be arrested if they did not leave.\textsuperscript{166} Within five minutes, they were arrested and taken to the Arlington County jail. The University lawyers paid for the $100 bond for each of the students, but the official counsel was a representative who one of the boys had personally reached out to before the protest in anticipation of their arrest. According to a Hoya article from February 21, 1963, the East Campus administration told the students that they “had the constitutional right to demonstrate and that the University could only advise them to think of their own personal positions and how a police record might affect them later in life.”\textsuperscript{167} Showing a concern for the police record of these students rather than recognizing the risk they were will to take for civil rights shows how the university had kept itself away from controversial issues, which at the time meant distancing itself from vulnerable and disadvantaged members of society.

This sentiment was reflected in the attitudes of students. In Kearns’ \textit{Commonweal} article, he noted the “casual indifference of students” across the university in response to this injustice and mentioned the fact that neither the \textit{Hoya} nor the \textit{Courier}, the student news magazine, mentioned the sit-in from the editorial perspective. Furthermore, he adds that when a motion to commend the student protestors was introduced in the student government, the motion was
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postponed indefinitely. Kearns wrote, “The university’s Student Personnel Officer issued a press release stressing the university's non-involvement; and a student-faculty petition calling for the administration to support the demonstrators’ moral position met with considerable resistance and has as yet elicited no response from the administrative office to which it was directed.”

The apathetic response on campus may be the reason for the lack of information available on this statement, but his examples reveal significant levels of indifference and apathy in the Georgetown student body and administration towards racial justice.

In response to Kearns’ piece, a Hoya Editorial was released in May titled, “Yes, Dr. Kearns…There is an Apathy.” This piece mentions Georgetown’s falling reputation as a Catholic university, behind Notre Dame and Holy Cross. The piece discusses how Kearns cites this decrease in prestige as a result of the lack of social engagement. The author responds:

Although we agree that Georgetown students are apathetic…This apathy is not, however, the destructive vice is has been made out to be. It is not equivalent to intellectual laziness or moral torpor. It is merely the inevitable product of a hierarchical society which has produced answers to all of the vital intellectual questions and moral problems in human experience.

Again, the authors are blaming the Georgetown education for creating an environment in which students did not feel a desire to become actively involved in real world problems, whether global
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issues or those in their own city. This article suggests that the very strength of Catholic practices on campus is what prevented the widespread call to action against injustices. The authors write:

We are distanced from modern problems not our own or those of our friends because we exist in a society which is perfect and which holds the assurance that all human problems will pass away. Unless they directly involve us, we have a perfect excuse for dismissing situations like racial injustice or political corruption.  

As Fournier noted the previous year, this statement further reveals that even when directly exposed to injustices, Georgetown students at the time did not feel it was their responsibility to improve them.

The article in response to Kearns does suggest a shift in this perspective. Closing with a call to action in the statement, “By looking beyond our religious thought we will become better and more worthwhile human beings,” the piece reveals a pushback against Catholic teachings in the name of service. This is further evidenced by Audette’s thesis in which she writes:

the timidity of Catholic students, faculty and administrators in seeking the racial equality professed by the Catholic encyclicals and leadership as a Church goal raised some important questions as to the appropriateness of the authority and discipline which Catholic schools required of their students.

In the early 1960s, the Georgetown student body engaged little with the issues in the Washington community. Certainly, one factor contributing to this lack of engagement appears to be the way in which the structure of their Catholic education encouraged students to focus on discerning Truth, but made little effort to connect these questions to the everyday problems that
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plagued communities outside the front gates. The existence of Sodality, while focused on connecting service to faith, seems to have created a small corner of campus that engaged in these issues. Because the primary impetus for engaging in such work was for Catholic’s relationship with God, Sodality’s work did not seem to connect to the larger campus community, and certainly did not create an understanding that part of the responsibility as Georgetown students was to be “women and men for others.”
Chapter IV: The Racial Disconnect between Georgetown University and Washington, DC

The apathy described in Chapter 3 was furthered by the lack of exposure in the Georgetown student body to the racial and economic injustices of the time. While Harvard started accepting black students in 1870, Yale in 1874 and the University of Pennsylvania in 1883, Georgetown did not admit a black undergraduate student until 1950. In 1947, University President Fr. Lawrence Gorman, S.J., asked administrators to include at least one black student in the next freshman class, but this did not happen. The Hoya notes that “the university began to shift over the next three years, black students were admitted to graduate programs, the medical school and the law school.” In 1950 the first black undergraduate, Samuel Halsey Jr. was finally admitted as a transfer student from Howard.

