

Volume 2
Issue 1
Spring 2008

UTRAQUE UNUM

A Journal of the
Georgetown University
Tocqueville Forum on the
Roots of American Democracy



Editor-in-Chief

Eric Wind

Managing Editor

Danielle Singleton

Section Editors

James Crowley (The Forum)

Chelsea Paige (The Chamber)

Anthony Carmen Piccirillo (The Sanctuary)

Justin Hawkins (The Cellar)

Amanda Marie Murphy (The Parlor)

Matthew Cantirino (The Observatory)

“Utraque Unum”

Georgetown University's seal is based directly on obverse of the Great Seal of the United States of America. Instead of the American eagle clutching an olive branch in its right talon and thirteen arrows its left talon, Georgetown's eagle is clutching a globe and calipers in its right and left talons. The American seal's eagle holds a banner in its beak that states “*E Pluribus Unum*” or “Out of Many, One” in reference to the many different people and states creating a union. The Georgetown seal's eagle holds a banner in its beak that states “*Utraque Unum.*”

As the official motto of Georgetown University, *Utraque Unum* is often translated as “Both One” or “Both and One” and is taken from Paul's epistle to the Ephesians. This motto is found in a Latin translation of Ephesians 2:14: “*ipse est enim pax nostra qui fecit utraque unum.*” Translated in the King James Version of the Bible it states, “For He [Christ] is our peace, who hath made both one.” *Utraque Unum* is the Latin phrase to describe Paul's concept of unity between Jews and Gentiles; that through Jesus Christ both are one.

In view of the Georgetown seal the motto represents pursuing knowledge of the earthly (the world and calipers) and the spiritual (the cross). Faith and reason need not be exclusive. In unity faith and reason enhance the pursuit of knowledge.

Acknowledgements:

The publication of *Utraque Unum* was made possible by the generous support of Bill Mumma, Georgetown University Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service Class of 1981 as well as the Collegiate Network. The Tocqueville Forum on the Roots of American Democracy additionally wishes to acknowledge the generous support of The Veritas Fund as administered by the Manhattan Institute, the Thomas W. Smith Foundation, the Jack Miller Center, and alumni and friends of Georgetown University.

The publication of *Utraque Unum* was inspired by the work of Jordan Hylden, who while at Harvard started the *Harvard Ichthus*, a journal of Christian thought. He then started “The Augustine Project” and set out helping students at other colleges create thoughtful journals of Christian theology. Jordan was able to provide invaluable help and advice in the early stages of this journal’s creation and for that we are deeply thankful.

The Tocqueville Forum promotes events and activities devoted to furthering and deepening student understanding of the American constitutional order and its roots in the Western philosophical and religious traditions. The Tocqueville Forum sponsors these activities solely through the contributions of generous supporters of its mission. If you would like further information about supporting the Tocqueville Forum, please e-mail tocquevilleforum@georgetown.edu or visit <http://government.georgetown.edu/tocquevilleforum>.

As always, we welcome your thoughts and comments regarding this journal. If you are or once were a Georgetown University student, professor or staff member we would welcome the opportunity to review your work for publication in *Utraque Unum*. In addition to writers we are looking for section editors, artists, graphic designers and web designers. Please e-mail the editors at utraque.unum@gmail.com for these inquiries.

The Tocqueville Forum on the Roots of American Democracy

<http://government.georgetown.edu/tocquevilleforum>

Tocquevilleforum@georgetown.edu



Georgetown University



Table of Contents

From the Editor-in-Chief	3
About the Tocqueville Forum	
Deepening Knowledge of the American and Western Tradition, <i>by Professor Patrick Deneen</i>	5
The Forum (Feature Articles)	
Alcibiades, <i>by James Crowley</i>	7
Jefferson’s Progressive Education, <i>by Sam Hornak</i>	13
Revising the Death of God, <i>by Lukasz Swiderski</i>	21
On Learning, <i>by Father James V. Schall, S.J.</i>	25
The Chamber (Articles on Law and Politics)	
Gun Control in DC, <i>by Matthew Cantirino</i>	33
Hylton v. United States, <i>by Ashley McClymont</i>	37
The Sanctuary (Articles on Religion)	
The Patriotism of America’s Catholic Universities, <i>by Father Stephen M. Fields, S.J.</i>	41
William Wilberforce’s Vision of Real Christianity, <i>by Justin R. Hawkins</i>	45
The Parlor (Reviews of Books, Movies, Music, and Plays)	
<i>Chariots of Fire: An Identity Crisis</i> , <i>by Emily Merki</i>	49
America’s First Catholic Family: the Carrolls, <i>by Amanda Marie Murphy</i>	53
The Cellar (Scholarship related to Georgetown University)	
Disbanding Georgetown’s Football Team, <i>by Henri Minion</i>	57
Father Walsh and the Founding of the School of Foreign Service, <i>by Emily Solis-Cohen</i>	65
The Observatory (Reflections related to Georgetown University)	
Breaking the Chains of Religious Intolerance, <i>by Eric Wind</i>	79

Letter from the Editor-in-Chief

Dear Reader,

Thank you for cracking the pages of *Utraque Unum*, a journal of the Georgetown University Tocqueville Forum on the Roots of American Democracy. I am very pleased with the positive feedback I received after the publication of the inaugural issue this past fall. Numerous readers commented on the quality of the writing as well as the genuine love and hope for Georgetown University presented in the first issue. I can only hope that the writing of the second issue lives up to your expectations.

The goal of *Utraque Unum* remains to promote intellectual discussion in regards to the founding of the United States of America, Western Civilization, Georgetown University, and matters of culture.. The journal continues to be run and driven by Georgetown undergraduates. This journal is to be a forum for all Hoyas past and present to discuss these topics.

In the hustle and bustle of daily life on the Hilltop it is easy to get thrown off by the little things. This past academic year Georgetown has in my view suffered a severe case of myopia. It seems that hardly a week goes by without some “outrage” occurring, usually uncovered with an exposé in our main student newspaper, *The Hoya*. These are inevitably followed by a proliferation of facebook groups, a formal petition to Georgetown administrators, and some indolent rallies of protest. This has also coincided with many of my peers feeling disillusioned with their Georgetown experiences, based on my conversations with them.

Why is this? I believe that it is more than just the Georgetown men’s basketball team’s loss to Davidson in the NCAA Tournament this March. Perhaps it is due to a loss of perspective. When one lives wholly on this parcel of land, it is easy to forget the rest of the world. Students rarely travel outside of the Georgetown neighborhood despite the fact that we are in our nation’s capital. It is more than this, however. I think that there is a strong disenchantment with some of the academics on campus as well as a lack of community.

Many of Georgetown’s administrators brag that it is a “research university” as if this is the zenith of academia’s goals. Conducting research is certainly important, but research can be done to the point of being asinine and useless. In addition, I do not believe that John Carroll founded Georgetown as a “research university.” Rather, the goal of the academy was to transfer knowledge from the teacher to the student. In fact, the very word “professor” suggests the importance of the lectures and seminars given by the teacher whereby the teacher could “profess” their faith and knowledge about their area of specialty. Teachers are more rewarded for writing books and articles that are reviewed by their peers, sometimes ultimately for consumption by an audience of a hundred, than for teaching their students.

This is of course not to say that professors at Georgetown are not uncongenial or terrible teachers. I have had great experiences with many professors here, as have many of my friends. It is just that many times professors are so caught up in the rat race of trying to gain tenure and write that they cannot devote themselves to their students. Some of my friends have commented on the difficulty of getting to know their professors because office hours seem very formal. Walking into the office of some professors to simply chat would be regarded as odd. There is almost the unspoken expectation that if we are going to meet with a professor we must have some specific question or area where we need help. For many of us this is vastly different than when we were in high school and we could strike up close connections with our teachers in an informal way.

I think that professors themselves are missing out on community. Georgetown sorely needs a quality private faculty club where professors could commune to relax and dine. Sure, there is a restaurant in the Leavey Center called "The Faculty Club," but this is a sorry excuse for the type of faculty club at many other universities.

Students also need to gain a better sense of community. One of the only venues for this is at sporting events, particularly basketball games. The excitement and euphoria of hard-fought victories at the Verizon Center is hard to match. I will never forget incredible sense of joy that we as a student body collectively felt in the after Georgetown beat then number-one ranked Duke on January 21, 2006. I have never experienced such elation as students rushed the floor and we all were hugging each other. If only we as students were always so nice to each other!

As Georgetown goes forward we need to ensure that we seek out the permanent things and not be swayed by the modern conventions of academia. In G.K. Chesterton's words, "Education is simply the soul of a society as it passes from one generation to another." We need to make sure that we are doing our best to have a virtuous soul as individuals and as a University. We should seek the permanence reflected in the magnificent grandeur of Healy Hall and not the transient trashiness of Lauinger Library.

Sincerely,
Eric Wind
Editor-in-Chief

Deepening Knowledge of the American and Western Tradition

Professor Patrick Deneen

This, the second issue of *Utraque Unum*, is again a testimony to our student authors, editors, and supporters of the Tocqueville Forum on the Roots of American Democracy. The first issue of the journal was an extraordinary success on campus and beyond, with several thousand copies having been distributed and over 1,500 more having been accessed online. A high standard has been established that we hope to see continued through successive generations of Georgetown students.

Started not even two years ago, the Tocqueville Forum has now hosted a large number of campus events that have addressed themes relating to American political thought, Western philosophy, the Biblical religious tradition and the prospects for liberal democracy. These events have been stunningly well-attended even by Georgetown standards, always drawing substantial numbers and at times filling to capacity the largest lecture halls on campus. Extensive student attendance at events is a particularly exciting development: while we are aware that students have extremely busy lives, we have aspired, and thus far succeeded, in attracting a large following of students who make time for events that deepen their knowledge of the American and Western tradition.

The Tocqueville Forum has sponsored well-attended voluntary reading groups on Tocqueville's book *Democracy in America* and selected dialogues of Plato; small private discussions for student fellows with special invited guests such as Princeton historian James McPherson and New York Times columnist William Kristol; and this spring hosted a joint Georgetown-Princeton student conference entitled *The Conference on the American Polity*. The Tocqueville Forum this past semester inaugurated the "Father James V. Schall Award for Teaching and Humane Letters," which was awarded for the first time this April to Professor Ralph McInerny of the University of Notre Dame. We continue to look for ways we can deepen the self-understanding of our students by providing a variety of stimulating intellectual encounters and building a community of seekers who gather gratefully to learn more about the American and Western tradition. We are grateful for the support of enthusiastic alumni, Foundations, and friends of Georgetown University who are interested in preserving and defending classical liberal learning about American constitutional democracy and its roots in the Western philosophical and religious traditions. The continued growth and success of the Tocqueville Forum has come

exclusively by means of such support; the Tocqueville Forum receives no funds from any unit of the University, and as such, relies exclusively on the generosity and enthusiasm of alumni and friends.

The Tocqueville Forum continues to make an impact on campus even at a time of tremendous change within the University and the nation as a whole. The University, following broader changes in the society, increasingly orients its attention toward international and global affairs. While a necessary and laudable goal, there is an attendant danger that this attentiveness to nations and issues outside our borders will, by default, translate into an inattentiveness and even demotion in importance of an understanding of America and the West, and will result in an atrophy of efforts to educate students about their own traditions or the tradition of the nation in which they have chosen to study. There is often a subtle but discernible rejection of such studies as overly “parochial” or narrow; too easily we lose sight of the fact that our fascination with foreign cultures is one of the enduring legacies of the Western tradition itself, dating back at least as far as the *Odyssey* of Homer and the *History* of Herodotus.

Ours has been an effort to ensure that our students adequately understand and support the principles at the heart of the American tradition and their roots in the West. The concern that such an emphasis is not similarly embraced throughout the University is likely to be exacerbated

by a series of discussions that will take place during the course of the next academic year, when there are likely to be proposals for changes to the undergraduate curriculum, some of which may entail paring back the existing requirements and possibly adding new and different ones in their place. These discussions will focus the attention of the University on what its role is, and what sort of human being it does and ought to seek to cultivate. While these discussions could and quite likely will be contentious, we are hopeful that the current support and enthusiasm among many students and alumni for the work of the Tocqueville Forum will lend credence to our concerns that the Georgetown curriculum continue to highlight, and indeed deepen, Georgetown’s historic Catholic and Jesuit tradition. This tradition in particular advances an education of the whole person through a core curriculum that focuses upon acquiring knowledge equally through reason and faith and seeks the ascent of human understanding from the diverse disciplines to an understanding of the Good. Its aim is the formation of adults of character, virtue, thoughtfulness, intellectual curiosity without the acid of pervasive cynicism and skepticism, and civic gratitude. The Tocqueville Forum will continue to emphasize and offer such an education to the students of Georgetown University, and will strive to persuade those who will listen that the University as a whole ought to seek to do the same.

On The Forgotten Origins
Of Human Science:

The Modern University and Alcibiades's Socratic Education

James Crowley

In the university today, most of us are scientists, and we can barely imagine a time when we were not. We are awed every time the precision of scientific method lends us a lens for gazing into the world or at least what we hope is the world. We trust the authority of method over the authority of scientists themselves. We trust method so much that we often try to find places to introduce it where it was not so before: in literature, in history, and in philosophy. We use method to inform our theories about the world: how our young develop into adults, how our authors compose narrative, and how a seed grows into a tree. In the university, we scientists attempt to cultivate our method in the souls of the naïve and prejudiced incoming freshmen in hopes that by the time they are seniors, they too will be good scientists.

Long before we were first awed by the precision of scientific method, there lived an ambitious, young, and beautiful aspiring statesman named Alcibiades in the ancient Greek city-state of Athens. The citizens of Athens were captivated by his beauty and physical grace. He spoke of his beauty not simply as 'a piece of good luck,' but as 'a windfall from the gods.' He was overcome with vanity; he was ambitious, but his

ambition was infused with an excess of pride. His beauty is remembered for eternity, but the failure of his practical intellect ended his mortal life. The Athenians trusted their city to him and he betrayed them in the most heinous way imaginable: he fled to Sparta during the Peloponnesian War to live under the laws of Sparta and love the Spartan queen.

The story of Alcibiades is a salient example of the failure to cultivate a young man into a good man. In one of his many dialogues with the young men of Athens, Socrates interrogates Alcibiades about what he knows. Alcibiades is the most hesitant of all Socrates's interlocutors to answer any of the questions that Socrates asks him. Alcibiades is hesitant not because he has a humble soul, but because, as Socrates tells us, he thinks excessively of himself. Alcibiades claims that he does not need any human being for anything, including practical knowledge, because what belongs to him—beginning with his body and ending in his soul—is so great that he needs nothing else. He is very handsome and tall, and he knows it. He belongs to a family that is very distinguished in his city of Athens, the greatest of the Greek cities. And his father and mother have given him many excellent men as friends to serve

him when he is in need (*Alcibiades I*, 104b). Despite all this, in life, his soul does not overcome his excess of pride, so the city overcomes him.

In the Platonic dialogues, Socrates hopes that the city will not overcome his young interlocutor. In hoping, Socrates gives us an account of science different from science as we know it today. However, Socrates is not a scientist, even according to his understanding of science. He asks questions to determine knowledge, and he figuratively ascends above his city of Athens to recover knowledge of the whole. An erotic love of wisdom drives his contemplation (not all erotic love is physical love). When he asks questions, he never abstracts from his experience of the world; he formulates his questions using the knowledge that he has gained within his home city of Athens. His life is the contemplative life of a philosopher, and not a scientist.

Despite its erotic beauty, the contemplative life of Socrates is not for all of us. Most of us live peacefully in our home city or country without having to ascend above it. We typically develop a craft or a science there and, over time, try to perfect that craft or science. Many of us gain a spouse and raise a family. We might determine that Socrates does not mean to cultivate young Alcibiades into a philosopher who ascends above the city walls to recover knowledge of the whole. Perhaps, Socrates is cultivating Glaucon into a philosopher through their dialogue in the *Republic*. In *Alcibiades*, Socrates would appear to be nurturing a political scientist in the original meaning of that term, the highest political skill.

Through his dialogue with Alcibiades, the budding political scientist, Socrates demonstrates for us the nature of human science. As Aristotle is clearer and more economical in his prose, let us start with him. Aristotle informs us at the beginning of his *Politics* that if man were the highest being, then politics would be the highest science. If a man and a woman naturally form a partnership and produce children, they just as naturally live in a household. Like the

original partnership between a man and a woman, the household in which they live naturally forms a partnership with other households to form villages. And villages naturally form partnerships with other villages to form cities. The city belongs among the things that exist in nature, and humans live in cities. Humans living in cities are political; they perform all the crafts and meet all the ends that are required for a city to flourish. In meeting these ends and performing their crafts, humans show themselves to be naturally political. Therefore, politics, Aristotle tells us, is the human science.

Socrates appears to think in the same way about the science of politics as Aristotle. Everything that Socrates knows and everything that his interlocutors know they have learned in their home city (or in contrast to their home city). They are no different in this way from us today. Like them, we know political things. We know about taxes even if we have never paid them. We know about jails even if we have never been incarcerated. We know about war even if we have never fought in one. We know about laws even before we can read them. We need not abstract from our experience in order to know these things. We need not construct theories and devise methods in order to know these things. We simply know them because we have experienced them or heard of them from our brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers, friends, or legislators. We know these things because we live with these things; we live in them.

Socrates demonstrates the activity of human science in its original form by interrogating Alcibiades about these political things. Many of these are things that Alcibiades already knows or has experienced, even if he does not know how to articulate them. Socrates does not use a scientific method to gather data or draw conclusions from Alcibiades's experience living in Athens. The Socratic Method commonly used in law schools is something that arose long after Socrates's death. Socrates sim-

ply asks Alcibiades what he knows. Socrates does not abstract anymore from Alcibiades's experience in Athens than is necessary to gain political knowledge.

The goal of Alcibiades's Socratic education is to turn him into a statesman. As Alcibiades perfects his soul, he perfects his craft. In the dialogue, he comes to possess political knowledge, political understanding, and political skill. Socrates is cultivating his young and reluctant student to become a political scientist in the original meaning of the term: *politike episteme*. Socrates asks Alcibiades about justice because Alcibiades brashly plans to advise the Athenians with brilliance unlike they have seen in any statesman before him. Socrates seeks to teach Alcibiades to love the city, while at once knowing the just. Socrates asks Alcibiades about war because Alcibiades claims to be an expert in advising the Athenians on war, even though he has never fought in one. Socrates seeks to teach Alcibiades about the manly potential for courage, while at once inculcating in him an awareness of moderation. This is the task of practical human science: the cultivation of the soul to know things through human experience, particularly political things.

For Alcibiades to become a great statesman and possess political skill in the highest degree he must be aware of the spirited part of his soul; he must somehow mate his manly inclinations with his cautious ones. Unfortunately, historic Alcibiades never realized courage in his manliness or moderation in his caution. Neither did he mate the two. Instead, he cowardly fled his city and failed in his statesmanship. He never fully possessed political knowledge in the highest form: political science, the original human science.

II. Today, we do not raise our young to become statesmen in the way that Alcibiades was raised. Perhaps we fear that our young will fail to reach their ends as statesmen,

just as Alcibiades failed. Whatever the reason for our change, we have forgotten what human science is. We have replaced it with a different sort of science that resides in and characterizes the university. This science does not begin in human experience; it abstracts from experience to fit its vision of the world into a mechanistic system. This science does not seek to know "man" or to cultivate him into a "good man;" it is more interested in bettering his condition. Had this science penetrated the Athens of historic Alcibiades, he might have learned it and become a good scientist. Then, he might not have failed his city as heinously as he did, but one wonders at what cost to his perfection.

Let us imagine that the ancient Athenians adopt the new science. They first have to build large complexes to facilitate all the research that would be necessary to develop the new science into one that better the human condition. They might call those complexes universities. Then they have to set up committees in order to recruit the most successful students of this new science to research those things that the science tells them to research, and if there is time, to teach some young and aspiring students about the new science. The ancient Athenians might call those most successful students the faculty. Then, once the ancient Athenians have established their universities and stocked them with a faculty, the faculty has to set up committees to filter out those new recruits who have diverged from the mission of the new science—those new recruits who have failed to successfully apply the accepted methods of the new science, and have instead asked themselves questions about the nature of man from their experience of man. The faculty might call these filtering committees tenure committees. The tenure committee must immediately flag Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle for heresy against the new science. And each of the three philosophers has to scrounge up enough money to build a Lyceum or an Academy where he can corrupt the youth

against the new science until the ancient Athenians decide to execute him.

Finally, once the ancient Athenians have built universities, supplied them with faculties, and created a way to filter out those faculty members who fail to apply the methods of the new science, the ancient Athenians have to figure out a way to pay for this large project. Being resourceful now that they have been trained to be resourceful by the new scientists, they turn to the city for money. But most of the citizens of ancient Athens are impatient. In exchange for funding the university, the citizens ask the faculty for more than just the research that it turns out and directs them toward bettering the Athenian condition and human condition more broadly. The citizens of Athens ask to send their sons to live in the university for four years in order to be trained by the new scientists so that these young sons of Athens do not fail and disgrace their families like young Alcibiades did.

This cycle of the new university continues until all of the young men of ancient Athens are trained to be good scientists or at least hope to be trained as good scientists. Because the new science so successfully drives at bettering man's condition and provides technology to that effect, the ancient Athenians begin to produce more sons, simply because they can. Soon, there are so many sons that the universities become too crowded to admit them all. Moreover, there are so many young men in Athens turning into good scientists that the university tenure committees can become more selective about which recently recruited scientists have the better prospects for turning out good research in the spirit of the new science. Those bona fide new scientists who are denied tenure go jobless until they notice the unmet demand for a university education among the young men of ancient Athens. In response to the demand, the untenured bona fide new scientists establish their own universities. Unfortunately, these new universities do not receive the same amount of money from the citizens of ancient Athens, because the wealthy-

est citizens want to secure a spot for their sons in the best funded, older universities with more productive faculties.

Eventually, ancient Athenian mothers and fathers worry that they have too many sons to send to the good universities. The parents of Athens start to use the technology that the university has given them to control how many sons they produce. The wealthy parents pay extra to select traits in their unborn sons that would be more likely to gain them admission into the good universities. With a good university education in the new science, the sons of the wealthy men of Athens replace the beautiful yet brash Alcibiades as the aspiring statesmen of the greatest city in ancient Greece. The citizens of ancient Athens never again have to contend with the potentially anguished consequences of a brash young leader like Alcibiades. The ancient Athenians are so pleased with the fruits of the new science that they grow tired of the ancient symbols of the time before the new science. In order to forget that painful time before the new science, they rename their city in a manner fitting the new science. Instead of Athens, they call it the New Atlantis.

Unfortunately for the ancient Athenians trying to rewrite their history to better capture their awe for the new science, the Germans beat them to the discovery of the university built on the premise of the new science over two millennia later. And around the end of the Second World War, we Americans imported and perfected the idea of this university. We Americans have so stalwartly and swiftly planted into the ground our idea of a university education in the spirit of the new science that it has become a rite of passage for all the young men and women of our country. We are so awed by the precision of the methods that have arisen from the new science that many of us have forgotten what the original purpose of the new science is. But that hardly deters us. Despite our forgetfulness, most of us call ourselves scientists or are trained as scientists and do not realize it. We are awed by the

precision of the scientific method even more than the young and ambitious Alcibiades captivated the ancient Athenians with his beauty and physical grace.

III. We are so awed by the precision of scientific method that we often create multiple methods in case one fails us. When the method of the Cartesians seems dried out, we look to the method of the Baconians. When we have difficulty applying either method to the study of literature or history, we make up a new method. We might call it psychoanalytic literary criticism or post-structuralism. Whatever we call the method that we use, it is methodical and it is scientific. We may not believe that we have adopted a scientific method. Often the method requires that we shun science in speech. But we do so methodically and without prejudice, one might say scientifically.

The new science liberates us, or so the other new scientists tell us. It removes us from our singular culture. It lifts us from the realm of opinion and prejudice and turns us into something that we could not be without it: perhaps cosmopolitans, perhaps doubters, perhaps bona fide new scientists. It liberates us from our earlier conception of the nature of man. It does not bore us with lofty ambitions to perfect man; instead it brings man down to earth. In liberating man from his earlier or permanent nature, the new science often encapsulates him within measurable parameters, be they sociological, economic, or biological. We scientists understand man as either a product of those parameters or the scientist who measures those parameters.

Take the vision of man that Darwin leaves us. Darwinian man does not rise above or even conquer nature because he is above it, like a god. Rather, he seeks to rise above because he is part of a nature that is a base and brutal struggle for existence, like Hobbes's state of nature, but

impermanent, uncontrollable, and containing its own principles of constitution. Darwinian man can never transcend nature or fully conquer it, because he is part of it. He must remain in the severe struggle for existence, or else he ceases to exist at all. He has risen because he is part of nature. And if he is base or if he falls, it is because he is part of nature. Darwin writes of man's rise and his ambition in nature:

Man may be excused for feeling some pride at having risen, though not through his own exertions, to the very summit of the organic scale; and the fact of his having risen, instead of having been aboriginally placed there, may give him hopes for a still higher destiny in the distant future. But we are not concerned with hopes or fears, only with the truth as far as our ability; and we must acknowledge, as it feels for the most debased, with benevolence which extends not only to other men but to the humblest living creature, with his god-like intellect—with all these exalted powers—Man still bears in his bodily frame the indelible stamp of his lowly origins.¹

Darwinian man is ambitious like Alcibiades. If Alcibiades is proud, Darwinian man clearly is. But Darwinian man will never be confused for his godlike qualities, as Alcibiades is. Alcibiades is beautiful from birth. He captivates the Athenians with his beauty and physical grace. Darwinian man, on the other hand, is base from birth. His beauty is relative to the beauty of his fellow man. If he is godlike, it is not because he possesses some eternal key to nature; he is part of a harsh, brutal nature. If he is godlike, it is only because with his intellect he can try to temper the brutal struggle in which he lives. But he can never transcend nature, nor can he possess qualities that transcend nature,

¹ Darwin, Charles. *Descent of Man*. From *So Simple a Beginning*. 2006. Ed. E. O. Wilson. New York: Norton. p. 1248.

like Alcibiades's divine beauty. Nature gives Darwinian man qualities that seem godlike, and nature can take those qualities away. When Darwinian man ceases to exist, when his mortal life ends, so too do all of his qualities. None of his qualities resides in the divine, but only in the earthly, the impermanent, the base, and ugly struggle that characterizes Darwin's vision of nature. Darwinian man's perfection in nature is inconceivable.

Whether we are Darwinians or not, some of us may not be satisfied with the scientific account of man because we think that it does not provide us with an accurate meaning of man. Whatever our scientific account of man, it will only be concerned with bettering his condition. It will not tell us much about his true being, his ethereal beauty, or his essential, yet fallen goodness. Plato, on the contrary, is concerned with these three things.

Plato gives an account of the perfection of man, and Alcibiades is man-exemplar. Alcibiades and Socrates search for the perfection of man or virtue in the good men (*Alcibiades I*, 124e). Good men, says Alcibiades, are gentlemen. And gentlemen are sensible men. They will exercise prudence in ruling cities. The good man, Socrates and Alcibiades concur, is the man who can rule cities (*ibid.*, 125d). The gentleman who rules cities is a statesman, and his virtue is the science of properly ordering his city (*politike episteme*). If the city is man writ large, as Socrates proposes to Glaucon at the beginning of Book II of the *Republic*, and the family is naturally in between the two, then one can only conceive of man as inseparable from the city. Man is not a naturally introspective and solitary being composed of many identities packed into a single escapable self so much as he is a citizen of a particular city and a thing with a permanent nature. He checks his passions and his appetites with reason that is external from his own mind. And

he understands himself to be virtuous when he lives in a particular city, has been cultivated in the custom of that city, and orders his soul and his city according to practical reason. This is the original understanding of the nature of man and the original human science.

I am not the first and surely not the last to wonder if we have lost something worth keeping by forgetting this Platonic account of man and human science. Plato's human science is one that does not abstract from experience using method. Plato's is a science that resides in human experience and envisions the perfection of man. In doing so, it reserves a place for an occasional lover like Socrates to pursue those higher questions about theoretical knowledge of the whole, without reducing that knowledge to thrifty scientific theories informed by dogged method. Because of the Chestertonian nature of this argument, I will conclude with a line from Chesterton's *Heretics*:

A man can understand astronomy only by being an astronomer; he can understand entomology only by being an entomologist (or, perhaps an insect); but he can understand a great deal of anthropology merely by being a man. He is himself the animal which he studies.²

I suppose that I am a heretic for writing this piece, though not in the sense that Chesterton understands the term. I believe that there should be more of us scientific heretics in the university today, more of us advocating the cultivation of good men and women over the education of scientific mechanists.

James Crowley is a senior in the Georgetown University College of Arts and Sciences studying government.

² Chesterton, G.K. *Heretics*. 1986. San Francisco: Ignatius Press. p. 155.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

Revising the Death of God: Charles Taylor and the Secular Age

Lukasz Swiderski

The problem with philosophy as a field is that it often disregards the history of thought. Bernard Williams, the late British philosopher who made it a point to deflate the ahistorical vacuum, indicated two thinkers who shared his view—Alasdair MacIntyre and Charles Taylor. Williams described their projects thus: “We all assume some historical commitments, they on a more ambitious scale than I, and perhaps there is a nervous competition for who writes the most irresponsible history.”¹

In an apparent effort to lose that contest, Charles Taylor provides us with a meticulously researched 874-page account of the changing conditions of belief in the Western world. At its core, *A Secular Age* carries a polemic that Taylor has been directing for more than forty years. Taylor wages a war on several fronts, but its chief target remains a certain approach to social theory, modeled after the natural sciences, that heralds the imminent “death of God.” If we look at history, Taylor argues, we will find that belief is still very much around, though in ways that irresponsible reductive theories fail to see.

When Taylor arrived at Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar in 1952, the story goes, he encountered

fierce hostility to religion. In response, Taylor, a Roman Catholic, set himself to dismantling its justification—the purportedly ‘objective’ and ‘empirical’ epistemology of social science. The idea of conducting social studies around objective universal laws comes from a line of thinkers from Francis Bacon to J.S. Mill. It was perhaps Mill who most famously articulated their ambitions for the study of humanity. “It falls far short of the standard of exactness now realised in Astronomy,” he declared, “but there is no reason that it should not be as much a science as Tidology is...”² Much of social theory since then has gone about its research program, confidently anticipating the arrival of (as William James put it) a Newton or Lavoisier that would put the human sciences on the same grounds as physics or chemistry.

It isn’t difficult to see why, in the meantime, secularization theory has become the living proof that universal laws directing human life do exist. After all, Western societies just several centuries ago were permeated by religion. Now, they are hardly so. Max Weber was the first to offer an explanation: the rise of the Protestant ethic led to a surge in economic behavior, and our worldly concerns pushed out faith. In the

¹ Bernard Williams, “The Liberalism of Fear,” *In the Beginning Was the Deed* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005) p. 54

² John Stuart Mill, *The Logic of the Moral Sciences* (Chicago: Open Court, 1994) p. 32

ensuing “disenchanted” universe, religious decline became inevitable. Contemporary secularization theories largely follow Weber, telling tales of loss. In their simplest forms, these accounts³ assert that, with modernization and historical progress, (1) religion is driven out of the public sphere and (2) religious belief declines. Cases like American religiosity are mere exceptions to a universal trajectory towards unbelief.

Taylor rallies against such “subtraction stories” in his book. The problem, he asserts, is that such arguments are underpinned by an “unthought” background that makes them sound so convincing. This underlying outlook holds that religion *must* decline because (a) it is either false, (b) becomes irrelevant next to the explanatory power of modern science, or (c) loses out because it is tied to notions of authority that modern societies undermine. The modern polemic against religion, Taylor stresses, involves something more than a convincing argument against God’s existence. For that argument to even be possible today, something must have happened that created the context for unbelief or religious doubt.

Taylor’s reworking of the secularization thesis must be viewed in the light of his well-developed approach to social theory. In his seminal article, “Social Theory as Practice,”⁴ Taylor argues that a society consists of a set of institutions and practices which cannot exist or be carried on without certain self-understandings. Social theory arises “when we try to formulate explicitly what we are doing” and its role involves bringing “practice out in the clear; that its adoption makes possible what is in some sense a more effective practice.”⁵ Taylor’s commitment to social understandings reappears in *A Secular Age* when he introduces the concept of

“social imaginaries,” the shared understandings that make our common practices possible.

Taylor indicates that our social imaginaries also extend to “the wider grasp of our whole predicament, how we stand to each other, how we got to where we are, how we relate to other groups, etc.” (172-173). Given this backdrop, one can see why Taylor portrays theoretical subtraction stories as a mucky morass. Instead of articulating the experience of shifting religious self-understandings and practices, they tell a butcher’s tale of societies “sloughing off” their religious past.

Taylor tackles one such butcher’s tale when discussing the effects of evolutionary theory on the decline of faith. At its crudest, the standard subtraction story describes the transition as: Science Refuted the Bible. Taylor pushes against this interpretation, stating: “What happened here was not that a moral outlook bowed to brute facts. Rather we might say that one moral outlook gave way to another” (563). The face-off between ‘religion’ and ‘science,’ in which traditional belief loses out to scientific rationalism, is thus “a chimaera, or rather, an ideological construct” (332). The ideological account fails to describe the reality of secularity because a society could not have ejected its religion-centered social imaginary without having created or discovered alternate sources of self-understanding. Otherwise, it would have disintegrated.

Taylor shows that an alternate social imaginary was already in place at the perceived changeover. What really occurred was people found something more appealing, more mature, and “readier to face unvarnished reality” in the scientific stance; according to Taylor, “the superiority is an ethical one” (365). However, once society attached itself to the new secular social imaginary, “then the very

³ Steven Bruce’s *Religion in the Modern World: From Cathedrals to Cults* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) is the most forceful expression of the orthodox theories of secularization.

⁴ Chapter 3 in Charles Taylor, *Philosophy and the Human Sciences: Philosophical Papers 2* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

⁵ *Philosophy and the Human Sciences*, pp. 93, 105

ethic of ‘science’ requires that the move be justified retrospectively” in terms of proofs (366). The subtraction story took over, penetrating into social consciousness. Reaching behind the veil of self-congratulating *fait accompli* tales, Taylor uncovers a deeper process of shifting social and moral self-understandings.

If not the inevitable march of subtraction, what, then, ushered in the transitions to secularity? As Taylor puts it, why is it so challenging and seemingly immature to believe in God in the modern West, whereas it was unthinkable *not* to just some 500 years ago? Taylor’s masterful account begins with the “enchanted” world of medieval carnivals. In 1500, the West existed immersed in the magic of communal rituals, sacred relics, and holy sites. Individuals saw themselves as part of God’s wider cosmos; the modern distinction between the “inner self” and the “outer world” did not yet exist. Situated in this magical reality, Western civilization felt God’s hand permeating its daily life.

At some point in Late Latin Christendom, however, reforming elites tried to purify and discipline society by making it “more consonant with the demands of Christian spirituality” (158). Communal religiosity was demoted, individual discipline introduced, and the sacrament of confession stressed. Taylor confesses that he has no explanation for the Western proclivity towards Reform, but he does highlight its consequences. The Reform project largely backfired, removing magic from the universe and setting the stage for the secular humanist alternative.

According to Taylor’s complex narrative, religion did not so much recede as new alternatives appeared. When the disciplined individual found autonomy in the universe, God still existed, but we could now manipulate His universe. Responding to the Deist position, the Romantics relocated God’s presence to Nature. Eventually, humanism divorced God from the world altogether. Taking our eyes off transcendence, we found authenticity and fulfillment in our tempo-

ral existence, most recently through the cultural revolutions of the 60s, for instance. Meanwhile, religion experienced its own splintering of spiritual options, from Catholic reform to Protestant Pentecostalism. Altogether, the West experienced a “Supernova Effect,” an exploding meteor shower of moral alternatives.

And so we arrived at what Taylor calls the “Immanent Frame.” Western societies march on among a plethora of diverse options, with belief and unbelief at the two ends of the scale. With the presence of so many alternatives, religious belief has naturally declined. Moreover, as we have become increasingly aware of the alternatives, the hold of our respective positions has weakened. Our religious practices dangle anxiously somewhere between the two ends, in a constant “cross-pressured” state. To find the highest source of human flourishing, the modern Western individual faces the dilemma of an ever-expanding set of choices.

A Secular Age thus ultimately battles against irresponsibility. It pulls the rug from out under reductive social theories that fail to acknowledge that their claims to universality represent but one ideological outlook among many. Taylor targets academics like Richard Dawkins (of Oxford, which remains as incorrigible as Taylor left it), whose appeals to reason and science betray a moral commitment of their own. Taylor also issues a warning to believers to be wary of fundamentalism—from religious-driven violence to attempts to restore Christendom in the West and cast out unbelievers. As inhabitants of this pluralistic supernova, we must instead figure out how to move forward together within our inherited historical context. Therein is our burden of responsibility. How we do will be measured by that one universal constant—history.

Lukasz Swiderski is a sophomore in the Georgetown University Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service studying ethics.

On The Dangers Of Thinking, And Other Oddities

Father James V. Schall, S.J.

"There is nothing more profound in the life of the intellect than our eagerness to know, without tepidity and without fear, under conditions of a certitude totally determined by the power of truth."

– Yves Simon, *A General Theory of Authority*, 1980.¹

"A young man who wishes to keep his soul atheist cannot be too careful of his reading. There are traps everywhere—'Bibles laid open, millions of surprises,' as Herbert says, 'fine nets and stratagems.' God is, if I may say so, unscrupulous."

– C. S. Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*.

"Now the human intellect, in gaining the knowledge of such truths (as known from reason) is hampered both by the activity of the senses and the imagination, and by the evil passions arising from original sin. Hence men easily persuade themselves in such matters that what they do not wish to believe is false or at least doubtful."

– Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, #2, August 12, 1950.

L Seldom does it occur to us that the people who have to be most careful of what they read are rather those who do not want to discover or live the truth. The libertine or atheist is pictured as someone who can, with impunity, read anything he wants. The hapless believer it is said must, to protect his faith, be severely restricted in his reading habits. Actually, ever since at least Aquinas, Catholics in particular have understood that they often know more of

what the atheist holds than the atheist himself. And to go back earlier to Augustine, he found out by trying them out himself that the problems with heretical and agnostic positions existed. He discovered from personal experience that they did not work in life.