By the time Georgetown accepted its first black student, other urban schools were putting full efforts into recruiting students of color. The 1960s brought with it a new focus from elite institutions on having a well-rounded student body that included students of different socioeconomic backgrounds. Harvard greatly improved its efforts to increase diversity after World War II. In a 1946 report Harvard noted a desire to have an institution in which “rich men’s sons and poor, serious scholars and frivolous wasters, saints and sinners, Puritans and papists, Jews and Gentiles will meet in her Houses, her Yard, and her athletic fields, rubbing off each
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other’s angularities and learning from friendly contact what cannot be learned by books.” In 1961 Columbia College circulated a report to high schools that stated the schools effort to stress “diversity of geographic and socioeconomic background as well as of academic fields of interest.” The energy of the Civil Rights Movement pushed schools to an even more directed approach for racial diversity. Affirmative action programs were launched in the early 1960s at the University of Michigan, UCLA, Cornell, Wesleyan and Swarthmore. In 1967 a New York Times article noted the Ivies’ effort to increase diversity as it stated:

Yesterday, when the schools sent out their 12,354 highly prized letters of acceptance, one, undoubtably went to the archetypal Episcopalian from Greenwich and another to the farm’s son from Montana, for balance. But, increasingly, letters also are going to the promising Negro from Newark and to the public high school student from the Bronx. Despite this active recruitment at other schools, and the stated desire from university leadership at Georgetown to increase diversity, Georgetown was still slow to shift.

In a 2012 Hoya article commemorating the death of Samuel Halsey Jr., Georgetown historian Emmett Curran, S.J. explains the campus climate in the 1950s as Georgetown was pursuing this effort. He stated, “It was … prejudice that they didn’t think it was in their tradition to admit African-American students. This was traditionally a very Southern school, and I think that tradition lingered the longest in the College.” Curran goes on to the explain that while the
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Georgetown neighborhood was predominantly black in the early-twentieth century, Georgetown still remained largely disconnected from it. He is quoted saying:

That was a time when the [School of Foreign Service] had two divisions — a day division and an evening division — and all the black students were enrolled in the evening division. They really weren’t all that visible. I daresay [that] your typical Georgetown University undergraduate did not know African Americans were attending [the school at that time].

While Georgetown had historically been a black neighborhood, by 1940 the black population had largely been forced out of the area due to the increasing wave of white federal workers from the expansion of the federal government. Georgetown’s African American population fell from nearly 25 percent in 1940 to 3 percent in 1960. A 1944 Senate committee report reads, “In Georgetown, only remnants of a long-established negro population now remain, because so much of their property has been purchased and improved for white occupancy.” As the tensions in DC rose around racial segregation and economic inequality, Georgetown was becoming increasingly isolated as it was situated in a “racially homogeneous enclave of white professional and political elites.” The efforts to improve racial diversity on campus, which would have helped to expose students to racial injustices, came in the face of a changing neighborhood that further isolated campus from the rising tensions across America. As Black
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Americans became more adamant and forceful in fighting against the injustices they had faced throughout the entire existence of the United States, the Georgetown neighborhood became more white, and more distant from the increasing tensions.

The slow progress of acceptance to racial diversity is evident in a 1970 Hoya article titled, “Hoya Black Athletes Here To Stay” which discusses the lack of diversity beyond athletic programs at Georgetown. The author writes:

And then we hit Georgetown, a white upper-middle class institution that is beginning to realize there is a multi-colored world just over the wall. The black athlete has made his appearance and does not plan to leave. And he does not hope to be a jock for the rest of his life. He wants to learn as well as to play. He wants to be a member of the Georgetown community. The trouble is, Georgetown is slow to take him in. Prejudice is ingrown.185

In 1970, after black students had been admitted to the university for two decades, the author is noting that the Georgetown community is just “beginning to realized there is a multi-colored world,” which reveals the continued absence of black students on campus while the civil rights movement was taking place throughout the 1960s. Georgetown’s first black basketball player explained in the article the challenges of trying to fit into the white culture, and the lack of understanding on the part of his peers about their own discrimination. "They will let you mix, but still they remember you're black...They don't know they're prejudiced, but you put it to them and they say 'it can't be me.'"186 This suggests that much of the reason for Georgetown’s disconnect from racial injustices was a result of the deep prejudice on campus, a direct
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contradiction to reaching out to the “most vulnerable and disadvantaged members of the community” as our identity now claims.

When Father Henle assumed the office of the president in June 1969, he demonstrated a desire to move the university toward “new concerns and interest in both urban and international affairs.”\textsuperscript{187} He noted that the small number of black students at Georgetown was a “cause for concern,” which at the time was 144 out of 7730.\textsuperscript{188} He revealed a departure from the traditional Georgetown model by pushing for more opportunities to connect students to realities outside of the campus gates. He stated:

I think it is important to have opportunities to interact…with people from disadvantaged groups…I would be in favor of a greater spread of types and classes in the student body at Georgetown. Certainly I would like to see more black students here and I want to keep up the geographical and international spread which I think is important.\textsuperscript{189}