Believers are required, by the requirements of intellectual integrity, to state fairly and accurately what any opposing position to faith or reason might maintain of itself. If the faith is true, as its

¹ Yves Simon, *A General Theory of Authority* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980), 91.

adherents maintain, they must, as a consequence, also know what is not true. As Chesterton implied in his *Heretics*, to know what is not true is almost as much fun as knowing what is true. Indeed, any full knowledge of what is true includes an accurate knowledge of what is not true as proposed by its best representatives. When we understand why errors arise against a truth, Aristotle taught us, we can better understand the truth to which they are opposed.

C. S. Lewis made this point in the famous passage, cited above, in which he solemnly and amusingly warns the budding atheist of the dangers of reading, of letting just anything into his soul. He cannot underestimate the power of words or of the consistency of his own mind as it ponders what these words mean. Strange things happen to us when we find out that the solemn reasons we propose to justify our rejection of faith or reason are not logically valid or, when spelled out, even particularly convincing to anyone. Error is much more tempting before it is articulated than after its full dimensions are comprehended.

The confident non-believer finds, to his surprise, that no one in the faith really holds what he thought he did. Lewis playfully says that God, when it comes to His devious providence concerning the salvation our souls, is “most unscrupulous.” In strict theology, the atheist may not love God, but God stubbornly loves the atheist and understands his argument. Only one of the two has a divine mind. The atheist has his work cut out for him. It is “odd,” isn’t it, to hear someone like Lewis give fatherly advice to the young atheist. He tells him, if he wants to keep his intellectual peace of mind, he must not examine his own premises too carefully. He must avoid certain paradoxical books. He cannot be too cautious. He has to protect his lack of faith assiduously.

The old Index of Forbidden Books, for which the Church suffered so much ridicule, not total-

ly unjustified, was premised on the notion that it was dangerous for one’s faith to read certain tomes and tractates, many of which were considered to be classics. The early books of Plato’s *Republic* make the same argument, beginning with the dangers of reading Homer. Our souls are also formed by what we read. Plato may be where the Church got the idea that books could be dangerous, though it is not particularly difficult to figure out why. Plato actually thinks, probably with good reason, that disordered music is more dangerous to our souls than reading the books of atheists and sundry other thinkers and poets with peculiar explanatory notions of reality. Pope Benedict may think this dire effect on our souls is also true of Church music whose leveling down has been one of the most debilitating consequences of post-Vatican II liturgy.

Today, however, with some version of the Great Books Programs present somewhere within most universities beyond Chicago, where the idea was first formulated, it is dangerous not to read them, at least if someone wants a degree. Their reading is even hailed as a kind of intellectual salvation, as if what the content of what they read did not matter. But what makes a “great” book great already requires a discernment that depends on an operative philosophy of *what is* that is not simply another great book.

Moreover, it has long been the advice of prudence that, in general, we should not read anything, even the Bible, until we are prepared to understand it. We should also be aware, as Leo Strauss said, that great books “contradict” each other. When this contradiction occurs and we notice it, such reading should cause us to think. The principal purpose of thinking is to resolve apparent or real contradictions in our affirmations about *what is*. We want to see in what sense what is presented for our understanding is or is not true. Thinking is distinguishing. It is, in fact, a great delight. We first simply want to know.

Plato warned us, however, that “to lie and to have lied to our soul about the things that are, and to be unlearned, and to have and to hold a lie there is what everyone would least accept; and that everyone hates a lie in that place most of all” (382b). If the best thing that can happen to us is to know the truth; the worst thing is to lie to ourselves, and know that we lie, about this same truth. We can choose not to know the truth. We should not doubt this. We should recognize this capacity from experience. When we do lie to ourselves, we must formulate plausible reasons for our unwillingness to admit what is true, for our lying to ourselves. The great danger in being endowed with a mind consists in the fact that we can use it as a tool, yes, a “rational” tool, to protect ourselves from *what is*.

II. Camille Paglia recently told of examining with a college class in Philadelphia the meaning of the words in the famous Spiritual, “Go Down, Moses” (Washington Times, April 19, 2007). The original words were meant to express a hope for liberation by recalling, as a basis, the great Jewish Exodus from Egypt. Paglia then asked her class: “who was Moses?” Only some of the black kids knew. The “regular” students had never heard of the gentleman with the odd name. Both Moses and “Go Down, Moses” become equally meaningless in such an atmosphere. Not to know the Bible is not to know what our civilization stood for, or, of equal importance, what it stood against.

One suspects that the net result of Vatican II’s endeavor to bring more Scripture into the Liturgy and to promote the study of the Bible has been to make the Bible the least known of books, something reserved strictly for specialists with their “scientific” methodologies. But our political and educational culture no doubt does think for a good reason that the Bible is “dangerous,” more for what it says than for what it does not say. But that is right. If some-

one does not want to know what the Bible says, it is for him a dangerous book to come across as it makes considerably more sense than it is given credit by those who do not read it or do not read it intelligently.

I regularly have this same experience about knowledge of the Bible. Information about the Bible is almost non-existent among students, not even Protestant students know much. Not only is the point of the Good Samaritan practically unknown, so are Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, as well as Isaiah and Jeremiah. The most common answer I get from students to the question “what is the Trinity?” or “what is the Incarnation?” is “I don’t know,” in the sense of “I never heard of the topic before.” And they haven’t. What can one conclude from this situation besides the disappearance of practical catechetics? Well, only this, that if it is “dangerous” to read the Bible, as Catholics themselves are often accused of having historically maintained, we do not have to worry. The Bible is not much read. And when it is studied, it is studied as “literature,” not truth. Most people, uncritically to be sure, assume that “literature” does not tell the truth, so it is safe.

Still, the potential danger to the unsuspecting atheist connected with thinking is there, even in the case of the Bible. We recall from the *Confessions* of Augustine, that, at several points in his life, he was in trouble because he came across an open Bible or a book of St. Anthony. Upon the reading them, he was directly moved to change his disordered life because he understood what was said. Thus, in this context, one could say that, if Augustine wanted to keep on the path of his previously wayward habits, he should not have read the passage in Romans that he chanced upon in the garden. They read: “Not in carousing, not in sexual excesses and in lust, not in quarreling and jealousy. Rather put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provisions for the desires of the flesh” (13:13-14).

Depending on the state of one's soul, these are still dangerous words to read. They are not to be read too carefully by any atheist who has no suspicion that his worldview is not wholly immune either from enticing words of Scripture or from principles in philosophy.

III. None the less, as Yves Simon, the great French philosopher, in a happy phrase, tells us, we have "an eagerness to know." Such eagerness is not something that most normal people need a French philosopher to tell them about. For, if we reflect on ourselves, we realize that we have already experienced it, whatever we may have called it. We do not just want to know this thing or that, but we are quite "eager" to know them both. The truth not only makes us "free," as Scripture tells us, but it also excites us, enchants us, exhilarates us.

How often do we catch ourselves manifesting this eagerness for knowing? How is it that, when we read something that strikes us as true or well-spoken, we want someone else to know about it? We seek someone to tell it to. We just want to know things "for their own sakes," as Aristotle told us, and we are delighted when we do. We think that our friend can have the same experience by knowing the same truth that is free to both.

We want to know the truth of things. We ask: "What are things?" "How are they?" "Why is this thing not that thing?" About some things we can even wonder whether they are or are not. This very eagerness to know, moreover, is what is most strange and perplexing about the intellect that we, on reflection, find that we each possess. We do not give this intellect to ourselves. We are quite sure of this. We find that, from the beginning, it is already operative in us, with its own rules. These rules are usually called "logic" when systematized. Not to know or not to follow these rules has consequences. Such consequences would not happen, it seems, if there

were no connection between our minds and *what is*. Yet thinking is more than logic. Our minds are checked by reality; they do not measure it, but are measured by it.

Before we ever articulate it, we habitually use the principle of contradiction, that basic instrument of all truth-seeking. It is co-terminus with mind itself, indeed with being itself. "A thing cannot be and not be at the same time and in the same way." This principle, even when we do not explicitly formulate it, is what powers our distinction-making adventures. Truth, as Plato said, is "to know of *what is* that it is, and of what is not, that it is not." Thus, it makes a considerable difference if we think what is not really is but we do not know it. It is important for us to know of *what is* that it is, almost as if to say that our knowing the word is as important as the world itself. This is but another way of saying that "in the beginning was the Word."

Yet, why should we be so "eager" to know anything? It is not just so that we can do something with what we come to know, as if knowing were merely utilitarian. The intellect has a "life" of its own. Or better, thinking is the proper life of our kind, something that belongs to the whole person who thinks. For human beings, to be and to live is to know. *Esse et vivere est intelligere*. For us, in the order of time, the knowing presupposes our being and living. We are not called "rational animals" for nothing. Our very corpus and our senses are arranged in such a fashion that we might know what is not ourselves. Indeed, to know ourselves we must first know what it not ourselves, as if to say that the whole world of knowable things must exist before we can know ourselves. Yet, as Socrates said, to know ourselves is our first introspective duty. And unless we "know ourselves," to use the famous Delphic admonition, we can hardly know what others not ourselves are like. Knowing ourselves is itself a social act.

Unlike the atheist, we do not mind that truth is something we discover. We see no evidence that the world is completely order-less except for our own impositions on it. We are, if we be sane, delighted to know that something is actually out there in the world besides ourselves. We are glad of it. We do not make our minds to be what they are as minds, or the world to be what it is as world. The “conditions of certitude,” of what we know, are determined, as Simon says, by “the power of truth.” We are excited that something is as it is and that we know it to be so. No doubt many things there are that we do not know. Yet we would like to know them and suspect that, ultimately, they are ours to know.

In the beginning, we do not know precisely anything. Yet, as Aristotle told us, these same minds that we are given are capable of knowing “all things.” The mind is *capax omnium*. Why we wonder? That these two seemingly disparate things, the world and our minds, fit together so that one relates to the other seems, at first, unlikely, if not odd. Yet, on second thought, it seems fitting, almost as if it were designed that way. Peter Kreeft in his book, *The Philosophy of Tolkien*, makes a comment pertinent to this point: “Science has very self-consciously dropped final causality, purpose, teleology, design. That is the philosophical issue underlying the evolution by blind accident versus evolution by cosmic design debate. Atheists resist the very idea of design in nature, because they see where it naturally (designedly) leads: to a Designer of Nature.”² This is perhaps the most dangerous thinking of all, “maybe there is a design,” a theme Chesterton followed in his *Everlasting Man*.

The import of these reflections is, I think, that we are given minds so that we can be ourselves, be what we are, individual finite, unrepeatable persons who are, at the same time, deprived of everything but ourselves and yet given back

everything that is not ourselves. We are not constrained to try to be something other than we are, as if we were deprived of what is not ourselves. In a stupendous act of mysterious generosity, we are given the world because we have minds, powers capable of knowing what is not the mind itself. That is, all that is not ourselves can become operative in us through our knowing *what each thing is*.

Notice that, so far, I have said nothing about “using” our knowledge for doing something else with it, be it good or bad. We can indeed use our knowledge on the world that is not ourselves. This is what it means to be given “dominion” over the world. Indeed, we can, more dangerously, use our mind on ourselves, to refashion ourselves. This is what “bioethics” is about. Knowing of itself, to be sure, is not dangerous. How we use what we know can threaten us, but need not. In other words, our minds are also related to our freedom. It is our mind, through what we know, that gives us the power to do or make this or that, to be not determined but free. And the minute we are free, we are responsible for how we use what we know, to what we direct our minds. Still, even if we abuse our freedom, it is better to know than not to know. We retain the power of repentance and reconsideration. We are well made, not by ourselves.

Still, why do we want to know “without tepidity and without fear,” as Simon incisively put it? The initial response is because, when God looked on His whole creation, as it tells us in Genesis, He saw that it was very *good*. “Whatever is, is good,” as Aquinas succinctly put it. A correspondence exists between ourselves and the things that are not ourselves. They are there for us to know. The world is initially meant for us to know. We are to have “dominion” over it. Name it. Yes, use it.

Sometimes I think that a needless tepidity and trepidation hover about the remarkable

² Peter Kreeft, *The Philosophy of Tolkien* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2007), 87.

abundance of the world. For too many, God's "dominion" over the world, now given to man, means that the world was not to be used, only preserved. Man's presence in the world is pictured as somehow alien to the purpose of the world itself. Earth days and ecology have become an almost mystical political pantheism, closer to paganism than to anything else. It is the "Moloch" of our times to which we offer babies, in terms of population control, to propitiate its lust. This new religion gives much attention to state control and little to the wonders and extent of the human mind. The human mind is the only real wealth in the cosmos. Without it nothing would be worth anything, nothing would flourish, not even nature.

No doubt, in strict logic, before we talk about the "dangers" of thinking, it is appropriate to say something about the pleasures of thinking. Aristotle is quite insistent on the importance of the pleasures connected with thinking. He even thinks it rather a civic danger when politicians do not know or enjoy such pleasures. Now, one might say, that politicians cause us enough trouble in their own field, why encourage them to think! Not surprisingly, the classical writers warned us that the most dangerous thinkers were in fact politicians whose souls were disordered. The twentieth century added the nuance that the intellectual politicians, men such as Lenin, were not simply in it for themselves, like classic tyrants, but wanted to cure the whole world of its ills by the imposition of their ideas on reality. It never worked, but that was generally not an impediment to trying it out again anyhow. We have learned that simply because an ideology once fails is no sure impediment for someone else to try it again. Such is the charm of ideas.

The title of this essay is "On the Dangers of Thinking and Other Oddities." At first sight, it

would seem that I am suggesting that, if thinking is dangerous, not to think is the only alternative. But this is far from my thought. In an old *Peanuts* cartoon, we see Linus talking directly to an unimpressed Charlie Brown. Linus affirms: "I am a friend of all nature." With arms wide, he continues in front of Charlie: "I love people and I love birds and I love fish and I love animals and I love plant life." Almost pleadingly, Linus continues while Charlie is wondering if he is nuts. "I love without reservation! I love without qualification!" Finally, to a totally unmoved Charlie, Linus shouts, "I LOVE WITHOUT EVEN THINKING!"³ Now this is one of the principal dangers of thinking, that is, to maintain that love involves no thinking. Love is not something that takes place without thought, but something that stimulates it in its own order. To love must also mean to know; indeed in scripture that is what it does mean.

IV. Pius XII, in a famous encyclical from 1950, said that the human intellect could know many things were it not hampered by the present human condition in which we find ourselves to be a fallen race. Because of this condition, men find an excuse to do whatever they want. They actually "persuade" themselves by thinking up arguments for them to do what they wish, not what is right. They claim that they are justified because of the difficulties or obscurities of the human condition. They thus claim to have clear consciences to do whatever they already want to do and plan to carry out. This too is a danger of thinking. Notice how the Christian mind, while sympathetic to the difficulties in coming to know the truth, does not think that they excuse us.

In the fourth chapter of Ephesians, Paul writes that we should no longer be "children." We are to "speak the truth in love." Our revela-

³ In Robert Short, *The Parables of Peanuts* (New York: Harper, 1968), 207.

tion is addressed to our reason. We are not to be “tossed to and from and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the cunning of men, by their craftiness in deceitful wiles” (4:13-14). This was pretty much the point of Pius XII. Winds of doctrine, cunning, and craftiness are no doubt dangers. We can only avoid them by first understanding them.

But following a lead provided by Aristotle, we must be aware that knowledge of the truth usually depends on our being virtuous so that we do not, as we can, use our minds to justify our disordered lives. “*Men easily persuade themselves that what they do not wish to believe is false.*” Thought can be used craftily to show how what is false is really true. This is, ultimately, what ideology means; it is what rationalization signifies; it is what choosing disorderly lives leads us to. We cannot live without giving reasons for how we live. But these reasons can be in turn examined against the measure and standard of *what is*. This examination, as Aquinas taught us, is what the intelligence of faith means. It means that the dangers of thinking need to be seen over against thinking the truth.

Socrates, in conclusion, put the issue this way in the *Republic*. A man can waste his life in courtrooms, always defending himself, accusing others. Since he does not know the truth or let it rule him, he becomes “clever at doing injustice and competent at practicing every dodge, escaping through every loophole by writhing and twisting and thereby not paying the penalty, and all this for the sake of little and worthless things; ignorant of how much finer and better it is to arrange his life so as to have no need of a dozing judge” (405b-c). The danger of thinking is this cleverness in dodging and escaping penalty to pursue “little and worthless things” hardly worthy of man. The danger is to be “ignorant” of how much better a fine and noble life is. “*Men easily persuade themselves that what they do not wish to believe is false.*” The young atheist would do well not to read too much about these oddities.

Father James V. Schall, S.J. is a professor in the Georgetown University Department of Government.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

The Impact of *Hylton v. United States*: How a Sixteen Dollar Tax Led to the Sixteenth Amendment

Ashley M. McClymont

During the late 1700s, tensions between the newly formed United States and the nation of France ran high. The early U.S. Presidents wrangled with their Cabinets to find ways to finance increased military spending, which proved to be a contentious issue, particularly when broached alongside zealous talk regarding the practice of taxation. Ink flew as letters changed hands and rapidly exchanged opinions took hold across the newly formed states. At the time, there were two main types of tax that came into play—a capitation tax and an excise tax. Of these, a capitation was a flat fee charged per head at the same rate for every person. An excise tax on the other hand, was due individually, upon sale of consumable goods.¹ Whereas a capitation was a means of taxing a uniform, fixed amount per citizen, an excise was paid out in proportion to expense. Capitations were

direct taxes levied directly by the United States federal government on taxpayers, as opposed to excises which were a tax on individual events or transactions of consumable goods.²

Debates incurred talk about the best way to tax. One of the excises, a tax on the sale of carriages, proved particularly unpopular among many in the upper class, who found it contemptible that they had to pay for a good used solely for private use. In a letter to Thomas Jefferson dated June 1, 1794, James Madison wrote from Philadelphia: “The Carriage tax, which only struck at the Constitution, has passed the House of Representatives, and will be a delicious morsel to the Senate.”³ Jefferson had his own opinions—in a letter dated December 28, 1794, Jefferson wrote from Monticello: “The excise law is an infernal one. The first error was to admit it by the Constitution; the second, to act on that admis-

1 See generally 84 C.J.S. TAXATION § 5; 71 AM. JUR. 2d STATE AND LOCAL TAXATION § 20; *City of Sacramento v. Drew*, 207 Cal. App. 3d 1287, (3d. Dist. 1989); *2nd-Roc-Jersey Associates v. Town of Morristown*, 158 N.J. 581 (1999).

2 See generally United States Department of State (2004). The Constitution of the United States of America with Explanatory Notes, available at <http://usinfo.state.gov/products/pubs/constitution/constitution.htm>. US Department of State website, United States, last retrieved 2007-01-03; United States Department of the Treasury. History of the U.S. Tax System, available at <http://www.treasury.gov/education/fact-sheets/taxes/ustax.html>. US Treasury Department : Education : Fact Sheets : Taxes, United States, last retrieved 2007-01-03.

3 Madison, James. *Letters and Other Writings*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & co., 1865, p. 18.

sion; the third and last will be, to make it the instrument of dismembering the Union, and setting us all afloat to choose which part of it we will adhere to.” Jefferson went on to denigrate the excise tax as one which was universally detested by the general populace.⁴

Despite heavily divisive debate, the Carriage tax bill did pass the Senate to become law. Anyone choosing to purchase a carriage would incur a one-time tax, or special assessment, at the time of sale, or event, in the same way that consumers today must pay a tax on each carton of cigarettes they buy, included in the price on the date of purchase, and paid only by consumers who choose to purchase that particular good, rather than being included in the general income tax. Despite the fact that the Carriage bill passed into law, President George Washington found the tax troubling and asked the court to dispense legal advice on whether or not it was constitutional. The court refused to dispense said advice on the grounds that it would be overstepping its bounds to rule without a case before it. Therefore, the government devised a scheme to bring the issue before court.⁵

Enter Daniel Hylton. In February of 1796, the Supreme Court began hearings for the case *Hylton vs. United States*⁶. Charged with evasion of taxes on 125 chariots (or carriages), Hylton

argued for the inclusion of the carriage tax in the general federal tax, to be distributed via even apportionment throughout the states.

The issue of the Hylton case related to whether the tax on carriages kept for private use was a direct tax. If the tax on carriages was not a direct tax, but an excise tax, then it would be constitutional and not in violation of the Apportionment Clause of the US Constitution.⁷ The federal census became the tool by which the apportionment of representatives and direct taxes was measured.⁸ All direct taxes had to be apportioned, but all duties and excises had to be uniform, at a flat rate rather than as a proportion of the federal tax.⁹

At the time of this ruling, judicial opinions were still offered *seriatim*,¹⁰ and each judge provided his reasoning apart from the others.¹¹ In this case, one can glean from segments of each analysis. Consider the analysis offered by Justice Chase: “Suppose two States, equal in census, to pay 80,000 dollars each, by a tax on carriages, of 8 dollars on every carriage; and in one State there are 100 carriages, and in the other 1000. The owners of carriages in one State, would pay ten times the tax of owners in the other. A. in one State, would pay for his carriage 8 dollars, but B. in the other state, would pay for his carriage, 80 dollars.”¹² Chase stated that this

4 Jefferson, Thomas. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*. Washington, D.C.: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907, p. 295.

5 Stabile, Donald. *The Origins of American Public Finance: Debates Over Money, Debt, and Taxes in the Constitutional Era, 1776-1836*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1998, pp. 120-125.

6 *Hylton v. United States*, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 171 (1796).

7 U.S. CONST., art. I, § 2, cl. 3.

8 14 AM. JUR. 2d CENSUS § 5.

9 U.S. CONST., art I, § 8:

“The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States...”

¹⁰ While *seriatim* opinions are commonly issued today, they are considered “minority” opinions that are separate from the first, or “full opinion”, issued by the court. These minority opinions will either concur with, or dissent from the majority opinion. Dissenting opinions are non-binding rule of law, but serve as persuasive legal sources in the common law system of present day America. When an opinion is delivered without minority opinions, it is called a *per curiam* decision and is typically shorter in its analysis as the reasoning is usually non-controversial between the judges. *Per curiam* decisions do not have to be unanimous, however, nor do unanimous decisions have to be *per curiam*. A unanimous decision can be coupled with a concurring opinion in which a justice explains that they agree with the outcome, or holding, of the case, but for a different line of reasoning. See *generally*, BLACKS LAW DICTIONARY, (7th ed. 1999).

¹¹ *Hylton v. United States*, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 171 (1796).

¹² *Id.* at 174

would be grossly inequitable. Justice Patterson agreed, supplementing his argument with the words of Adam Smith, from the economic treatise, *Wealth of Nations*. Smith explained it thus: “The impossibility of taxing people in proportion to their revenue, by any capitation, seems to have given occasion to the invention of taxes upon consumable commodities; the state not knowing how to tax directly by taxing their expense, which is supposed in most cases to be neatly in proportion to their revenue. Their expense is taxed by taxing the consumable commodities upon which it is laid out.”¹³ Justice Iredell, in turn, pointed out that the law of the Constitution was meant to affect individuals, not states.¹⁴ The court ruled against Hylton and upheld the rule of law, finding the carriage tax constitutional on the grounds that apportionment by state would overburden some citizens over others.

In the California case, *City of Sacramento v. Drew*¹⁵, “special assessment” is a charge imposed on particular real property that is used for local public improvement of direct benefit to that property. Were this definition applied to the Hylton case, one might say that the carriage fell under the category of special assessment as it added to the valuation of Hylton’s property and directly benefited him and his guests rather than the community as a whole, therefore obviating any defense of uses as a carriage under general expenditure, and eradicating the ability of the tax on such a good to be apportioned rather than excised individually. In other words, taxes are imposed on all property for the general maintenance of federal government while individual

assessments (excises) are placed only on the property or individual to be benefited.¹⁶ This means that it would be fundamentally inequitable to apportion excises by spreading it over the population as a whole, wherein each state pays a portion of the aggregate assessment in proportion to its population. For example the aggregate in this case would be the entire tax due on all carriages bought across the country.¹⁷

The fee and tax structure of this country has changed radically since the time of the Founding Fathers. Recall that a flat fee per head, regardless of income or occupation, called a capitation tax, was instituted across the land at the time *Hylton v. United States* entered the Supreme Court docket in 1794. The federal income tax that is the norm today—charging a proportion of an individual’s income rather than his expense—had not yet been proposed and would not come into play until 1861. At this time, the Revenue Act imposed an income tax which was instituted to offset costs of the American Civil War. This Act was abolished after the war ended in 1872.¹⁸

One hundred years after *Hylton*, the Wilson-Gorman Tariff Act of 1894 attempted to impose a federal tax of two percent on incomes over \$4,000. The act was challenged in federal court as being unconstitutional by the Supreme Court’s ruling in *Pollock v. Farmers’ Loan & Trust Co.*,¹⁹ making the imposition of any income tax politically unfeasible. In 1913, the Sixteenth Amendment overruled the effect of *Pollock* on this point of law, effectively stating that, “the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source

¹³ Smith Qtd. in *Hylton. Id.* at 180, 181.

¹⁴ *Hylton v. United States*, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 171 (1796) at 181.

¹⁵ *City of Sacramento v. Drew*, 207 Cal. App. 3d 1287, (3d. Dist. 1989).

¹⁶ 84 C.J.S. TAXATION § 5.

¹⁷ *Supra*, note 1.

¹⁸ *Supra*, note 2.

¹⁹ *Pollock v. Farmers’ Loan & Trust Company*, 157 U.S. 429, *aff’d on reh’g*, 158 U.S. 601 (1895).

derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.”²⁰

It is telling to observe how the civil disobedience of just one man could bring about such a monumental turn of events, leading to a stronger Constitution by the edifying act of amendment that allowed the law to flex in order to accommodate to public policy and continue to be the best instrument for advocating the public interest. Interestingly, Hylton did not in fact own 125 carriages. The charge was brought against him in order to justify bringing the case to court so that Washington’s legal inquiry could be put to the test. In order to incur a suit against the United States, Hylton refused to pay an excise tax on the sole carriage in his possession. The original eight dollar carriage tax and subsequent eight dollar penalty accrued to Hylton did not approach the \$2,000 fee of bringing a case before Supreme Court. In order to make the charge worth the fee, the government charged Hylton with evading taxes on 125 carriages. In its quest for comprehensive judicial review, the government footed the legal bills, and the case went on. *Hylton v. United States* is monumental for it is the first time the issue of judicial review came up in court.²¹

The ability of the Supreme Court under the 1789 Judiciary Act to reject laws passed by the Congress based on their lack of Constitutionality gave teeth to the proclamations of fairness and equity through a federal system of checks and balances.²² It was such a system that marked America’s inchoate government as distinctive from the European tyrants of decades past. In a speech delivered before the Senate in 1847, Senator John Calhoun—former Vice President of the second Adams Administration—proclaimed the steadfast importance of the Constitution in “...that we have a federal instead of a national government—the best government instead of the worst and most intolerable on the earth.”²³ The importance of upholding this document remains today a distinguishing factor between American democracy and other contemporary governments. Madison called it the “cement of the Union”²⁴; John Adams called it the result of “good heads prompted by good hearts”²⁵; today the Constitution is respectfully referred to as the supreme law of the land—no statute or common law trumps its venerated virtues.

Ashley M. McClymont has a BA from the University of Colorado and is currently pursuing a paralegal certificate at Georgetown University.

20 U.S. CONST. art. I, § 9, cl. 4; U.S. CONST., amend. XVI.

21 The court found that the tax was constitutional. Not until 1803 in the landmark case *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, would the court actively assert its power of judicial review by striking down part of the Judicial Act of 1789 in the name of upholding the spirit of the Constitution.

22 See Judiciary Act of 1789, § 25. The Supreme Court is given the power to reverse state laws and state court decisions that conflict with the federal Constitution.

23 Edward Jayne, *Oliver Ellsworth: Architect of the Constitution*, *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine* (August-September 1977) pp. 703-705, revised August 1, 2004, available at http://www.edwardjayne.com/judicial/O_Ellsworth-Architect-of-the-Constitution.pdf, last retrieved 2007-01-05.

24 Madison’s Inaugural Address (1809), reprinted in *The American Presidency Project* [online]. John T. Woolley and Gerhard Peters, *The American Presidency Project* [online]. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California (hosted), Gerhard Peters (database). Available from world wide web: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=25805>, last retrieved 2007-01-06.

25 Adams’ Inaugural Address (1797), reprinted in *The American Presidency Project* [online]. John T. Woolley and Gerhard Peters, *The American Presidency Project* [online]. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California (hosted), Gerhard Peters (database). Available from world wide web: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=25802>, last retrieved 2007-01-06.

The Patriotism of America's Catholic Universities

Father Stephen M. Fields, S.J.

Forty-five years ago John Courtney Murray SJ published his groundbreaking work *We Hold These Truths*, which he subtitled as Catholic reflections on the American proposition. Murray's view of American democracy compellingly reaffirms the patriotic service that Catholic universities offer our nation.

Murray understands the American proposition to be enshrined in our country's motto, *e pluribus unum*, printed on every greenback of whatever denomination. *Out of many, one*: for Murray, this means that however much dissension, disagreement, and divergence characterize public argument in America, they do not threaten the underlying consensus that maintains our civic order.¹ So much of course could be said as a commonplace. But Murray's incisive eye looks deeper. It sees that the American proposition is founded on a realist epistemology, crystallized in the notion that truths are self-evident. Truths are objective, universal, and accessible to human reason. Deny this epistemology, he claims, then deny the American proposition. Deny the proposition, eviscerate civic order. Eviscerate civic order, then obviate the possibility for peace, justice, and freedom.²

This basic syllogism serves as an oracle reminding us of the American proposition's tenuousness. Voices from many quarters are all too loud nowadays in their denial of its major premise, the realist epistemology. Not the least of these voices is shouted cacophonously from the contemporary university, for whom truth is too often merely a matter of opinion. (It is amazing how quickly this relativist view of truth breaks down when a student complains about receiving an "unfair" grade. Suddenly both teacher and student find themselves marshaling universal arguments for justice. At root, there is something instinctively connatural about the realist epistemology.)

For those, however, who may be skeptical of a full-blown realist epistemology, as worked out by an Aquinas or a Suarez for instance, it is evident that at least this must be conceded to Murray. As a matter of historical and practical fact, the realist epistemology forms the basis of the American civil union. If it is to be replaced, then the entire proposition, together with the institutions that are derived from it, needs major overhauling. Put this way, then all of us, no matter what epistemology we personally subscribe to, have a vested interest in sustaining the realist

¹ John Courtney Murray, SJ, *We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960), x.

² *Ibid.*, viii-ix.

one. If we wish to avoid anarchy, then we need to accept it as the firm ground on which the forms of public order are built.

The chief form of American public order, contends Murray, is neither the House nor the Senate, neither the Executive nor the Judiciary. It isn't Jefferson's eloquent *Declaration*, nor Madison's high-minded *Papers*, nor even our revered *Constitution*. It is rather the presupposition of all these. It is a shared belief in the efficacy of public argument. By public argument, Murray means the continuing debate about the nature of the consensus that grants America's forms of civic order their legitimacy.³ The efficacy of this debate cannot be reduced to free speech, nor to the license of personal expression, nor even to the equitable process of letting all sides be heard. Efficacy obtains when public conversation is disciplined by, and sustained according to, the laws of reason. Efficacy means that public conversation is not merely process-driven; it is resolution-oriented. The resolution that emerges from public debate may not embrace universally shared conclusions. But it should at least be able to express those differences that can be tolerated, and why; and those that cannot, and why not.⁴ In short, the efficacy of public argument means that truth is realizable and capable of transparency. Such is America's debt to Socrates, Cicero, and Augustine.

Why is the American proposition so tenuous? Ever precarious, it lies in perennial danger of hosting the corrosive cancer that Murray calls barbarism. The essence of this is the inability of public argument to function efficaciously.⁵ Barbarism, Murray reminds us, results from the ambiguous nature of the human person, prone

to the avarice, prejudice, passion, and solipsism that blind and befuddle reason. Thus handicapped, errant reason concomitantly skews and sunders the delicate balance between individual freedom and civic order, as the American proposition incarnates it.⁶

Murray's thinking about the foundation of American democracy offers both encouragement and prophecy to Catholic higher education. As we survey the state of the university in America, or for that matter in the industrialized West, we find a potpourri of views about the nature of human reason. Some of these are fabricating the university into an incubator for the barbarism that Murray deplors. Let us take J. M. Roberts' analysis for starters. This former Warden of Merton College Oxford observes that the contemporary university has entered into complicity with the rampant materialism and relativism of modern society. The value of the university, he says, especially the public university, is increasingly becoming its ability to manipulate nature, to create wealth, and to augment power.⁷ Such a view, I suggest, makes human reason the hostage of avarice. The growth of avarice makes the civil order more prone to the plutocratic ambitions of capital, corporate lobbying, and cartels.

Then there is the opinion of Donald Kennedy, formerly president of Stanford. He argues that the current leadership of American higher education has failed "to create sharply individualized, recognizable identities" for America's colleges and universities.⁸ This failure fuels the increasing trend in the Academy to homogenize the methods of inquiry and the subjects of research. Obviating a healthy diversity of per-

³ Ibid., 9.

⁴ Ibid., 13

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid., 14.

⁷ J. M. Roberts, "The Idea of a University Revisited," in *Newman after a Hundred Years*, ed. Ian Ker and Alan G. Hill (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), 193-222, esp. 201, 221.

⁸ Donald Kennedy, "Making Choices in the Research University," *Deadalus* 122 (1993): 127-56, esp. 149.

spectives, this trend compromises the academic freedom that is the life-blood of the university. The result, I submit, makes human reason the hostage of prejudice. The institutionalizing of prejudice renders the impressionable young more prone to the group-think of fascism.

There is also the postmodernist view. At its best, as John Ellis of UC Santa Cruz observes, postmodernism seeks to redress a moral flaw. The West's dominant forms of thought have tended to eclipse the minority voices of race, class, and gender.⁹ At its worst, however, postmodernism seeks to deconstruct these forms of thought without replacing them.¹⁰ Jean-Francois Lyotard, a prominent postmodern thinker, summarizes the movement's efforts in what he calls the "fission of meaning." By this he means (ironically) that reason entirely lacks any center, any generalizable laws governing it.¹¹ When reason is thus hollowed out and left an empty shell, the human person is rendered the hostage of passion. The rational deregulation of passion hands the civil order over to the invidious cant of the demagogues.

Finally, there is the secular view posited by the Enlightenment. It is antithetical to postmodernism. In fact, it serves as the *magna carta* of the modern university, insofar as this can be traced to Germany, and from there to Johns Hopkins, and then to the proliferation of graduate education and research according to its model. This view still reigns, however implicitly, at least in its distrust of religion and theology in the university. As Kant argues in *The Conflict of the*

Faculties, only philosophy is an autonomous discipline, because only it is governed by free rational inquiry alone. Therefore, since disciplines like theology tend to accept received traditions blindly and uncritically, it is the university's role to purge them by autonomous reason of their proclivity to superstition.¹²

The problem with this view is that it turns reason into a fetish or a talisman. As the contemporary French thinker Maurice Blondel demonstrates, the laws of reason demand an object not bound to time and space in order to explain themselves and to satisfy their need for an ultimate resolution. Consequently, when reason is mistakenly thought to be self-sufficient, it becomes an idol believed capable of achieving universal perfectibility. But this belief, like a sorcerer's conjuring, is chimeral. Far from purifying religion of superstition, the secular view itself devolves into superstition.¹³ When this superstition of reason is enshrined in the university, it makes the human person the hostage of an arrogant solipsism. In turn, this renders the civil order more prone to the strident self-confidence of ideologies, especially chauvinism and imperialism.

Avarice, prejudice, passion, and solipsism: these are Murray's definition of barbarism. Their ramifications that I have just suggested show the fatal flaw in Bill Readings' recent work *The University in Ruins*. He argues that it is both misguided and anachronistic to continue sustaining the university as the seed bed of our cultural self-knowledge as a nation.¹⁴ Grant him

9 John M. Ellis, *Literature Lost: Social Agendas and the Corruption of the Humanities* (New Haven: Yale University, 1997), 27-28.

10 *Ibid.*, 117f.

11 Jean-Francois Lyotard, "The Sign of History," in *The Lyotard Reader*, ed. Andrew Benjamin (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 409-10; see also *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988); cited in Thomas R. Flynn, "A Reply to Kenneth L. Schmitz," in *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 73 (Spring 1999): 261-66, esp. 262.

12 Immanuel Kant, *The Conflict of the Faculties*, trans. Mary J. Gregor (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1962); cited in Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge: Harvard University), 56-61.

13 Henri Bouillard, S.J., "Philosophy and Christianity in the Thought of Maurice Blondel," in *The Logic of the Faith* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967), 161-85, esp. 68-72. Bouillard summarizes the argument of Blondel, *Action* (1893), trans. Oliva Blanchette (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1984), 43-322.

14 Readings, *University*, 12, 15.

this, then grant us the increased likelihood of plutocracy, fascism, demagoguery, and ideology.

Most importantly, Murray's prophecy about the tenuousness of the American proposition leads us to reaffirm the high service that the Catholic university performs in maintaining our democracy. This service is insufficiently appreciated. Even our founder, the priest-patriot-prelate John Carroll, thought of Georgetown's benefits, not so much as civic, but as cultivating personal virtue and feeding the Church with ministers.¹⁵ By contrast, Murray reminds us that American civil order is founded on an implicit model of human reason that is the guarantor of our freedom. This model is realist, because a realist understanding of truth sustains the efficacy of our public argument about ourselves. We undermine this model to our social peril. At a time when other models of reason in the American academy are courting this peril, the Catholic university presupposes a realist model congenial with the American proposition. This does not mean that other models, and those who believe in them, should not hold appointments in Catholic higher education. It does mean that the realist model should flourish there. By exercising a pride of place, it inhibits the reduction of reason to its own supposed autonomy. In this way the Catholic university advances the interests of academic freedom, to which *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* unequivocally commits it.¹⁶

The hallmarks of the realist model that Catholicism sustains are embedded in the motto that, through Georgetown, Carroll bequeathed

to us all – *utraque unum*. It means that faith and reason harmoniously yield access to the unity of the true, the good, and the beautiful. This unity is transcendent; it is the goal of reason, as well as the energy that drives reason. It means that faith is primarily a rational act, not reducible merely to love, trust, and sentimentality. As rational, faith advances humanity's understanding of the ultimate nature of reality, even as free rational inquiry into the nature of reality cannot help but more deeply articulate the truth offered by faith. Religion and theology thus diversify the university's methods of research and subjects of inquiry. They widen the search for truth by augmenting the perspectives that analyze problems. Without a transcendent perspective, for instance, empirical reason will inevitably induce us to do what we should not. Similarly, the range of the human imagination will be narrowed, limiting the creativity that triumphs over the merely mimetic and static.