The fact that Henle’s push for a more diverse student body at Georgetown and for more interaction with the local urban community was seen as “being quite different from the breed of men who have previously inhabited the presidential suite on second Healy” again illustrates the disconnect that existed between Georgetown and the Washington community throughout the 1960s and for some time beforehand.\textsuperscript{190}
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The same Hoya edition from September of 1969 discusses the addition of seven black studies courses into the College curriculum. While Father Henle endorsed the addition of these courses to the curriculum, he noted the absence of black faculty at Georgetown and the implications of this for pursuing a more diverse curriculum. He explained that he “opposed the raiding of southern universities in an attempt to mold a black faculty at this particular time. An instant black faculty would be the offspring of such a program. We don't do anyone any good if we set up a third-rate program.”\textsuperscript{191} This quote shows that even the leadership at Georgetown who recognized the lack of diversity on campus were struggling with how to fix the circumstances and were subject to their own prejudices, which contributed to slow progress in bringing more black students and faculty onto campus. Henle reveals the disconnect with black Americans as he asked for the help of the Black Student Alliance to “find out through their national grapevine where there are black Ph.D.’s coming out.”\textsuperscript{192} Henle also recommended that “Howard to be the bastion of black studies and to do it well,” suggesting that Georgetown did not see itself as a place which needed to, or even should, dedicate significant resources into integrating courses focused on black studies.\textsuperscript{193} By hindering the expansion of black studies on campus, Healy’s actions reveal an intentional institutional disconnect from providing the student body with access to leaning more about black history and racial justice.
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In September 1969 the Black Student Alliance launched a column in the Hoya “to inform the Georgetown community of the activities of the Black Student Alliance and to provide a forum for the articulation and advocacy of views which more often than not will be at variance with those of this paper and its readership.” The students discussed their interest in not necessarily changing the views of all Georgetown students, but rather in providing an alternative to the ideas that were traditionally discussed in the newspaper and across campus. The piece discusses how black students had traditionally tried to work with the administration or faculty to achieve their objectives separately from the general student body, and felt that seeking the support of the wider student body could potentially create problems in their negotiations, particularly if most students opposed their proposals. This piece demonstrates again that even as the number of black students increased at Georgetown throughout the 1960s, the predominantly white student body was still distant in their everyday lives from the experiences of black students on campus. This disconnect was not remedied simply with the presence of 50 black undergraduate students, but rather required something more to get the student body aware of racial injustice and what they could do about it. Another sign of the disconnect between the Georgetown student body and the black community in Washington was the nature of campus events during the early 1960s. In 1963
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Georgetown hosted a panel discussion titled, “Can Integration Come Too Fast?” The panel included leaders of the black community in Washington, namely, Sterling Tucker, Director of the Washington Urban League, Julius Hobson, Chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality, and Rev. E Franklin Jackson, President of the Washington NAACP. There were representatives from Georgetown, Howard, Trinity, and George Washington who were invited to ask questions. The discussion topics included jobs, education, housing and equal accommodations in Washington, and the various methods that had been used by civil rights groups to combat the discrimination black people had experienced in these areas. The intention of this panel was to expose students to issues of racial prejudice and inequality, and to help them to better understand the ongoing battle for equality. A Hoya article describing the event notes the need for better communication between the leaders of different races to help clarify their challenging experiences and further the movement towards equality. The need for such a discussion again highlights the lack of natural exposure in the Georgetown campus culture and education to such issues.
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Another attempt to better engage with black students in Washington because of the lack of exposure to diverse perspectives on Georgetown’s campus is illustrated in a 1966 Hoya piece titled, “Today’s Negro: In Quest of Human Power.” The article was part of an effort in which the Hoya explored differences in attitudes and perspectives of students at different universities in the Washington area through symposiums and discussions. The article states, “The Hoya’s intent was to reach and report views of this problem that the average white student might never hear, rather than to portray the Negro student as a 'race-monger, interested only in that problem.”201 The symposium allowed black students to share their experiences and respond to comments made by Georgetown students. The need for the Hoya to capture these from an event focused on students from Howard University shows again the absence of the opportunities for these conversations on Georgetown’s campus. The article goes on to say:

And making their own purposes are exactly what today's young Negroes are anxious to do. The question as to whether the educated Negro will desert the cause of his poorer brothers is apparently being answered in the negative on today's Negro campuses. The entire Negro problem may some day be resolved by men of various campuses across the country.202 This quote demonstrates that the Hoya felt a need to explain to Georgetown students the beliefs, interests and needs of black students their own age, which serves as further evidence that this understanding was not available in their normal daily interactions on campus.

The disconnect between Georgetown students and the racial injustice and economic inequity in Washington is partially explained by the small population of black and low-income students from Howard University shows again the absence of the opportunities for these conversations. The article goes on to say:
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students at the institution. It is also evidenced through the language on campus around racial injustice and the lack of support black students felt from their peers. The Georgetown environment in the early 1960s did not provide students adequate exposure to issues of social justice and racial inclusion, which made it easier for students to be uninterested in pursuing solutions to these issues in their own community. While there were efforts in the 1960s to bring these discussions to campus, which will be discussed in the following chapter, it is clear that the lack of diversity on Georgetown’s campus perpetuated the apathy among students towards getting involved in the fight against injustices that plagued their time.
Chapter V: The Secularization and Popularization of Service

As the early 1960s brought with it a new meaning of Catholic responsibility to service, an expansion of protests and civil disobedience around the Civil Rights Movement, and a growing awareness on college campuses of the state of national poverty, the culture on Georgetown’s campus saw a significant shift. Students began to combat the apathy which they had long been characterized by, and became more involved in service efforts in the local Washington community. With the presence of civil rights protests and increasing levels of poverty throughout the country, it seems that the Catholic institution may have connected Vatican II discussions at the time calling Catholics to service to these issues and motivated students to get involved. However, in reality, the increase of students involved in service efforts was largely motivated by secular, grassroots movement in which students felt an increasing responsibility to use their education to help empower others.