If barbarism is to be combated and our nation's freedom sustained, the realist epistemology that undergirds the American proposition needs aggressively to be developed. It needs to be brought into critical dialogue with other views that run counter to it. America's Catholic universities are distinctively qualified to do this, not only for the sake of religion, but as a dutiful act of patriotic piety.

Father Stephen M. Fields, S.J. is a professor in the Georgetown University Department of Theology.

15 R. Emmet Curran, *From Academy to University 1789-1889* (Washington DC: Georgetown University, 1993), 12, 14-15; vol. 1 of *The Bicentennial History of Georgetown University*.

16 John Paul II, "Apostolic Constitution," *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, of the Supreme Pontiff, on Catholic Universities, in *Catholic Universities in Church and Society: A Dialogue on "Ex Corde Ecclesiae"*, ed. John P. Langan (Washington DC: Georgetown University, 1993), 229-53, esp. section 12 and note 15.

William Wilberforce's Vision of Real Christianity

Justin R. Hawkins

On October 28, 1787, at the age of 28, William Wilberforce wrote in his diary, "God has set before me two great objects, the suppression of the slave trade and the reformation of morals." These two great objects colored every endeavor he pursued, both personal and political. His guiding vision was his Christianity and his desire to resolve the discrepancy between what the popular conceptions of Christianity in nineteenth century Britain were and what real Christianity, as espoused by the Bible, actually was. The goal that consumed Wilberforce's life was the revival of not simply morality, but Christian morality; and his many interests—abolition the foremost among them—were the practical examples of his consuming vision for a renewed Christianity.

Wilberforce wrote extensively on the topic of Christian morality. After the Slavery Abolition Act of 1833 was passed, Wilberforce condensed all of his musings on the topic into a little-known treatise regarding Christian morality as he saw it, which he rather verbosely titled *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians in the Higher and Middle Classes of this Country, Contrasted with Real Christianity*. His seminal work on morality, this treatise contains enough to make the modern religionist cringe. In it Wilberforce thoroughly abandoned all semblance of political correctness in favor of the passionate expressions of the convictions of his heart which cry out from

every page in this sincere appeal for the revival of Christian morality in Britain. Wilberforce's plea was directed toward those who, believing in the veracity of the Bible, considered themselves to be Christians.

Wilberforce came to Christianity in 1785 at the age of 26, only one year after he took office as a Member of Parliament representing Yorkshire. An energetic young Independent, his political career seemed to be inevitably blossoming ahead of him. However, when Wilberforce converted to Christianity, it became obvious to him that he had found something revolutionary. So overwhelming was his newfound love for God that Wilberforce initially considered giving up his promising political life in favor of a solely religious one. The political events in which he was engaged seemed infinitesimally trivial when compared to the eternal mysteries that now tantalized his imagination and intellect. Yet it soon became clear to Wilberforce that God had providentially placed him in his privileged position for the sake of doing a great work.

Wilberforce's calling came one year later when he was approached by several prominent abolitionists looking for a voice for their cause in the House of Commons. They approached Wilberforce because he was one of the few principled MPs left in the House which was dominated by members who supported slavery because of its economic advantages. Nevertheless, Wilberforce was hesitant when first

approached by the abolitionists. He had converted to evangelical Christianity only two years before and was still torn between a life of political service and one of professional ministry. In his view, there was no possible marriage of the two. The abolitionists, however, disagreed. The movie *Amazing Grace* contains one scene which depicts the moment out of which his abolitionist passion was born. Famed British abolitionist Thomas Clarkson tells Wilberforce, "We understand that you are having some difficulty deciding whether to do the work of God or the work of a political activist." After a moment of pregnant silence, Hannah Moore, the English writer and vehement opponent of slavery, whispers, "We humbly suggest that you can do both." From this moment forward, Wilberforce's life would be one that was decidedly political, but guided by his Christianity. He was an unashamedly Christian politician. From Wilberforce's own writings it is clear that his work in abolishing the slave trade was one tangible example of the transformative effect his newfound Christianity had on him. However, it must be noted that while he is widely-known for his work in abolition, Wilberforce viewed himself first as a Christian with obligations. His two great objects—the abolition of slavery and reformation of morals—were connected, but they were never equal in Wilberforce's own eyes. He was first a Christian, and as a result of his Christianity, he was also an abolitionist.

Wilberforce's own approach to abolition was unique even from most of his fellow abolitionists. They viewed slavery as a great injustice in itself (which it obviously was), but Wilberforce took his diagnosis a step further. He viewed slavery not as a social problem solely, but as a symptom of a deeper moral problem which was prevalent in his time. Fittingly, abolition was not his ultimate end, but only the means to his end of reestablishing a moral foundation in his homeland. As he considered virtue in Great Britain, Wilberforce saw universal decline.

Morality was being degraded. Value was placed on financial stability over ethical conduct, and religion was faltering. Churches were no longer being filled; men were becoming lewd and selfish; and the overall religious state of the nation was slipping into moral anarchy. Wilberforce commenced his writing of *Real Christianity* to combat such trends and call men back to true Christianity.

Where religion was being diluted in every area of the country—often by religion's self-proclaimed adherents—Wilberforce stood as a solitary voice calling his nation back to a significant, meaningful, Biblical Christianity. His criticisms were aimed at those people whom he refers to as "self-professed Christians," and he reserves his most poignant criticisms for those people who, claiming to be Christians, were living lives of moral debauchery. These people Wilberforce refers to as "Nominal Christians." He contended that the popular notions held by the majority of nominal Christians were deeply flawed, almost to the extent that the people who espoused them could no longer be reasonably called Christians. To a man of such strong principle as Wilberforce, this lukewarm vacillation between the competing worldviews of Christianity and secularist-induced moral relativity constituted what was, to him, the most pressing domestic danger of his day. The first step in his reformation of morals would be the destruction of the aforementioned "popular notions" of Christianity.

Wilberforce identified two insufficient and faulty beliefs among nominal Christians, and he leveled his criticisms against these. The first popular notion that Wilberforce explodes is the belief that Christianity is simply a religious creed. Holding that belief, some nominal Christians had chosen a non-substantive, non-demanding Christianity that only consisted of regurgitating the Christian creeds without thought or meditation. But this was too shallow. For Wilberforce, Christianity could not simply

be poetic words, but rather consisted of noticeable action—"faith without works is dead" (James 2:17). Because he believed Christians had an obligation to impact the world, it was deeply painful for him to witness the religious and spiritual apathy that accompanied the mechanical recitation of creeds unaccompanied by substantive action. To Wilberforce, the nominal Christians who claimed to believe the Bible but made no attempt at righteous living were the worst of hypocrites and blowhards.

The second fallacy that Wilberforce attacked was a deficiency of another sort. Conversely to the aforementioned mindless readers of creeds, this second group ignored creeds and beliefs altogether in favor of only good works. They deemed it unnecessary to have a religious and moral backing to their good works but considered true Christianity to consist of simply being "good men." But this also was too shallow for Wilberforce; did Jesus die to make us simply good men, decent and moderate in our actions (146)? Could we not do that on our own, without Jesus coming to earth to be tortured and killed? Wilberforce believed that there was something more, something deeper, that the second group of nominal Christians had fully overlooked.

Wilberforce's firm conviction was that Christianity is not only a creed; it is neither only a moral code. It is both a belief in God, the truth of Scripture, and the personhood of Jesus (creed) combined with a moral code, grounded in theology, that governed human thought and behavior (conduct). Neither aspect was dispensable, and neither was more essential than the other. Creed and conduct were the two legs upon which Real Christianity stood. The result was a Christian worldview that permeated all aspects of life and resulted in firm love for God articulated in the creed and unshakable dedication to Him expressed through conduct. The nominal Christians, devoid of either of Real Christianity's two legs, were as cripples hob-

bling through their spiritual lives in mediocrity and weakness on account of the shortcomings of their diluted faith.

Wilberforce held that the cause of the prevalent tepid thoughts and feelings regarding Christianity was ignorance; the nominal Christians simply did not understand the severity of the issues that were being dealt with because they were ignorant of what the Bible said about them. Since his work was directed toward supposed Christians, Wilberforce assumed belief in the Bible and based the entirety of his arguments upon that Book. But he also acknowledged that it was perhaps fitting for the truth to have lost its impact among nominal Christians because most of them did not *actually* believe it. If the Bible is true when it says that man is wicked and that a just and eternal punishment which we deserve on account of that wickedness awaits us, then the significance of the redemption offered through Christ cannot be overstated. But that truth had lost its impact, even among those who verbally assented their belief in it. In response, Wilberforce advocated a revolution in thinking spurred by a deeper knowledge of Biblical truths among Christians who must recognize the dire predicament from which Christ has rescued them. This, he believed, would cause men to return to "Real Christianity" and stir up a passion in them for renewed dedication when they discovered the true gravity of Christianity. To this end Wilberforce dedicated himself in the only way he knew how, tirelessly and wholeheartedly. He was a staunch proponent of Real Christianity until his death in 1833.

Though now almost two centuries removed, Wilberforce's vision of Christianity is as relevant today as it was in his time. Twenty-first century America faces many of the same challenges as did nineteenth century Britain. If Wilberforce were alive today he would surely diagnose America with an acute case of pervasive nominal Christianity. Today, Christianity is often con-

ducted with minimal thought or effort. The “popular notions” against which he so eloquently spoke are returning and regaining their prevalence. Both the supporting legs of Creed and Conduct which Wilberforce believe to be indispensable are now being amputated, often by the very people who espouse belief in Christ. While Wilberforce's Christianity spurred him to take action to oppose injustice, abolish slavery, and promote human rights; modern nominal Christianity in America has, in large part, ceased influencing behavior to the point where the title *Christian* means very little today.

Wilberforce would have been appalled to learn of Christianity's banishment from the courts and legislatures of this country and its relegation to the closet to be suppressed and concealed. The outcry against “legislated morality” would undoubtedly strike him as utterly absurd. There was no doubt in Wilberforce's mind that slavery was a moral issue—a moral issue on which he proudly took a moral stand and against which he tirelessly advocated moral legislation. The bifurcation of American life into the public secular life and the private religious life is reminiscent of the nominal Christianity which Wilberforce viewed as a direct threat to the foundations of a free country in Britain. It is institutionalized hypocrisy which abandons its adherents to live without a rational and consistent foundation of belief.

Wilberforce's passionate appeal for moral reform—his second ‘great object’—serves as a call to action to Christians whom Wilberforce believed should be on the frontlines of positive revolutionary change in the world. Action in the political realm by Christians was not only a right, but a duty and a solemn obligation. And the opportunities for positive activism are as prevalent now as they were in Wilberforce's time. When looking out at our malady-inflicted world we may echo Wilberforce: “Where is it that in such a world as this, health, leisure, and affluence may not find some ignorance to instruct, some wrong to redress, some want to supply, some misery to alleviate” (159)? Wilberforce saw such deficiencies in his world and his Christianity spurred him to action. Were he alive today, he would certainly have more than a sufficient number of causes to which to dedicate himself. His vision was not of a comfortable Christianity free from obligations and exertion, but of a revolutionary, world-impacting Christianity that must come to fruition through action undertaken with the most determined dedication and tireless resolve.

Justin R. Hawkins is a freshman in the Georgetown University College of Arts and Sciences studying government.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

This article is unavailable for public access at this time.

America's First Catholic Family: the Carrolls

Amanda Marie Murphy

Centuries before the Kennedy clan captured the imagination and filled the tabloids of American society, the equally Irish and perhaps much more Catholic Carrolls were forging the very nation that allowed families like the Kennedys to survive and flourish. The story of the Carrolls is one of persecution, tragedy and triumph. In Ronald Hoffman's *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland: A Carroll Saga 1500-1782* their story comes alive. Deprived of their land and livelihood in Ireland and marginalized in colonial Maryland society, the Carroll family became the wealthiest and most successful family in the new United States of America. Their journey is the ultimate tale of the American dream.

Every Georgetown student knows at least the name of John Carroll. Some even know that he was the first Catholic bishop and then archbishop of the United States. However, for most of us, the last time we hear about our great founder is at our GAAP weekend. Little do we know how inextricably linked Georgetown University is to the Carroll family. To put it simply, if it weren't for them this place would not exist.

Hoffman centers his story around the three most important patriarchs of the Carroll dynasty: Charles Carroll the Settler, Charles Carroll of Annapolis, and Charles Carroll of Carrollton, famous for being the only Catholic to sign the Declaration of Independence. Each

man's life represents the three different phases Hoffman distinguishes as important to the Carroll saga: the Irish pioneer, the Maryland planter, and the American revolutionary.

The history of the Carrolls begins in the wilds of the Gaelic heartland of Ireland, beyond the reaches of the English Pale. For centuries the Carrolls were the chieftains who ruled the land known as Ely O'Carroll, on the border of the modern day counties of Leinster and Munster. The early Carrolls were perpetually engaged in the power struggle between their fellow Gaelic chieftains, the great Anglo-Irish families that had been entrenched since the Norman invasion, and the ever present encroachment of the English crown. As the Protestant rulers of England began implementing exclusionary policies aimed at destroying the Catholicism of the Irish and settling Protestant Scots and Englishmen in their place, the ancient Gaelic families allied themselves with their Norman-Irish coreligionists. The moderation of the Stuart dynasty gave way to the repression of Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate that not only deprived Catholics of their land and civil rights but also dispossessed them of their land, creating a Protestant landowning hegemony that would continue in Ireland until the twentieth century. Although a small respite was afforded Catholics under the Stuart restoration of Charles II and the brief rule of the Catholic

James II, the so-called Glorious Revolution would be anything but peaceful and just to the Catholics of the British Isles.

In this dangerous period of 1688, a young law student named Charles Carroll decided to try his fortunes in the new colony of Maryland, founded by Charles Calvert (Lord Baltimore) as a safe haven for Britain's persecuted Catholics. The first American Carroll, Charles Carroll "the Settler" came to the colonies with an ambition for success sharpened by the years of persecution by England's Protestant regimes. His emigration was to mark a new era in the history of the Carrolls. To commemorate this important occasion Charles Carroll the Settler changed the slogan on the Carroll family coat of arms from "fide et in bello forte" ('Strong in faith and war'), to the ringing declaration 'Ubi cum libertate' ('Anywhere so long as there be freedom')." However, like most immigrant stories, the Carrolls encountered the very same prejudice they had left behind.

Soon after Charles Carroll the Settler arrived in Maryland, the proprietary rule of the Calverts over the colony was overthrown by a rebellion of Protestants. Anti-Catholic laws were enacted barring them from all aspects of public life. Thus the Carrolls now faced the same kind of persecution that they fled. Charles Carroll the Settler could have abandoned his faith and joined the Protestant Church of England, but he was made of sterner stuff. Realizing that the family's future would not be protected by the legal establishment, he fixed his attentions on creating an economic dynasty in which the Carrolls' position in society would be protected by their immense wealth.

The Settler's son Charles Carroll of Annapolis would continue and greatly expanded his father's legacy. With his shrewd eye for business, he managed to augment the family's wealth, adding several plantations in addition to the Settler's manor at Doohoragen. Despite his economic success Charles Carroll of Annapolis

experienced an even greater anti-Catholic bigotry than that of his father's day. Several times throughout the early decades of the eighteenth century the Maryland legislature debated the confiscation of all the property and assets of the colony's besieged Catholics. In fact, these bills came so close to passing that Charles Carroll of Annapolis contemplated moving the family to the French colony of Louisiana. This rampant anti-Catholic prejudice instilled within the Carrolls a great distrust of the imperial establishment and an immense pride of their Irish Catholic roots.

Charles Carroll of Carrollton, or "Charley" as he was affectionately referred to by his family and friends, inherited his father's skill in business dealings. At the age of ten, Charley, along with his "Cousin Jack" (who would one day become John Carroll, S.J.) left Maryland for St. Omer College, a Jesuit school founded to educate the sons of Britain's Catholic families who were not allowed to educate their children within the imperial territories. Charley spent almost twenty years abroad, becoming fluent in French, Greek, and Latin. He studied law in London's famous Temple Bar and mingled in both French and British high society. While abroad he cultivated his mind by reading the Church Fathers as well as the great Enlightenment thinkers.

Charley returned to a Maryland quite different from that of his father. The Carrolls were not admirers of British rule and when organized dissent began to emerge in the early 1770's, Charles Carroll of Carrollton was one of the first people to speak out against British injustices. This was a marked transition from the attitude of his forefathers which privileged the family's survival over all other things. Charley recognized that this was his opportunity to become part of the public sphere in a way no Catholic had been before. His efforts were soon recognized by the Continental Congress. That his Catholicism did not seem to matter to his congressional colleagues demonstrates that

American colonial society was rapidly changing. Suddenly liberty seemed to supersede confessional differences. By throwing his lot in with the revolutionaries, Charley was allowing the Carrolls to truly become Americans. The 'Ubicumque cum libertate' of the Settler's heraldry was finally united with the 'Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness' of the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Thus Ronald Hoffman's excellent book gives valuable context to the story of Georgetown. The story of the Carrolls is something that every Hoya should know. The Carrolls were very much dedicated to reason as being inextricably

intertwined with their Catholic faith. The family's long relationship with the Society of Jesus attests to their dedication to the development of the mind as well as that of the soul: the cura personalis, or care for the person, which characterizes Georgetown University today. Hoffman's *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland: A Carroll Saga 1500-1782* is more than just an interesting story of an interesting family; it is part of the very essence of Georgetown..

Amanda Marie Murphy is a junior in the Georgetown University Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service studying culture and politics.

*One of the requirements of becoming a Georgetown University John Carroll Fellow is to conduct research on some aspect of Georgetown University history. In the past students could fulfill this requirement by choosing a Georgetown object and writing a research project. More recent Carroll Fellows have been asked to pick a letter or series of letters in the Georgetown University archives for study. The following is the research project by a John Carroll Fellow on a letter related to the disbanding of Georgetown's football team in 1951. *Utraque Unum* will be featuring more articles related to Georgetown University history in forthcoming issues. –The Editors*

Disbanding Georgetown's Football Team

Henri Minion

Brigadier General William Horace Hobson was born on September 5, 1886, in Somerville, Tennessee. He graduated from West Point Military Academy in 1912 and performed administrative work in the Office of the Inspector General during the First World War.¹ This in turn catapulted him into a faculty position at Georgetown University, where he became responsible for the redevelopment of the university's Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) program. He stayed in this position from 1919 through 1923.²

During his time at Georgetown, General Hobson invigorated the ROTC program and produced outstanding rifle teams. He became known as a leader amongst the boys. For his service to the university, he received an honorary degree of Doctor of Military Science. Four

years after coming to Georgetown, General Hobson left to serve other schools and military programs in Kansas, Utah, and West Point.³ Yet, despite leaving the university, his heart remained on the Hilltop and he returned to his old post as head of the ROTC in 1929.⁴

General Hobson spent another four years at Georgetown, once again making an outstanding ROTC program. When he left the university in 1933, he continued to teach at other military posts in the Washington, DC, area and in Georgia. He retired in 1945 to California where he remained active in community service activities until he died. He continued to serve young men in his work with the Boy Scouts in California. Having consistently worked with young athletic men, his support of the abolition of Georgetown intercollegiate football is signifi-

¹ This information is taken from an unknown newspaper article found in the Georgetown University Special Collections. It is a clipping without any information – there is not even a page number. This article will be referenced as “Gen.” throughout this paper.