Vatican II, which took place between October of 1962 and December of 1965, called on Catholics to engage in dialogue with those of different backgrounds and advocated for a responsibility to fight against discrimination. One example of this is the Georgetown Lay Mission Group’s effort to send students to Mexico in the summer of 1963 to improve “economy, health, literacy, and general well-being.”203 The project was described as “a humble response to the Church in crisis in Latin America” because “the impact of technology and the problems of a rapidly changing society threaten to overwhelm the Church.”204 It was intended to be “in line


with the rebirth of the Catholic Church embodied in Vatican II” and the Mater et Magistra encyclical that was put out by Pope John XXIII in 1961 calling on the church to be a “mother and teacher.” The encyclical called on the church to promote authentic community and human dignity and it gave the church a responsibility to intervene in things such as education, health care and economic development. While this understanding may have been the impetus behind the project, the project was not marketed as a way to fulfill one’s religious responsibility. It was marketed as a way to learn about other cultures, help the less fortunate, and experience an adventure. This is evidenced in the Spring 1964 recruitment flyer which read:

Have you considered traveling outside the United States, perhaps Mexico? Would you be willing to sacrifice the pleasure and leisure of summertime here to work among the Otami Indians of Mexico in conditions of poverty and sickness? Are you looking to share the benefits we enjoy here in America with the less fortunate and at the same time broaden your knowledge and experience?

Even with a different Catholic approach to tackling social justice issues, this flyer shows that the efforts on the Georgetown campus were framed from a secular approach. This recruitment effort demonstrates a much broader appeal than earlier efforts put on by Sodality that primarily focused on the religious benefits of the trip.

The new approach to marketing service work was matched with increasing presence on campus of fights against racial and economic injustice going on off campus. For example, in the
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Spring of 1963, the Hoya reported that there was a desire to develop a sustained relationship with poor areas of the Washington community after “a handful of Georgetown students became aware that the need for tutors at local settlement house and public schools could easily be met by college students.” Additionally, in the fall of 1963, student government leader Nick Nastasi issued a call to action, reinforcing the need for a shift in the undergraduate population. He wrote:

“It is not only a continuation of the traditions of the past that is essential to our progress, but an engagement with the issues of the present…Now is the time to commit and dedicate ourselves to a course which goes beyond the ordinary isolated pursuits of campus life. Let us sincerely attempt during this memorable year to become vital members of our generation.”

Nastasi again calls on students to look beyond the environment they see on campus and to engage with issues of the present, which were around race and poverty.

The formation of the social action committee that was established under the Association of African and American Students (AAAS) in the fall of 1963 illustrates an attempt to create space on campus that supported efforts to engage with the community. The committee was open to anyone in the Georgetown community, and was intended to “help area high school students who have academic or social problems, and also to assist outstanding students who are preparing for their College Boards.” At the time, there were few opportunities for these students to channel their energy, as the president of AAAS stated, “there is cause to believe that there are several students at Georgetown who have the desire to do something in this field and are at a loss
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as to where to channel their efforts.” While the group worked through St. Paul and Augustine's Parish, again, there was not a primary religious motivation to either create or participate in the organization. At the time of the establishment of the group, there were “about 25 prospective tutors,” which shows a significant interest in a secular service effort, but not yet widespread interest across the institution. Additionally, it is important to note that such a committee was created by black students, who were still a part of a very small demographic on campus. The increase in black students brought with it individuals who had experienced discrimination and injustice and channeled the desire to do something about it into service work. Before the expansion of racial diversity on campus in the 1960s, this connection between experience and service efforts would likely not have been made.

As the Civil Rights Movement grew, Georgetown’s location in Washington brought students continual opportunities to be involved. There was a growing presence of activists from the Civil Rights Movement on campus and an increasing involvement of students, staff and faculty in civil rights demonstrations in Washington, DC. For example, on September 20, 1963 Francis Kearns published his account of the March on Washington in *Commonweal* magazine, showing how religious institutions in Washington became more involved in issues of racial justice as a result of the Civil Rights Movement events in their own community. He wrote:

> Perhaps the most significant gain scored by the march, however, is that, more than any previous incident or demonstration in the field of racial justice, it led great numbers of religious institutions and church members to make an act of commitment…On the speakers platform one could see the familiar bishops, but what was new was the presence
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in the audience of Washington parish priests, Woodstock seminarians, and suburban Maryland parishioners.\textsuperscript{212}

In regards to Georgetown, Kearns suggested that the institution “had a mixed record on racial justice” but responded strongly to the March:

When called upon to support the march, the university community responded generously. The administration endorsed the participation of a Georgetown group and offered dormitory space and meals to out-of-town marchers. Moreover, though only thirty to forty marchers were expected from the campus, over 250 students, priests, and lay professors participated. One could sense that many other Catholics at the Lincoln Memorial were taking the first difficult steps toward a Christian stand on the race problem.\textsuperscript{213}