² This information is taken from a loose page out of the Georgetown University yearbook found in the Georgetown University Special Collections. There is no page number referenced anywhere on the page. This article will be referenced as “Major” throughout this paper.

³ “Major”

⁴ “Gen.”

Letter OF Transcription

Brigadier General William H. Hobson
U.S.A., Retired
Monterey Peninsula Country Club
~~Del Monte~~, California
Pebble Beach 1 January 1952

Dear Father Guthrie:

First, in my ~~first~~ letter of the New Year (1952), I extend New Year greetings to you and ~~all~~ ~~Georgetown~~, my beloved Alma Mater

Next, I write your attention to the enclosed press clippings which reflect the reaction of the San Francisco press (that is, the Chronicle, the most conservative of the City papers) to the shocking and surprising decision of the University of San Francisco to abandon intercollegiate football.

And, as you'll note, Loyola has done the same thing in Los Angeles.

So, it appears that Georgetown's pioneer example in taking such drastic action made her a ~~leader~~ in the educational field with respect to [Page Break] eliminating one of those factors in our modern educational institutions which are not conducive to the real purposes of a college education.

I hazard the guess that soon we shall see many other larger universities follow your leadership, which, I fully appreciate, required much more courage.

I congratulate you and all of Georgetown upon the big event of the year – dedication of the McDonough Memorial Gymnasium. I am glad to have a copy of the booklet, with a colored wonderful likeness of Father Mac in it, which came in the mails yesterday.

I was privileged to know and work with that great "Boyologist" in 1919-23, & 1929-33, during my two regimes as Commandant at Georgetown, and I loved and admired him all along the way.

Blessings on you, Father, and all Georgetown!

Rev. Hunter Guthrie, S.J.
Georgetown University

Faithfully, W^m H. Hobson
Georgetown 1922

cant as he was widely popular amongst the young men. Hobson died in San Francisco in 1960 at the age of 74.⁵

born on January 8, 1901, in New York City, New York.⁶ In 1917, at just sixteen years of age, he entered the Jesuit order at Poughkeepsie, New York.⁷ Guthrie received his initial college degrees from Woodstock College in Maryland and went on to study at major universities

Very Reverend Hunter Guthrie, S.J.

The Very Reverend Hunter Guthrie, S.J., was

⁵ "Gen."

⁶ This information is taken from a portion of a piece of paper found in the Georgetown University Special Collections. It has been identified by the staff as being taken from the Georgetown University Medical Bulletin, most likely from the April-May 1949 issue. This page will be referenced as "Father" in this paper.

⁷ Hailey, C6

throughout Europe, including the University of Berlin, the Gregorian University of Rome, and the University of Paris. However, prior to his European education, Father Guthrie traveled around the world as an educator, spending a significant amount of time in the Philippines.⁸ Father Guthrie was ordained in the Jesuit Order in 1930 in Maryland and took his final vows in Paris four years later.⁹ Wanting to return to education, he returned to the United States to take positions teaching at Jesuit institutions.¹⁰

Father Guthrie came to Georgetown in 1943 as the head of the Graduate School. He created a stir when he became the first dean to allow women to enroll in graduate classes.¹¹ He quickly moved up the ranks of the administration, eventually being selected president by officials in Rome in 1949.¹² While he only stayed in that post for three years because of health reasons, he is best known and remembered for being the president that saw the completion of the McDonough Memorial Gymnasium in 1951 and his elimination of intercollegiate football earlier that same year.¹³ It is ironic to note that, upon receiving word of his selection as president, a student reporter asked him what he thought of Georgetown sports. His apparent reply was the he supported them, but simply “wished that the teams were doing better....”¹⁴

Father Guthrie died in Wernersville, Pennsylvania, in 1974 at the age of 73. At the time, he was a professor of philosophy at Saint Joseph’s College in Philadelphia. While his tenure as president of Georgetown University

was short, he had a huge impact on the campus. While he made important academic changes, he will probably be most remembered for abandoning intercollegiate football in 1951.

Ending Football at Georgetown

On March 22, 1951, Georgetown University President Hunter Guthrie decided to end intercollegiate football at Georgetown. Brigadier General William Horace Hobson believed that this decision would make Georgetown a “*leader* in the educational field....”¹⁵ Hobson, who was living in the general area of San Francisco, California, at the time, parallels the Georgetown decision with that of the University of San Francisco. He enclosed three press clippings from the *San Francisco Chronicle* with his letter.

As Hobson’s letter is a reaction to the news about Georgetown University dropping its football program, his inclusion of the reaction of San Francisco to the University of San Francisco’s decision provides some insight about how the two were rather similar. One of the included articles announced that Loyola University of Los Angeles, a school run by the Jesuit Order like those of San Francisco and Georgetown, would eliminate football as well.¹⁶ According to University of San Francisco President William J. Dunne, football was eliminated because it did not meet the goals of the university.¹⁷ Similar reasons were given by Georgetown University.¹⁸

Hobson’s letter suggests that the Georgetown decision was part of a national move. In 1951 alone, “nearly fifty institutions dropped football

⁸ “Father”

⁹ Burns, 1

¹⁰ “Father”

¹¹ Hailey, C6

¹² Burns, 1

¹³ Hailey, C6

¹⁴ Burns, 1

¹⁵ Hobson, 1

¹⁶ This information is taken from the press clipping that Hobson attached to his letter. The clipping contained no pagination – it simply included the newspaper name as the *San Francisco Chronicle*. It will be cited in this paper as “Undeclared.”

¹⁷ “Undeclared”

because of rising costs and dwindling attendance....”¹⁹ For example, “Georgetown ha[d] lost \$100,000 each and every year [from 1937 to 1951]” because of football,²⁰ according to a letter sent to Dr. James S. Ruby of the Alumni Association by Reverend Guthrie. In modern amounts, that would be close to \$800,000! No university could sustain such a heavy loss every year.

While the 1950s trend was national and spanned many different types of colleges, the majority of the schools that dropped intercollegiate football had some similar characteristics. Most were located in urban environments like Georgetown in Washington, DC, and San Francisco in the downtown area of that city. These schools cited cost as their major factor – building a stadium in places with very high property costs was simply too expensive. In Washington, DC, all three major colleges (American University, Georgetown University, and George Washington University) dropped football by 1966.²¹ The other schools that ended football tended to be Jesuit institutions that claimed that football went against their academic philosophies. Thus, by the end of the 1960s, only two Jesuit colleges still had football programs: the College of the Holy Cross and Boston College.²²

This ideology is argued by Hobson, who wrote that football is “not conducive to the real purposes of college education.”²³ According to him, the purpose of attending college, especially a liberal arts college like Georgetown University, is to gain knowledge that will prepare a student

for the real world. As Guthrie wrote in an article for the *Saturday Evening Post*, “the coaching staff’s objective is not the objective of the school administration.”²⁴ The football coach looks for boys who will be good football players; the liberal arts college looks for boys who will be good professional men. This difference, President Guthrie believes, is an irreconcilable one.²⁵ Thus, intercollegiate football was removed from Georgetown University in 1951.

There were two main reasons for the abolition of intercollegiate football at Georgetown and around the nation in the 1950s. First, rising costs and lower monetary intake made it extremely difficult for urban schools to make a profit. Second, Catholic institutions strived to reconnect to their original ideologies which did not include the strong sway of sports. Hobson’s letter of support captured the essence of these two points and showed President Guthrie that his decision was a decent one that allowed other schools throughout the nation, mainly urban and Jesuit, to do the same.²⁶

Explanation of Annotations

(1) General Hobson’s letterhead has his address as being in Del Monte, California. However, he crossed that out and wrote in Pebble Beach. The reason for this is that the area was originally created as the Del Monte Properties Company in 1919 and was known by that name for years.²⁷ However, the post office for the area is officially known as the Pebble Beach Post Office. In addition, the town is known as Pebble Beach to locals.²⁸ Thus, it would seem that either name,

18 “No”, 1

19 “College”, 4

20 “Letter”, 6

21 “Chapter”, 2

22 “Chapter”, 2

23 Hobson, 2

24 “No”, 1

25 “No”, 1

26 Hailey, C6

27 This information is taken from Pebble Beach’s website.

Annotated Letter

Brigadier General William H. Hobson
 U.S.A., Retired
 Monterey Peninsula Country Club
~~Del Monte~~, California
 Pebble Beach¹ 1 January 1952

Dear Father Guthrie:

First, in my ~~first~~ letter of the New Year (1952), I extend New Year greetings to you and ~~all~~ ~~Georgetown~~, my beloved Alma Mater

Next, I write your attention to the enclosed press clippings which reflect the reaction of the San Francisco press (that is, the *Chronicle*², the most conservative of the City papers) to the shocking and surprising decision of the University of San Francisco to abandon intercollegiate football.

And, as you'll note, Loyola has done the same thing in Los Angeles³.

So, it appears that Georgetown's pioneer example in taking such drastic action made her a ~~leader~~ in the educational field with respect to [Page Break] eliminating one of those factors in our modern educational institutions which are not conducive to the real purposes of a college education.

I hazard the guess that soon we shall see many other larger universities follow your leadership⁴, which, I fully appreciate, required much more courage.

I congratulate you and all of Georgetown upon the big event of the year – dedication of the McDonough Memorial Gymnasium⁵. I am glad to have a copy of the booklet, with a colored wonderful likeness of Father Mac⁶ in it, which came in the mails yesterday.

I was privileged to know and work with that great "Boyologist"⁷ in 1919-23, & 1929-33, during my two regimes as Commandant at Georgetown⁸, and I loved and admired him all along the way.

Blessings on you, Father, and all Georgetown!

Rev. Hunter Guthrie, S.J.
Georgetown University

Faithfully, W^m H. Hobson
*Georgetown 1922*⁹

Del Monte or Pebble Beach, would result in the letter arriving at the correct destination, but one addressed to Pebble Beach would be considered more correct.

(2) The *San Francisco Chronicle* is a newspaper based in San Francisco, California. It is the most widely read newspaper in Northern California

and one of the largest newspapers in the United States. The *Chronicle* has a reputation as being the newspaper of the educated and also being highly tuned to stories reflecting education and the community. For example, it is said that 41% of the newspaper's readers are college graduates, a figure much higher than 30% of people in

²⁸ This information is taken from Del Monte Forest's website.

the area who graduated college.²⁹ Thus, it is no surprise that the *San Francisco Chronicle* printed several stories about the University of San Francisco's decision to drop intercollegiate football. That story is one that enters both the education and community realms.

(3) Loyola University of Los Angeles (now Loyola Marymount University) is a Jesuit-run school like the University of San Francisco and Georgetown University. It very much followed the example of Georgetown in its practices. For example, Georgetown created an intramural football program as a replacement of the intercollegiate one. Loyola's president, Reverend Charles S. Casassa, S.J., wrote Father Guthrie asking for "an outline of the intramural program at Georgetown."³⁰ Loyola had the intention of doing the same as Georgetown in regards to football. Georgetown led, Loyola followed.

(4) In 1938, the University of Chicago abandoned intercollegiate football, but few other universities followed. Those that did were generally small schools, like Sewanee, the University of the South.³¹ The same did not happen when Georgetown abandoned intercollegiate football. "More than fifty colleges... abandoned football..." around the same time as Georgetown³². Some of these schools turned out "solid or highly ranked teams in the late 1930s...."³³ Examples include Saint Mary's College and Duquesne University. The University of San Francisco may be one of the most notable ones following Georgetown.³⁴

In general, larger schools that followed Georgetown were run by Jesuits as well. Fordham University, the University of Detroit, Marquette University, and Xavier University all abandoned football by 1970, leaving Boston College and the College of the Holy Cross as "the only Jesuit colleges playing major college football."³⁵ Or, the larger universities were in close proximity to Georgetown, like Catholic University and the George Washington University.³⁶ While Ivy League schools did keep football, they instituted a practice known as *de-emphasis*. Not truly following Georgetown's example, they nevertheless followed the reasons for Georgetown's decision to drop intercollegiate football.³⁷

(5) The dedication of the McDonough Memorial Gymnasium was a weekend of festivities in December 1951. The program started on Friday, December 7, with various activities including a basketball game against Fordham University.³⁸ The official dedication ceremony commenced at 10:30 in the morning on Saturday, December 8, with a special dedicatory mass.³⁹ Sunday, December 9, ended the dedication weekend. The booklet that General Hobson received was a forty-four page program that had a colored picture of Reverend Vincent S. McDonough, S.J., on the third page.⁴⁰

(6) Reverend Vincent S. McDonough, S.J., was affectionately known as Father Mac by the students at Georgetown. According to some students, he was "one of the finest, one of the most

²⁹ This information comes directly from the San Francisco Chronicle.

³⁰ This comes from a letter in the Georgetown University archives from Casassa to Guthrie.

³¹ Watterson, 243

³² Watterson, 242

³³ Watterson, 243

³⁴ Watterson, 243

³⁵ This information is taken from HoyaSaxa.com, an unofficial website for Georgetown Athletics. It will be cited as "Chapter" in this paper.

³⁶ "Chapter"

³⁷ Watterson, 243

³⁸ This information is taken from the program of the dedication of McDonough Memorial Gymnasium, available in Georgetown University's Archives. It will be cited in this paper as *Dedication*.

³⁹ This information is taken from the invitation to the dedication of McDonough Memorial Gymnasium.

⁴⁰ Dedication

feared Jesuits on campus."⁴¹ Father Mac was the Moderator of Athletics and the Prefect of Discipline, so most students knew who he was. Despite being in charge of discipline, he was close with all of the students. When the *Washington Times-Herald* reported his death in 1939, they said that "in 30 years [of service to Georgetown] one can say with certainty that he never lost the friendship of one boy."⁴² Father Mac worked closely with General Hobson because Hobson was in charge of the ROTC program, a program that emphasized discipline. Accounts show that the two men were good friends during their times at Georgetown, which appear to have overlapped significantly.

(7) Using simple etymology, the term "boyologist" would be the study of boys. In Father McDonough's case, he acquired this title because of his special connection with the young men of Georgetown. He had a deep love "for athletics and the boys who took part in them..."⁴³ He "counseled them, chided them, inspired them and spoiled them..."⁴⁴ After his death, a group of students presented Georgetown with a painting of Reverend McDonough; they presented the painting as being on behalf of Father Mac's "boys".⁴⁵

(8) Commandant is "a title generally given to the heads of military schools."⁴⁶ While Georgetown University was not a military school, General Hobson acquired that title for all of his work on the university's ROTC program. In addition, since he was a commandant at other school, had he not received that title at

Georgetown, it may have been viewed as a demotion by the United States military.⁴⁷

(9) While General Hobson never formally attended Georgetown University, he was awarded an honorary degree, a degree which he received at the 1922 Commencement Exercises with all of the other graduates from that year.⁴⁸

Bibliography

- Angelo, Mark V. *The History of Saint Bonaventure University*. Saint Bonaventure: Franciscan Institute, 1961.
- Burns, George. "Retiring Fr. Gorman to Build Retreat House." *Hoya* [Washington] 23 Feb. 1949: 1+.
- Casassa, Charles S. Letter to Hunter Guthrie. 22 Jan. 1952. Special Collections. Georgetown University Lib., Washington.
- "Chapter 7: The End of One Era..." *Georgetown Football*. 7 Feb. 2007. HoyaSaxa.com. 10 Feb. 2007
<<http://www.hoyasaxa.com/sports/hist07.htm>>.
- "Chronicle Mission Statement and History." *San Francisco Chronicle*. 2005. 11 Feb. 2007 <<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/history/history.dtl>>.
- "College Football in the Age of the NFL." *Answers.com*. 2007. Encyclopedia of American History. 7 Feb. 2007
<<http://www.answers.com/topic/football>>.
- "Col. Hobson Returns." *Washington Star* 23 Aug. 1942.
- "Commandant." *Dictionary.com*. 2007. Lexico Publishing Group. 10 Feb. 2007

41 Hagerty, 88

42 This information is taken from a Washington Times-Herald article by Dick O'Brien preserved in the Georgetown University archives without pagination. It will be cited in this paper as "O'Brien".

43 "O'Brien"

44 This information is taken from an article in the Georgetown University archives that lacks pagination or the name of an author. It will be cited in this paper as "Portrait".

45 "Portrait"

46 "Commandant"

47 "Major"

48 This information is taken from 1922 Commencement Exercises Booklet, available in Georgetown University's archives.

- <<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/commandant>>.
- Conway, Ed. "Good-bye Football." *Hoya* [Washington] 11 Apr. 1951. 6.
- Dedication of the McDonough Memorial Gymnasium at Georgetown University*. Special Collections. Georgetown University Lib., Washington, 1951.
- Emmons, Mark. "Greatness Sidelined." *San Jose Mercury News* 22 May 2006. 29 Jan. 2007 <<http://usfdons.cstv.com/genrel/052206aab.html>>.
- "Father Guthrie." *Medical Bulletin* (Apr.-May 1949). Special Collections. Georgetown University Lib., Washington.
- Fenimore, Watson. "For Georgetown – no more gladiators." *Pathfinder*. [Washington] 4 Apr. 1951: 48.
- "Football." *Hoya*. [Washington] 11 Apr. 1951. 2.
- "Gen. 'Bun' Hobson, Former Commander of Ft. Benning." [Unknown Newspaper] 6 Jul. 1960. Special Collection. Georgetown University Lib., Washington.
- Georgetown University. "1922 Commencement Exercises." Commencement Booklet. Special Collections. Georgetown University Lib., Washington.
- Guthrie, Hunter. "Letter to Dr. Ruby From Father Guthrie." Letter to James S. Ruby. 22 Mar. 1951. *Hoya*. Washington: 11 Apr. 1951. 6.
- . "No More Football for Us!" *Saturday Evening Post* [Philadelphia] 13 Oct. 1951: 1+.
- Hagerty, Jack. "Four Great Men." *On the Hilltop: Reminiscences and Reflections on their Campus Years by Georgetown Alumni*. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1966. 88-91.
- Hailey, Jean R. "Hunter Guthrie, Former GU President, Dies." *Washington Post* 13 Nov. 1974: C6.
- "History & History Related Items." *Del Monte Forests*. 26 Aug. 2006. Key to the City. 11 Feb. 2007 <<http://www.usacitiesonline.com/cacountydelmonteforest.htm>>.
- Hobson, William H. Letter to Hunter Guthrie, S.J. 1 Jan. 1952. Special Collections. Georgetown University Lib., Washington.
- Invitation to a Solemn High Mass of Dedication*. 8 Dec. 1951. Special Collections. Georgetown University Lib., Washington, 1951.
- "Major William H. Hobson, Commandant." *Ye Domesday Booke* 1930. Special Collections. Georgetown University Lib., Washington.
- Murphy, Francis X. Letter to Hunter Guthrie, S.J. 31 Oct. 1951. Special Collections. Georgetown University Lib., Washington.
- O'Brien, Dick. "Fr. M'Donough, Ex-G.U. Sports head, Dies." *Washington Times-Herald* 14 Apr. 1939.
- "Pebble Beach Company History." *Pebble Beach Resorts*. 2007. Pebble Beach Company. 11 Feb. 2007 <<http://www.pebblebeach.com/page.asp?id=1378>>.
- "Portrait of G.U.'s Father Mac Presented by 'His Boys.'" *Washington Star* 12 Oct. 1946.
- Ruby, James S. Letter to Senator or Board Member. 30 Mar. 1951. Special Collections. Georgetown University Lib., Washington.
- "Undeclared Dons Won't Play in '52." *San Francisco Chronicle* 31 Dec. 1951.
- Unidentified Article. "Maj. William H. Hobson" *Washington Star* 2 Nov. 1930. Special Collections. Georgetown University Lib., Washington.
- Watterson, John Sayle. *College Football*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Henri Minion is a sophomore in the Georgetown University Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service studying international history.*

Father Walsh and the Founding of the School of Foreign Service

Emily Solis-Cohen

I. Transcription of the Letter

War Department
Committee On Education And Special Training
Section Of Training And Instruction Branch
War Plans Division, General Staff
New England District
Rogers Building, 491 Boylston Street
Boston, Mass

Boston Nov. 23 1918

Dear Fr. C:

I have the following to report: Went to Fordham and saw Joe Farrell regarding his brother. His brother James is sick at present but he says he thinks he can be interested. He says that as soon as James is somewhat better, he (Joe) will arrange a meeting in Albany and he will go up with me to help on our case.

Saw Mr. Jos. O'Neil, President of Federal Trust and got his co-operation. He is enthusiastic about the idea and is writing a letter to Cooksie, Asst. Treasurer of the U.S. urging him to interest himself in the new Department. O'Neil says we have an unequalled opportunity. I told him I should expect \$25,000 through his office some way or other. He is going to think it over and suggest some sources.

Saw Judge DeCoursey of Supreme Judicial Court who is equally enthusiastic. He wants you to call a Regents' Meeting very soon to get the thing really started. Mentioned that he would be free of court business the weeks of Dec. 9th and 23rd. He and O'Neil both spoke of that man whom Fr. Donlon was anxious to reach—Mr. Longyear. This might appeal to him. I will look him up. DeCoursey thought men like Schwab should undoubtedly be approached now. He also mentioned Charles Neal, Labor Commissioner as a source of expert information. Maurice Francis Egan is now available for lecture etc. He thought we might get Agar's interest around on a project of this kind.

Judge DeC. and I took a walk together along Beacon St. and talked over the prospects for Georgetown. He is very enthusiastic and believes we must not let the chance go by.

Any news from Dr. Constantine McGuire? Has he finished that preliminary letter yet? We might let it be known that one of the chairs will be against Socialism. Public men and financial men will appreciate that.

Have no new information about S.A.T.C. When you write to me, send letters to B.C. High—or if to this office, mark them “*personal*,” otherwise they might be opened in my absence under the assumption that they concerned routine office work.

D. Rodriguez has left Boston—for N.Y. Thence after a short time to Tampa, I presume. With regards to all,

Edmund A. Walsh

II. Introduction of the Sender

Father Edmund Aloysius Walsh, S.J., known as the founder of the School of Foreign Service (SFS) at Georgetown University that bears his name, was born in Boston, Massachusetts on October 10, 1885. Despite his boyhood dreams of joining the Navy, he entered the Jesuit Novitiate at Frederick, Maryland in 1902 and was ordained a priest in 1916. A professor of literature at Georgetown from 1909 to 1912, Fr. Walsh succeeded Fr. Creeden as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in May 1918 when the latter ascended to the presidency. Within months of this appointment, however, Fr. Walsh was called by the War Department to serve as Assistant Director of the Student Army Training Corps (S.A.T.C.) and dispatched to Boston, where he became known as “the soldier priest.” At the conclusion of World War I in November 1918, Fr. Creeden offered Fr. Walsh the Regency of the newly conceived School of Foreign Service. Walsh held this post from 1919 to 1921, and again from 1924 to 1952, when he was also Vice President. During his four-year hospitalization after a cerebral hemorrhage in 1952 Walsh held the titles of Regent Emeritus of the SFS and Vice President Emeritus of the University.

From 1922 to 1924, Fr. Walsh served as Director of the Papal Relief Mission to Russia by the appointment of Pope Pius XI in the wake of the 1921 famine. Fr. Walsh’s first-hand observations of and interactions with the officials, intelligentsia and masses of the Soviet Union profoundly impacted his geopolitical views and convinced him that Communism would prove to be a truly global menace. Fr. Walsh’s other notable diplomatic work included directing the Campaign for Funds for the Relief Work in the Near East (1927-28), assisting in the settlement of Church claims in Mexico (1929), serving as a consultant to the U.S. Chief of Counsel at the Nuremburg Trials (1945-46) and traveling to Japan as an Official Visitor of the General of the Society of Jesus for the erection of a Vice-Province (1947-48).

Fr. Walsh died October 31, 1956 at Georgetown Hospital, and the SFS was officially named for him on September 1, 1957.

III. Introduction of the Recipient

Father John Creeden, S.J. served as President of Georgetown University from 1918 to 1924, and in accepting Dr. Constantine McGuire's proposal for a department dedicated to training foreign service personnel, also can be considered the founder of the School of Foreign Service.

Born in Arlington, Massachusetts on September 12, 1871, Fr. Creeden entered the Society of Jesus at Frederick, Maryland in 1890 and was ordained a priest in 1905. He taught at Georgetown from 1897 to 1902, returned in 1909 as Athletic Director and Prefect of Studies, and served as Dean of the College from 1909 to 1918.

During his presidency the Board of Regents authorized a major expansion plan for the University in 1922 that included the construction of the Hospital and Medical and Dental Schools. To finance this undertaking, Creeden announced the creation of the Georgetown Endowment Association to organize a two-year, \$5 million capital campaign — the first such drive in Georgetown's 133-year history.

In the spring of 1920 the President of Venezuela awarded Creeden the Medal of Public Instruction — the highest educational honor bestowed upon a foreign national—in commemoration of the founding of the School of Foreign Service.

On November 20, 1921, Creeden received French Marshal Ferdinand Foch at Georgetown and awarded him an honorary degree of Doctor of Canon and Civil Laws. Marshal Foch was also presented a gold sword on behalf of the American Society of Jesus.

Upon leaving Georgetown Fr. Creeden taught philosophy at Boston College from 1924 to 1926. In 1926 he founded the Boston College Law School and served as Regent until 1939. Spiritual Counselor at the Cranwell Preparatory School in Massachusetts from 1939 to 1942 and at the Jesuit Novitiate in Shadowbrook, Massachusetts from 1942 to 1947, Creeden died on February 26, 1948 in Boston.

IV. Contents of the Letter

This letter summarizes Fr. Walsh's activities regarding the two main concerns in organizing a new academic department: funding and faculty. When the armistice ending World War I was signed on November 11, 1918, the War Department immediately disbanded the S.A.T.C. and Fr. Walsh returned to Georgetown. Appointed Regent of the nascent School of Foreign Service just days before writing to Fr. Creeden, Fr. Walsh began networking with various friends, colleagues and associates in the Boston area in order to identify potential donors and professors.

Although Fr. Walsh served as the chief architect of the SFS, Dr. Constantine McGuire appears to have been the driving force behind the original proposal. In a March 1918 meeting arranged by Fr. Richard Tierney, S.J., McGuire discussed with Fr. Creeden the possibility of establishing a school to train personnel for careers in the State Department, Commerce Department and international business. Fr. Creeden officially accepted the plan in a May 1918 memorandum, provided that the necessary capital could be raised and experienced professors could be recruited. At their June 1918

meeting the Board of Regents of Georgetown University unanimously authorized Fr. Creeden to establish the new department. The provisional inaugural semester began on February 16, 1919 and the formal opening ceremony took place on November 25, 1919. Appropriately located in the nation's capital, Georgetown's School of Foreign Service was the first institution of its kind in the United States.

It is of note that Georgetown began using the term "foreign service" before its formal adoption by the State Department in the Rogers Act of 1924. As Fr. Walsh expounded in his address entitled "The Aims of the School of Foreign Service" during the inaugural exercises, the "foreign service" included all types of international representation in the public and private spheres including commercial, financial, and diplomatic activities. The United States could no longer afford to shirk its global responsibilities: "Unprepared as we were for war, we have highly resolved that we shall not be unprepared for peace. Having entered upon the stage of world politics and world commerce, we assume worldwide obligations."

Fr. Walsh's appointment to the War Department proved particularly auspicious in that he perceived first-hand the deficiencies of diplomacy and foreign language studies at American colleges compared with those in other nations. While American dignitaries were generally knowledgeable and well cultured, their education was hardly formalized before 1919. Preoccupied with domestic politics and industrial development during the nineteenth century, Americans had little concern for cultivating an elite diplomatic corps. The First World War, however, thrust Americans into the international arena, thus rendering McGuire's vision even more salient.

Although Fr. Walsh provides informative descriptions of certain figures, James Farrell, Schwab, and D. Rodriguez cannot be identified positively based on the context of the letter. It is unclear what he hopes to discuss with James Farrell, what DeCoursey thinks Schwab might provide, and what McGuire's "preliminary letter" concerns. Other unresolved issues include the exact date of Fr. Walsh's appointment to the Regency of the SFS and if O'Neil's office followed through with the \$25,000.

Fr. Walsh's letter reveals the sheer number of leads he had to pursue just to commence the practical organization for the SFS. In less than three months his enthusiasm and perseverance yielded a two-year certificate program with seventy third-year students and seventeen faculty members. Walsh only became more dedicated to the SFS as it evolved, a sentiment McGuire echoes in a letter to the Very Reverend Father Provincial dated April 29, 1953: "The Foreign Service School was his major concern. He put all that he had into it. Whatever the School is, he has made it."

V. Annotated Text of the Letter

WAR DEPARTMENT¹
 Committee on Education and Special Training
 Section of Training and Instruction Branch
 War Plans Division, General Staff
 New England District
 Rogers Building, 491 Boylston Street
 Boston, Mass

Boston Nov. 23 1918²

Dear Fr. C:

I have the following to report: Went to Fordham³ and saw Joe Farrell⁴ regarding his brother. His brother James⁵ is sick at present but he says he thinks he can be interested. He says that as soon as James is somewhat better, he (Joe) will arrange a meeting in Albany⁶ and he will go up with me to help on our case.

Saw Mr. Jos. O'Neil⁷, President of Federal Trust⁸ and got his co-operation. He is enthusiastic about the idea and is writing a letter to Cooksie, Asst. Treasurer of the U.S.⁹ urging him to interest himself in the new Department¹⁰. O'Neil says we have an unequalled opportunity. I told him I should expect \$25,000¹¹ through his office some way or other. He is going to think it over and suggest some sources.

Saw Judge DeCourcey¹² of Supreme Judicial Court who is equally enthusiastic. He wants you to call a Regents' Meeting¹³ very soon to get the thing really started. Mentioned that he would be free of court business the weeks of Dec. 9th and 23rd. He and O'Neil both spoke of that man whom Fr. Donlon¹⁴ was anxious to reach—Mr. Longyear¹⁵. This might appeal to him. I will look him up. DeCourcey thought men like Schwab¹⁶ should undoubtedly be approached now. He also mentioned Charles Neal¹⁷, Labor Commissioner as a source of expert information. Maurice Francis Egan¹⁸ is now available for lecture etc. He thought we might get Agar's¹⁹ interest around on a project of this kind.

Judge DeC. and I took a walk together along Beacon St²⁰. and talked over the prospects for Georgetown. He is very enthusiastic and believes we must not let the chance go by.

Any news from Dr. Constantine McGuire²¹? Has he finished that preliminary letter²² yet? We might let it be known that one of the chairs will be against Socialism²³. Public men and financial men will appreciate that.

Have no new information about S.A.T.C²⁴. When you write to me, send letters to B.C. High²⁵—or if to this office, mark them "*personal*," otherwise they might be opened in my absence under the assumption that they concerned routine office work.

D. Rodriguez²⁶ has left Boston—for N.Y. Thence after a short time to Tampa, I presume. With regards to all,

Edmund A. Walsh

VI. Notes

1) When the United States entered World War I in 1917, the War Department called Fr. Walsh into service. Named Assistant Educational Director of S.A.T.C., Fr. Walsh, along with four other educators, organized the academic training at colleges taken over by the government to prepare draftees. Fr. Walsh was assigned to Corps Area Number One, which included 32 colleges in New England.

2) The date of the letter, November 23, 1918, is especially significant because the Armistice ending the war with Germany was signed on November 11, 1918. It was at the conclusion of World War I that Fr. Creeden appointed Fr. Walsh Regent of the nascent School of Foreign Service.

3) Fordham University is a Jesuit university in New York.

4) Rev. Joseph A. Farrell, S.J. (1875-1957) was a professor of history and mathematics at Georgetown University from 1907 until 1912 and again from 1916 to 1917. As financial officer of the Papal Relief Mission and the American Relief Agency, Fr. Farrell accompanied Fr. Walsh on his mission to Russia from December 1922 to June 1923. Fr. Farrell also served as treasurer of Georgetown from 1927 until 1943, sub-minister from 1943 to 1944, Spiritual Father from 1945 to 1951 and Confessor in 1951. Born into a prominent newspaper family in Albany, New York, Fr. Farrell entered the Jesuit Novitiate at Frederick, Maryland in 1902. He studied philosophy at Woodstock College (Maryland) from 1904 to 1907 and returned there in 1912 to complete his studies of theology. In 1915 James Cardinal Gibbons ordained Fr. Farrell a priest. Minister at Fordham University from 1918 to 1920, Fr. Farrell also was Rector of Brooklyn College from 1920 to 1926. It was during Fr. Farrell's tenure at Georgetown that the White-Gravenor building, Copley Hall and the Medical and Dental School were constructed, and in 1950 Fr. Farrell was awarded the first Georgetown University

Vicennial Medal "to the men who have devoted twenty years or more to Georgetown in its advancement of Catholic education" in honor of his 28 years of service to the University.

5) James Farrell (1870-1920), brother of Rev. Joseph A. Farrell, S.J. While no records concerning this James Farrell could be located, it should be noted that James Augustine Farrell (1863-1943), President of the U.S. Steel Corporation from 1911 to 1932, provided the initial endowment of \$20,000 to the School of Foreign Service in August 1919. James A. Farrell became a Regent of the University in 1920 and served as chairman of the Regents' Committee in Charge of the Foreign Service School. In 1922 James A. Farrell was awarded an honorary Doctor of Laws for his extraordinary gift to the University and his many accomplishments in the world of business. In 1932 James A. Farrell began teaching a graduate course in the SFS—"Present Problems in Foreign Trade"—for which he traveled from New York to Washington once a month to conduct class. Even after his passing James A. Farrell continued to enrich the Georgetown community: in May 1960, his son-in-law J.B. Murray donated to the University the Samurai Sword that the government of Japan presented to Farrell for having provided emergency portable bridges during the Russo-Japanese War of 1905.

6) Albany, New York. The Farrell family owned the Albany Times Union newspaper.

7) Joseph Henry O'Neil (1853-1935) was a Massachusetts banker and politician. He served in the Massachusetts State House of Representatives from 1878 to 1882 and represented Massachusetts' Eighth District in the United States House of Representatives from 1889 to 1895. Appointed by President Cleveland, O'Neil served as Assistant Treasurer of the United States at Boston from 1895 to 1899. Fr. Walsh probably visited O'Neil to enlist his support in securing funds for the endowment of the new Foreign Service School.

8) The Federal Trust Company of Boston, which merged into the Federal National Bank in 1922. O'Neil organized Federal Trust and served as its president from 1899 until 1922 and chairman from 1922 until his death in 1935.

9) "Cooksie" [sic] is actually George R. Cooksey, assistant to Secretaries of the Treasury McAdoo, Glass, Houston, and Mellon from March 6, 1917 to October 8, 1921 after serving as the private secretary of Secretary McAdoo from 1913 until 1917. Cooksey was Director of the War Finance Corporation (1920-1929), a Member of the Federal Farm Loan Board (1927-1932), Vice President of the Board of Trustees of Electric Home and Farm Authority (1935-1941), Secretary of the Disaster Loan Corporation (1937-1941), Secretary of both the Metals Reserve Company and of the Board of Directors of the Rubber Reserve Company (1940-1941), and a Member of the Board of Directors of the Defense Supplies Corporation (1940-1941). His son, George R. Cooksey, Jr., graduated second in his class from the College of Arts and Sciences at Georgetown University in 1930. Cooksey died on July 25, 1941.

10) The "new Department" most likely is the School of Foreign Service, itself, since the SFS originally was intended as a department, rather than an entire school. In June 1918 the Board of Regents authorized President Creeden to establish a new department to train personnel for the Foreign Service.

11) \$25,000 would be equivalent to \$333,774.83 in today's dollars.

12) "Judge DeCourcy" [sic] is Charles Ambrose DeCourcy (1858-1924) of Lawrence, Massachusetts. A Massachusetts Superior Court justice from 1902 to 1911 and Massachusetts Supreme Court Justice from 1911 to 1924, DeCourcy also was President of the National Society of the Alumni of Georgetown. Selected as one of his class Commencement speakers, he graduated with honors from Georgetown College in 1878. He then received a Master's

Degree from Georgetown in 1889 and an honorary Doctor of Laws in 1904. One of the original University Regents, DeCourcy also was one of ten men who made the first contributions — \$1000 each — to relocate the Georgetown Preparatory School to Maryland.

13) Established in 1914, the Board of Regents of Georgetown University was largely the brain-child of John Agar. Until then a group of clergy known as the Corporation exclusively managed the University. The Board of Regents, on the other hand, was comprised of successful alumni in the professional and financial sectors and served as an advisory body in close communication with the President of the University. In June 1918 the Board of Regents authorized Fr. Creeden to establish the School of Foreign Service. According to the minutes from the November 8, 1913 meeting of the Advisory Committee of the Alumni of Georgetown University, the Board of Regents was to consist of the President of the College, the four Directors of the College and "twelve lay alumni to be elected by the Alumni at large, and to be taken from six different sections of the country." As stated in the By-Laws of Board of Regents, its responsibilities were "to receive, hold, invest, administer and apply for the uses of the University all funds donated without specific limitations and intended for the development and advancement of the University; to visit the University, and make suggestions and recommendations to the President and Directors of Georgetown College concerning the administration of the University in all its departments; [and] to perform all other acts for the benefit of Georgetown University within the scope of the powers hereby vested in the said Board." After their first meeting on April 19, 1914, the Regents met at least three times a year in January, June and October. By 1929, electing Regents by a general alumni vote had become too complicated, and an amendment was passed granting this authority to the Corporation.