Georgetown’s involvement in the March is likely the result of Archbishop Patrick O’Boyle of Washington who had called upon local churches to pursue anti-discrimination clauses in contracts, had developed an apprentice training program for black people and had facilitated home exchange visits between black and white families.\textsuperscript{214} This level of involvement is very different from how the University responded to its own students being arrested at the diner in February, showing again that it was the Civil Rights Movement that pushed Georgetown to involve itself in racial justice work in the local community. It was not an already present force, but rather a new effort, resulting from outside pressure from the influence of the Civil Rights Movement on the Catholic leadership.
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In addition to this event, in February of 1964, the National Leadership Conference on Civil Rights requested for volunteers to "visit House members in their offices, buttonhole them in the corridors, and watch them voting on amendments."\footnote{215} Father Richard McSorley claimed that Georgetown was the leading school in interest and in numbers in these efforts.\footnote{216} In April of 1964, McDonough Gymnasium was used for a “National Call to Pray” for the Civil Rights Bill that was pending in Congress.\footnote{217} Archbishop O’Boyle of Washington presided over the service along with a prominent Rabbi and the Stated Clerk of the Presbyterian Faith.\footnote{218} This service was meant to lead services all over the nation in unity to demonstrate on a national scale the support for the legislation. These events reveal how Georgetown’s location in the national capital pushed it into the Civil Rights Movement and brought these local and national challenges inside of its front gates.

Recognizing the inadequacy of Sodality’s efforts in tackling the campus thirst to get involved in community action and service, Rev. Jack Haughey convinced the leadership of Sodality to engage in their religious work by coordinating other students who had interests in community work. The Georgetown University Community Action Program was born from this, and grew from eight students with an interest to more than 500 engaged in projects in just one
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year, between December 1963 and December 1964. GUCAP provided an outlet for combatting apathy and directing the existing energy on campus into a space that transformed the Georgetown experience into something applicable in students’ daily lives.

In March 1964, the Washington Post ran an article highlighting GUCAP titled, “Youth Wages War on Poverty: Students Tackle Problems of City’s Underprivileged” which discussed the impact of the program on the Washington community. Calling the program “extraordinary, ambitious, and wide-ranging” the article reveals a wider recognition in the Washington community of Georgetown students’ desire to help battle community challenges. The article describes GUCAP as the “nucleus of students (and some faculty) who are, in a matter-of-fact and quiet way, waging their own war on poverty.” The article largely frames the desire of students to get involved in the community as the impetus behind the massive effort. Rev. Jack Haughey, the administrative leader for GUCAP, is quoted saying:

There is an idea among educators that is implicit, that they are educating people who haven’t arrived yet. But the kids, no matter what level, are rebelling against the idea that they will only be valuable to society in the future. They want to do something relevant now. Jesuits run colleges for the future social yield of the student we are producing. It’s just a question of how ‘future’ you want to make it.
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This quote reveals that at the time of the launch of this program, university leadership noticed that the program fit in line with Jesuit ideals, but admitted that it wasn’t inspired by these ideals. Rather, it was a pushback against the traditional Catholic notion that they were preparing students to eventually serve others, and instead insisting that Georgetown students were ready to serve others now.

The article also reveals a reframing of the Georgetown student experience around opportunities outside of coursework. The article notes Ellen Canepa, a freshman in the nursing school who had maintained her 3.75 grade point average while also teaching piano lessons a few hours a week. Canepa was quoted saying, “If I stopped to think about it, I probably wouldn’t do it. But I can’t find a good enough reason not to, so I just make the time.” Her statement shows that students saw a need in their community and felt a responsibility to help improve the community, even at the sacrifice of their own sleep or studying schedules. This choice of potentially sacrificing academics for service shows a deeper connection to the Washington community than what was displayed prior to the mid-1960s, in which students seemed relatively unaware of the challenges in their city.

By May of 1964, the Hoya ran a review of the year, in which it noted GUCAP as an effort in “destroying the myth about college student apathy by sponsoring civil rights and anti-poverty

224 Secrest, “Youth Wages War on Poverty: Students Tackle Problems of City’s Underprivileged.”

225 Secrest, “Youth Wages War on Poverty: Students Tackle Problems of City’s Underprivileged.”
However, in the same issue, the Hoya revealed a poll of 302 students and faculty members in which 107 of them were in support of the Civil Rights Bill, 145 were in support of it with modifications and 50 were against the bill. The Hoya qualifies these numbers by saying:

In short there has not been very much happening either in opposition to or in favor of the Civil Rights Bill since school began in September. There are very few ‘Pass the Bill’ buttons and there are even less ‘Kill the Bill’ buttons floating around our Campus. It almost seems as if no one cares one way or another.

This highlights that there was still a disconnect on campus between the ongoing social justice issues in Washington and throughout the country, but the previously discussed articles demonstrate that the primary response on campus to connecting with these issues was through the civil rights and anti-poverty work of GUCAP.

In December 1964, The Courier, a student-run newspaper for the School of Foreign Service, wrote an article about the development of the Georgetown University Community Action Program and the role of its leader, John Lacy, in much of its success. Lacy’s motivations again reveal a sharp change in tone toward service on Georgetown’s campus from the pre-1962 widespread apathy. The article states:

His stated purpose is to give students a contact with reality to counterbalance the ‘ivory tower’ aspects of higher education, and at the same time, to do something concrete to make the world a little more bearable for many more people. He attributes much of the success of GUCAP to a noticeable attitude among students of concern for the crucial issues of our time and feels that it is a direct refutation of the concept of ‘student apathy.’ But to John Lacy and GUCAP must go the credit for providing a vehicle for the
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realization of the abstract desire to ‘do something’ among the conscious students of Georgetown.228

Lacy’s language of doing service “to make the world a little more bearable” shows a break from the selfish tone of doing service only when convenient for you and to “feel ever so much better” that was highlighted in the Sodality bulletin from 1960 discussed in Chapter 3.229 His belief that there is “an attitude of concern for the crucial issues of our time” is a very different perspective than that of the Fournier’s in 1962 which was discussed in Chapter 3 and suggested, “We cannot play a dynamic role in the modern world because we have rejected that world - have occupied ourselves with the empty disputations of an imaginary realm instead of the infinitely more serious problems.”230 This demonstrates a new feeling of responsibility to service work and to engagement with social justice issues simply by being members of the Georgetown community.

This quote also demonstrates a recognition of the disconnect between the Georgetown campus and the reality of many people in the Washington community - a recognition that was referred to earlier in the discussions of apathy on campus, but did not directly lead to efforts to fix it in previous years. It was when the civil rights and poverty discussions were brought onto campus in the mid-1960s that Georgetown students began to see this disconnect as an opportunity for engagement.

228 “John Lacy- GUCAP,” The Courier, December 1964, Georgetown University Archives.
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By December of 1964, there were nearly 600 members of the Georgetown community participating in the work of GUCAP, making it the largest student organization on campus. Students dedicated 1200 hours per week to 40 different projects in the “inner-city” of Washington. Sodality was seen as being “more active” in 1962 when it had 60 participants, so 600 participants reveals the extent to which service work expanded in the Georgetown community during these years. GUCAP was run largely by students, and developed projects based on requests from schools and independent groups at work in Washington, DC. The projects ranged from tutoring children, volunteering in the Georgetown University Hospital Emergency Room, working at a credit union, caring for abandoned babies at Children’s Hospital, collecting food and clothing donations, and researching legislation impacting the DC community. A Hoya article noting the size of the program in December 1964 wrote, “there is one rapidly growing segment of the Georgetown population for whom the Christmas spirit is a year round reality.” While this was still seen as a segment of the Georgetown population, it was a significant proportion of the student population, and the motivation reflected a deeper sense of responsibility in Georgetown students than any previous service effort had exhibited.
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In October 1964 a community action project was added to the freshman orientation program as a result of Rev. Haughey’s work. An article from *The Hoya* on October 8, 1964, explains that typically the service project event uses freshman manpower to do odd jobs in the Georgetown community but, “this year’s [Service Project] Chairman Frank Keating felt that such a program ‘created rather than satisfied a need’ and determined to find a better way to serve the school.” It was from this concern that he worked with Rev. Haughey to create a program in which they cleaned an orphanage and played with the children. This again shows a shift in 1964 towards projects that were a response to demonstrated needs in the DC community, rather than ones created in a silo of spiritually-focused people in the Georgetown community.

The change in dialogue on campus as well as the shift in the size and nature of service programs seems to suggest that this core piece of the Georgetown University identity, as displayed by being in our mission statement, has shifted in meaning over time. In May 1965, the Editorial Board published a piece titled, “The New Breed” which revealed their understanding of this shift on campus in the 1960s. The piece states, “No more can students look merely to the more static disciplines taught in the classroom. Once learned, they must be constantly revised to fit a constantly changing society and then put into action.” While we are a school founded by Jesuits, a community that asserts a tradition of social justice, these documents reveal that the idea of educating people to be women and men for others has not always been a widespread practice in the experience of Georgetown students. The expansion of these programs in the early 1960s
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changed the student desire to bring this responsibility to the core of the Georgetown education. This energy was not naturally cultivated by the campus environment. Rather connections to the Civil Rights and War on Poverty movements off-campus helped students to identify a desire within themselves to connect more with the DC community and then develop the means to do so.
CONCLUSION

When prospective students visit Georgetown’s campus today, they are offered an invitation to be a part of a historic Jesuit tradition that brings with it an institutional identity grounded in values of service, faith, and intellectual curiosity. Georgetown’s written history asserts:

Georgetown’s Jesuit tradition also promotes the university’s commitment to spiritual inquiry, civic engagement, and religious and cultural pluralism… Students are challenged to engage in the world and become men and women in the service of others, especially the most vulnerable and disadvantaged members of the community.237

When Georgetown University was established by John Carroll in 1789, it was intended to be the bedrock of Catholic education for American youth and possibly a seminary for future clergymen. In many aspects, it was grounded in religious and cultural pluralism, opening its gates from the very beginning to students of different faiths and being an early leader in providing access to international students. However, other aspects of this institutionalized memory appear less grounded in historical evidence. Specifically, this thesis looked at the institutional pursuit of community service for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged members of the Washington community. This thesis focused on efforts to help educate low-income children as a lens into Georgetown’s wider efforts to serve the most vulnerable in the Washington community.

As the Jesuits were developing Georgetown in the early 1800s, only a few individuals involved themselves in the development of the boys and girls Poor Schools in the neighborhood. The early leaders that did involve themselves pursued such efforts through personal motivation

and did not seem to view their interest as the result of an institutional responsibility. In addition, prior to the 1960s, student service in the community was limited as a religious task for a small section of students. The predominantly-white student body was largely disconnected from realities of economic inequity and racial injustice in Washington, contributing to an already apathetic student body with little desire to participate in the service efforts that were available. However, the national social movements around poverty and economic inequality in the 1960s inspired secular student programs on campus that provided an outlet for students to get involved in the community. As these programs expanded, there was a growing sense of responsibility as Georgetown students began to battle against injustice. While programs that were born in the 1960s align strongly with the Jesuit tradition, they were not created primarily as a result of the motivations of the Jesuit university leadership. This analysis has made it clear that the piece of Georgetown’s modern identity which encourages student engagement in the service of others finds its roots not primarily in the Jesuit tradition of the university but rather in student involvement in the social movements of the 1960s.

I am not arguing that Georgetown is currently, or ever has been, an institution completely enveloped in a desire to serve others. My concern was about understanding how a responsibility to serve as men and women for others came to be a piece of our institutional identity and memory. From my analysis, it is clear that the student efforts of the 1960s are what created this sentiment of responsibility to others, but possibly because it fit into the Jesuit tradition, we have reclaimed it as motivated by that tradition and actively promoted by this institution since its founding. The extent to which this notion of civic responsibility has permeated throughout campus since the 1960s is a question to be further researched. It would also be of interest to
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analyze how Georgetown compares to the other Jesuit universities’ historical involvement in service.

Additionally, in Chapter 4 I discuss the implications of having few low-income students or students of color on our campus in the 1960s. My point was certainly not that GUCAP solved the issue of Georgetown’s disconnect from the Washington community or the injustices of the time. This is a problem that Georgetown battled with well into the 1970s, as evidenced by my research in Chapter 4, and continues to battle with today in having a predominantly wealthy, white institution with small numbers of students from the local community. My point, rather, is that the student-led efforts to engage in the community in the 1960s were the beginning of our desire as an institution to use our education directly in the service of those in our own community. The increasingly diverse student body contributed to a greater desire throughout the university community to fight against societal injustices, but this is by no means to say that Georgetown has distanced itself far enough from its ivory tower. I am simply asserting that earlier demographics of the student body created a barrier that distanced Georgetown from the “most vulnerable” and that as these demographics shifted, becoming more diverse in the 1960s, we saw an increase in student desire on campus to fight against injustices. It would be of interest of future research to explore how Georgetown has continued to battle in the past sixty-five years against this ivory tower image and how the establishment of the Center for Social Justice in 2001 has contributed to this.

The birth of the Center for Social Justice (CSJ) demonstrates a continued desire and more intense commitment to better connect our institution to disadvantaged communities. However,
the idea pervades Georgetown’s campus that we engage the way we do with society primarily because of our Jesuit values and tradition. The CSJ’s website states:

CSJ draws significant inspiration in its work from Georgetown's Jesuit values and mission statement, which declare: ‘Georgetown educates women and men to be reflective lifelong learners, to be responsible and active participants in civic life and to live generously in service to others.’

My research shows, however, that the tradition of service that exists at Georgetown was not initially inspired by Jesuit values. It is possible that those values had a key role in sustaining that involvement after the 1960s, but that is beyond the scope of this paper. My point is that our institutional memory should recognize other factors, primarily the social movements of the 1960s, student activists, and our location in Washington - not just as the nation’s capital but also as a poor, racially divided urban center - as the primary inspiration for the way we engage with disadvantaged members of society today.
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APPENDIX

Figure 1: Robert Emmett Curran, *From Academy to University, 1789-1889*, vol. 1, *The Bicentennial History of Georgetown University* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1993), 409.
Figure 2: Robert Emmett Curran, *From Academy to University, 1789-1889*, vol. 1, *The Bicentennial History of Georgetown University* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1993), 410.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 4 Tabulations</th>
<th>Table 4.1 DEMOGRAPHICS OF ALL 175 GEORGETOWN STUDENTS FROM 1820</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* 410 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Father’s Occupation          | (25 known) | 44.0% |
| Merchant                     | 11         | 44.0% |
| Gov’t officials/diplomats   | 6          | 24.0% |
| Planter                      | 5          | 20.0% |
| Artisan                      | 1          | 4.0%  |
| Gov’t clerk                  | 1          | 4.0%  |
| Career military              | 1          | 4.0%  |

| Nation or Area of Origin    | (157 known) |
| U.S.A.                       | 148         | 94.3% |
| Central America              | 4           | 2.5%  |
| South America                | 3           | 1.9%  |
| Europe                       | 2           | 1.3%  |

| U.S. Geographic Region       | (148 known) |
| Local                        | 111         | 75.0% |
| South                        | 31          | 20.9% |
| Northeast                    | 6           | 4.1%  |

| Native State (148 known)     |
| D.C.                         | 65          | 43.9% |
| Maryland                     | 46          | 31.1% |
| Louisiana                    | 16          | 10.8% |
| Virginia                     | 10          | 6.8%  |
| Pennsylvania                 | 5           | 3.4%  |
| Georgia                      | 2           | 1.4%  |
| Connecticut                  | 1           | 0.7%  |
| Kentucky                     | 1           | 0.7%  |
| Missouri                     | 1           | 0.7%  |
| Tennessee                    | 1           | 0.7%  |

| Urban/Rural Locale (145 known) |
| City                          | 79          | 54.5% |
| Country                      | 39          | 26.9% |
| Town                         | 27          | 18.6% |

| Ethnic Group (173 known) |
| English                     | 119         | 68.8% |
| French                      | 14          | 8.1%  |
| Irish                       | 14          | 8.1%  |
| German                      | 10          | 5.8%  |

| Ethnic Group (cont’d)        |
| Hispanic                    | 6           | 3.5%  |
| Scotch                      | 4           | 2.3%  |
| Greek                       | 3           | 1.7%  |
| Dutch                       | 1           | 0.6%  |
| Portuguese                  | 1           | 0.6%  |
| Welsh                       | 1           | 0.6%  |

| Religious Affiliation (130 known) |
| Catholic                     | 114         | 65.2% |
| Protestant                   | 61          | 34.8% |

| Religious Vocations (5 known) |
| Society of Jesus             | 4           | 3.5%  |
| Diocesan clergy              | 1           | 0.8%  |

| Financial Status (166 known) |
| Paid full tuition            | 111         | 66.9% |
| Tuition waived               | 32          | 19.3% |
| Paid reduced fees            | 11          | 6.6%  |
| Paid group rate              | 10          | 6.0%  |
| Rec’d outside aid            | 2           | 1.2%  |

| Housing Status (175 known)   |
| Campus boarders              | 116         | 66.6% |
| Day students                 | 59          | 33.4% |

| Disciplinary Status          |
| Expelled students            | 12          | 6.9%  |

| Degrees Earned              |
| A.B.                        | 25          | 14.2% |

| Occupation or Career (24 known) |
| Doctor                       | 5           | 20.8% |
| Lawyer                       | 5           | 20.8% |
| planter                      | 4           | 16.6% |
| Merchant/businessman         | 3           | 12.5% |
| Writer/journalist            | 3           | 12.5% |
| Clergyman                    | 2           | 8.3%  |
| Career military              | 1           | 4.2%  |
| Educator                     | 1           | 4.2%  |
Figure 3: “GU Pride And Prejudice Mark Racial Protests At Virginia Restaurant,” The Hoya, February 21, 1963, Accessed October 6, 2015. Digital Georgetown, Georgetown University Archives.
Figure 4: “Yes, Dr. Kearns...There is an Apathy.” *The Hoya*. May 2, 1963. Digital Georgetown, Georgetown University Archives.
Figure 5: “Panelists To Examine Inter-Racial Problems,” The Hoya, November 7, 1963, Digital Georgetown, Georgetown University Archives.
Figure 6: "Hoya Reviews 1963-1964 Activities," The Hoya, May 15, 1964, Digital Georgetown, Georgetown University Archives.
Figure 7: “Hoyas for Civil Rights Bill Modification,” *The Hoya*, May 15, 1964, Digital Georgetown, Georgetown University Archives.
Figure 10: “The New Breed,” *The Hoya*, May 14, 1965, Digital Georgetown, Georgetown University Archives.

Editorial: The New Breed

It is customary at the end of the school year to review the year’s events and their relative merit. There seems to be one predominant tone that has characterized the important happenings of 1964-65. In one form or another, this has been the year that the New Breed came into its own at Georgetown. The transition from the non-conformism of the fifties to the social engagement of the sixties has begun to take on a more practical directive. The appearance of this movement has been accompanied by much hope and some disappointment.

This year has seen a new administration, increased student participation, better communications, and the maturing of such New Breed organs as GUCAP and STIMULUS. The advances made in the above areas and by these activities have opened up new hope for experienced and mature participation in student “protest.” There has only been a hopeful beginning, not without its disappointments, but the emphasis of action has begun to swing toward those students who are concerned enough to initiate and consolidate solutions through trial and error.

The HOYA achieved a new freedom of expression during the last year, and has begun to face the problem of how to use it responsibly. Because of the nature of a newspaper, the problems are very different from those of other organizations, but the goal and emphasis is the same. No longer can students look merely to the more static disciplines taught in the class room. Once learned, they must be constantly revised to fit a constantly changing society and then put into action.

This year’s seniors have left us a legacy, and the atmosphere to foster it is potentially present. At the end of a school year there is always the promise of better things. This year there seems to be even more reason to look toward September. Across the country there is a gradual realization that there is hope to be found in the students of today; students who are engaged in “examined commitment”—this is the mark of the New Breed. The unrest which each year turned thoughts toward a Spring riot has given way to an attempt to engage in the future. This spirit has come into its own at Georgetown during the past year, and it is the responsibility of next year’s students to give it meaningful direction.

Figure 12: “Our Mission & Identity, Grounded in our Jesuit Heritage,” Georgetown University, accessed April 15, 2016, https://missionandministry.georgetown.edu/identity.

Figure 14: “Spirit of Georgetown Values,” Georgetown University, accessed April 15, 2016, https://missionandministry.georgetown.edu/thespiritofgeorgetown/values#others.

Women and Men for Others - Fr. Pedro Arrupe, S.J., Superior General of the Society of Jesus from 1965 to 1981, employed the phrase "Men for Others" in a notable 1973 presentation in Valencia, Spain. Father Arrupe provocatively challenged the alumni of Jesuit schools and universities to be engaged in the struggle for justice to protect the needs of the most vulnerable. Today, this phrase has become more inclusive and its spirit is evidenced in Georgetown's promotion of community-based learning courses; our local, national and international service projects; justice immersion programs; and over forty student-led service and justice organizations.