14) Fr. Alphonsus J. Donlon, S.J. (1867-1923), was President of Georgetown University from 1912 to 1918 and the first Georgetown alumnus to hold this office. Fr. Donlon came to the Georgetown Preparatory School in 1883, began his studies at the College in 1884 and graduated with highest honors in 1888. Having entered the Jesuit Novitiate at Frederick, Maryland in 1893, Fr. Donlon returned to Georgetown as Professor of physics and as the faculty director of athletics in 1895. Known as the “Father of Georgetown Athletics,” Fr. Donlon restored the university’s football team for the 1898 season, introduced the first track team, and helped produce two of the best baseball teams in Georgetown history up to that point. After being ordained a priest in 1903, Fr. Donlon again returned to teach physics at Georgetown in 1906. He served as Assistant Provincial of the Maryland-New York province of the Jesuit Order from 1911 until assuming the presidency of Georgetown. It was during Fr. Donlon’s tenure that that the SFS was conceived, Georgetown Prep was moved to Maryland, the Board of Regents was created, and the graduate school was resumed.

15) John Munroe Longyear (1850-1922) was a capitalist who attended Georgetown College from 1863 to 1865 but did not graduate. He made his fortune from assets in the mineral and lumber lands of northern Michigan and the coal mines of the Spitzbergen Island in the Arctic Ocean. President of the Marquette (Michigan) National Bank, Longyear also was Mayor of Marquette from 1890 to 1891. He was president of a button company in Detroit, a member of the Board of Control of the Michigan College Mines from 1888-1913 and a Member of the Corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. A prominent philanthropist, Longyear contributed to many hospitals, colleges, libraries and high schools. In a letter dated May 5, 1916, Fr. Donlon suggested to Judge DeCourcy that he approach Longyear regarding contributions for the relocation of

Georgetown Prep, referring to Longyear as “our most promising hope at present.” Fr. Walsh most likely hoped to secure Longyear’s financial support in the establishment of the SFS.

16) Since no mentions of “Schwab” were discovered in any of Fr. Walsh’s other letters, it is impossible to identify him with any certainty. As it seems that Fr. Walsh hopes to meet with Schwab to discuss a possible contribution to the endowment of the SFS, Schwab could be Charles M. Schwab, President of both the Carnegie Steel Company and the United States Steel Corporation and then the Bethlehem Steel Company.

17) “Charles Neal” [*sic*] actually is Charles Patrick Neill (1865-1942), U.S. Commissioner of Labor from 1905 to 1913. After attending the University of Notre Dame from 1885 to 1888 and the University of Texas from 1888 to 1889, Neill graduated *summa cum laude* with a Bachelor of Arts degree from Georgetown in 1891—the first time the University had conferred this honor. Neill taught at Notre Dame from 1891 to 1894 and received his doctorate in economics and politics from Johns Hopkins University in 1897. From 1897 to 1905 Neill served as an instructor, Associate Professor and then a Professor of economics at the Catholic University of America. President Theodore Roosevelt appointed Neill assistant recorder of the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission in 1902 and then Labor Commissioner in 1905 (President Taft reappointed him to this office in 1909). Inspired by Upton Sinclair’s *The Jungle*, Neill’s investigation of the meat packing industry culminated in the Meat Inspection Act of 1906. Appointed Commissioner of Labor Statistics by President Wilson in 1913, Neill helped mediate railroad labor disputes and drafted the Newlands Labor Act in 1913. Neill also served as a member of the United States Immigration Commission (1907-10); Manager of the Bureau of Information of the Southeastern Railways (1915-1939); a member of the United States Coal Commission (1922-23);

Fellow and President (1916-1917) of the American Statistical Association; and Vice President of the Board of Charities of the District of Columbia (1900-1908). Neill was especially active in Catholic social action movements and was the first director of the national Catholic School of Social Service.

18) Maurice Francis Egan (1852-1924) was an author and diplomat who taught and studied philosophy at Georgetown from 1875 to 1878 and received an honorary degree from Georgetown in 1889 during the University's centennial year. Egan began his career writing for various Philadelphia newspapers, later becoming sub-editor of the New York publication *Magee's Weekly* in 1878 and editor and part proprietor of *Freeman's Journal* in 1888. During these years Egan also wrote book reviews, articles and poetry for other magazines with larger circulations. Egan became a professor of English Literature at Notre Dame University in 1888 and Chair of English Literature at the Catholic University of America in 1896. In the words of President Theodore Roosevelt, Egan was an "unofficial diplomatic adviser" to three presidents (McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft). He was a member of the Indian Commission from 1906 to 1907 when Roosevelt appointed him minister to Denmark, a post he held under Roosevelt, Taft and Wilson. Crucial to the security of the Panama Canal, the 1916 purchase of the Danish West Indies by the United States was largely a result of Egan's efforts. Although Egan declined both Taft's and Wilson's offers for the ambassadorship at Vienna, he became senior diplomat at Copenhagen in 1916. In the introduction to Egan's memoir *Recollections of a Happy Life*, author and diplomat Henry van Dyke wrote: "He was not only the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, he was its Prince Charming, the one to whom all turned for help in difficulty and for conciliation in dispute. No man in Denmark was more respected and beloved." Upon retirement Egan served as Dean of the American

Diplomatic Service. He wrote many successful works including *Ten Years Near the German Frontier* (1919), an account of his diplomatic service, and *Confessions of a Book Lover* (1922).

19) John Agar (1856-1935) was the chief architect of Georgetown's Board of Regents, one of the twelve original Regents and a former president of the Alumni Association. After enrolling in the Preparatory School in 1869 and the College in 1872, Agar graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1876. Georgetown later awarded him a Master of Arts in 1888, a doctorate in 1889, and an Honorary Doctor of Laws in 1910. A partner in the New York law firm Agar, Ely & Fulton, Agar chaired the "Subscription Committee" that raised the capital to complete the Healy Building, and Gaston Hall in particular. When the Rowing Association was founded in March 1876, Agar headed the "Committee on Colors" that chose blue and grey scarves and flags to identify the nascent crew team during races. Georgetown officially adopted these colors after the girls of the Visitation Academy gave a blue and grey flag to the Boat Club that was gradually used at University events beginning with the 1876 Commencement exercises.

20) Beacon Street is a historic road in Boston and the backbone of the exclusive Beacon Hill neighborhood.

21) Dr. Constantine McGuire (1890-1965) arguably conceived of the School of Foreign Service and played a critical (although very much behind-the-scenes) role in its establishment. In a letter dated April 29, 1953 to Fr. William F. Maloney, S.J., then Provincial of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus, McGuire wrote that "[t]he plan for the school was drawn up by me in 1916-1917 and discussed by me with Father Thomas I. Gasson, S.J. [then Dean of the Graduate School] and Father John B. Creeden, S.J. [then President of the University]...Very few persons have any knowledge whatever that I had something to do with

the origin of the school; in fact, few persons, in or out of the Society, are now living who know that I had. Probably Dr. J de S. Coutinho is the only man at Georgetown University other than Father Walsh, who knows it..." Since Fr. Creeden initially harbored reservations for financial reasons, McGuire then tried to interest Catholic University in the proposal, which likewise did not possess the resources to fund it. American involvement in World War I, however, certainly helped McGuire's case. In a May 1918 memorandum Creeden accepted McGuire's plan, provided that the necessary capital would be obtained and a distinguished faculty could be convened. McGuire worked tirelessly finding and hiring faculty and secured the first main financial contribution—\$20,000 from James A. Farrell—for the school's endowment. He served as the unofficial secretary of the SFS from 1919 to 1922 and lectured in his specialty of Public Finance (he had been Assistant Secretary-General of the Inter-American High Commission in Washington, which facilitated international economic and financial relationships among nations and worked closely with the State Department to draft international agreements). Yet differences in opinion led McGuire to separate himself from the SFS in 1923. McGuire had envisioned more of a high-level research institute than an undergraduate study program and also felt that the SFS could undertake expensive projects before raising the requisite funds, while Fr. Walsh had no desire to spend the University's money before raising it. Despite these divergences, McGuire probably was responsible for suggesting to the Vatican that Fr. Walsh lead the Papal Relief mission to Russia in 1922, and Fr. Walsh dedicated the published collection of his lecture series given at the Smithsonian Institution in 1920-21 to McGuire. In 1943 McGuire restored his ties with Georgetown and persuaded Father Walsh to establish the Institute of World Polity, a research institute for policy-making rendered even more essential due to the ongoing Second World War.

22) The preliminary letter Walsh refers to probably concerns persuading a potential faculty member or likely donor. No other references to a specific letter could be found.

23) With the Russian Revolution of 1917 a fresh memory and Russia mired in a bitter civil war at the time of this letter, Socialism was emerging as a powerful menace. Fr. Walsh was one of the first scholars to recognize the threat of international communism, and it was McGuire who played a key role in convincing the Regents of Russia's importance on the world stage and in inspiring Fr. Walsh's interest in the region. In a letter dated November 5, 1920, McGuire wrote to Fr. Walsh encouraging him to establish an Institute or Department of Slavic Studies: "Five or ten years from now the demand for men who know Russian well will relatively far exceed the demand for men who know other languages; and those who are acquainted with Russian life and the conditions under which it is carried on, with Russian literature and history, will find themselves in very great demand..." Fr. Walsh's 1922-1923 relief work in Russia inspired a course that he personally taught in the SFS entitled "Russia in Revolution" and the public lectures on Russia and Communism that he delivered for many years beginning in 1924. Attended by distinguished diplomats, government officials and scholars, Fr. Walsh's lectures were so popular that he had to move them from Gaston Hall to the larger Constitution Hall at the headquarters of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Upon Fr. Walsh's death in 1956, President Eisenhower recalled these famed addresses in letter dated November 9 to Fr. Bunn, then President of the University: "In the note I wrote you expressing my sympathy to you in the death of Father Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., I failed to say that in 1928 I had the rare privilege of listening to a magnificent lecture of his on the growing menace of communism. I think that I could recite some parts of it today."

24) S.A.T.C., the Student Army Training Corps, was a system utilized during World War I whereby certain American colleges served as sites for the training of military personnel. When the United States declared war in April 1917, a unit of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (R.O.T.C.) was formed at Georgetown to train and prepare officers. An August 12, 1918 telegram from the Adjutant General of the United States Army to the President of Georgetown University officially activated the campus to S.A.T.C. status. All students above the age of 18 became privates in the army and followed a joint military and academic program as specified by the War and Navy Departments, while those younger than 18 were trained as a separate civilian unit. Students who successfully completed a three-month training period were transferred to regular army camps for final preparation as commissioned officers. Approximately 800 army and navy personnel, officers and candidates were present on Georgetown's campus for S.A.T.C. purposes. Moreover, as part of Georgetown's S.A.T.C. standing, the War Department called Fr. Walsh to serve as Assistant Educational Director of S.A.T.C. units in New England. With the signing of the armistice ending the war on November 11, 1918, demobilization began and Georgetown reverted to its previous R.O.T.C. status, allowing for the Spring 1919 semester to begin normally.

25) B.C. High is Boston College High School, founded in 1863 and known as "The Jesuit High School of Boston." A private, all-male institution, B.C. High was a constituent part of Boston College until 1927. Walsh attended B.C. High, beginning his studies there at age thirteen. Although currently located in the Dorchester section, the school's campus originally was in Boston's South End.

26) No records of "D. Rodriguez" could be found in either Fr. Walsh's letters from the period or other sources.

Bibliography

- "About B.C. High: History." *Boston College High School*. 10 Feb. 2007
<<http://www.bchigh.edu/podium/default.aspx?t=18735>>.
- "Approve Greater Georgetown Plan." *Washington Post* 15 Jan. 1922: 7.
- "Biographies of the Representatives of the 8th District of Massachusetts." *U.S. Congressman Michael E. Cupano: MA08*. United States House of Representatives. 11 Feb. 2007
<<http://www.house.gov/capitano/about/history/statistics.shtml>>.
- "Bylaws of the Board of Regents of Georgetown University." Unpublished notes, 1914. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- Catalogues of Georgetown University, 1860-70*. Vol. II. Georgetown University Archives, Special Collections.
- "College Athletics Urged by Creeden." *Washington Post* 23 Nov. 1922: 13.
- "Complimentary Dinner by The Boston University Law School Association." Program, 26 Jan. 1922. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- "Cooksey, George Robert." *Who Was Who in America. A Companion Biographical Reference Work to Who's Who in America*. Vols. 2, 1943-1950. Chicago: A.N. Marquis, 1963. 127.
- Courtin, John. "John Agar and Georgetown's Blue and Gray." *Georgetown's Blue & Gray* Oct. 1987: 29-31.
- Coutinho, Joaquim De Siqueira. *The 50th Anniversary of the School of Foreign Service*. Ms. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- . *In the Halls of Georgetown University: Glimpses of the School of Foreign Service and its Staff, between 1919 and 1960*. Ms. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- "Creeden Is Chosen." *Washington Post* 22 Aug. 1909: S1.

- DeCourcy, Charles Ambrose. Letter to A. J. Donlon, S.J. 21 Nov. 1916. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- -. Letter to A. J. Donlon, S.J. 5 June 1917. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- -. Letter to John B. Creeden, S.J. 27 May 1918. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- Donlon, A. J., S.J. Letter to Charles Ambrose DeCourcy. 5 May 1916. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- "Dr. Creeden Gets Medal." *Washington Post* 19 Dec. 1920: 38.
- "Dr. Donlon Stays Here." *Washington Post* 7 Feb. 1915: 16.
- Egan, Maurice Francis. Letter to Henry Shandelle, S.J. 21 Feb. 1911. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- -. *Recollections of a Happy Life*. New York: George H. Doran, 1924.
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. Letter to Edward B. Bunn, S.J. 1 Nov. 1956. *Edmund A. Walsh, S.J.: A Biography*. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1962. 246-47.
- -. Letter to Edward B. Bunn, S.J. 9 Nov. 1956. *Edmund A. Walsh, S.J.: A Biography*. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1962. 247.
- "Ex-G.U. President Celebrates Golden Jubilee as Jesuit." *Washington Star* 30 Aug. 1940.
- "Ex-Steel Chairman Becomes Instructor at Georgetown." *Washington Daily News* 7 Oct. 1932.
- "Ex-Steel Head on G.U. Staff." *Washington Times* 7 Oct. 1932.
- "Farrell, James A." Unpublished notes. Georgetown University Archives. Alumni Files.
- "Farrell Quits as President of U.S. Steel." *United Press* 12 Jan. 1932.
- "Father Creeden, Ex-President of G.U. Dead." *Washington Times-Herald* 26 Feb. 1948.
- "Father Donlon Dies Suddenly; Former Georgetown Head." *Washington Post* 5 Sept. 1923: 5.
- Fitzgerald, J.V. "James A. Farrell Started Career in Steel at Bottom and Worked Way to Top Position." *Washington Star* 27 Aug. 1930.
- "501 at Georgetown University Are Given Diplomas as Rain Drives Assemblage of Spectators to Shelter." *Washington Post* 10 June 1930: 4.
- Fritschel, Heidi. "The School That Father Walsh Built." *Georgetown Magazine* Nov.-Dec. 1984: 2-8.
- Gallagher, Louis J., S.J. *Edmund A. Walsh, S.J.: A Biography*. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1962.
- Georgetown College Journal, 1915-16*. Vol. 44. Georgetown University Archives, Special Collections.
- "Georgetown in Wartime." *Georgetown College Journal* Jan. 1844: 6.
- "Georgetown Opens \$5,000,000 Campaign." *Washington Post* 18 Sept. 1922: 3.
- Georgetown University News Service.
- "Georgetown School of Foreign Service to be Renamed in Honor of Father Walsh." Press Release, 14 Dec. 1956. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- "Give Sword to Foch." *Washington Post* 17 Nov. 1921: 1.
- Guthrie, Hunter, S.J. Letter to Joseph A. Farrell, S.J. 27 Apr. 1951. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- -. Letter to Joseph A. Farrell, S.J. 26 Apr. 1950. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- Hinrichs, A. F. "Charles P. Neill, 1865-1942." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 38.221 (Mar. 1943): 110-111.
- "Honorary Degree for James Augustine Farrell." *Georgetown College Journal* (1922): 420.
- "In honor of Father Edmund A. Walsh and Father Joseph A. Farrell on their Golden Jubilees as Members of the Society of Jesus." Program, 19 Oct. 1952. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.

- "An inventory of the Charles Patrick Neill Papers at The American Catholic History Research Center and University Archives." *American Catholic History Research Center and University Archives*. 6 Dec. 2005. Catholic University of America. 7 Feb. 2007 <<http://libraries.cua.edu/achrcua/neill.htm#series1>>.
- "Judge DeCourcy Dies at Golf Club House." *Boston Globe* 22 Aug. 1924: 1.
- Levins, Peter T. "Rev. John B. Creeden, S.J." *Georgetown College Journal* June 1918: 590-591.
- "Longyear, John M." *Who Was Who in America. A component Volume of Who's Who in American History*. Vol. 1. Chicago: A.N. Marquis, 1943.
- "Longyear, John Munroe." *Dictionary of American Biography*. New York: Scribner, 1928-1936. 395-6.
- McCain. Letter to President of Georgetown University. 12 Aug. 1918. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- Meehan, Thomas F. "Maurice Francis Egan: A Biographical Note." *Recollections of a Happy Life*. By Maurice Francis Egan. New York: Doran, 1924. 371-374.
- "Minutes of the First Meeting of the Board of Regents of Georgetown University." Unpublished notes, 19 Apr. 1914. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- "Neill, Charles Patrick." *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*. New York: J.T. White, 1930. 182.
- "Neill, Charles Patrick." *Who Was Who in America. A Companion Biographical Reference Work to Who's Who in America*. Vols. 2, 1943-1950. Chicago: A.N. Marquis, 1963. 393.
- Nevils, Coleman, S.J. *Miniatures of Georgetown, 1643 to 1934; Tercentennial Causeries*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown UP, 1935.
- "New Dean at Georgetown." *Washington Post* 10 May 1918: 7.
- "New Men in Faculty." *Washington Post* 25 July 1912: 12.
- "New Post for Cooksey." *Washington Post* 24 Jan. 1920: 2.
- "New Trade Course for Georgetown." *Washington Post* 22 Aug. 1919: 19.
- "O'Neil, Joseph Henry." *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-Present*. U.S. House of Representatives. 5 Feb. 2007 <<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=O000092>>.
- "O'Neil, Joseph Henry." *Who Was Who in America. A component Volume of Who's Who in American History*. Vol. 1. Chicago: A.N. Marquis, 1943.
- "Philanthropist to Teach." *Washington Star* 7 Oct. 1932.
- Quigley, Carroll. "Constantine McGuire: Man of Mystery." *Courier*. Vols. XIII-XIV. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University, 1964. 16-20.
- "Reception to Regents to Celebrate Epoch." *Washington Star* 26 Jan. 1915.
- "Returns to the Gridiron." *Washington Post* 4 Sept. 1898: 10.
- "Rev. John B. Creeden, Georgetown Ex-Head." *New York Times* 27 Feb. 1948: 21.
- "Rev. Joseph Farrell Dies; Former GU Treasurer." *Unidentified Newspaper [Washington, DC?]* 2 Oct. 1957.
- "Schwab, Charles M(ichael)." *Encyclopaedia Britannica. Britannica Online*. Encyclopaedia Britannica. 11 Feb. 2007 <<http://0-www.search.eb.com.library.lausys.georgetown.edu/eb/article-9066248>>.
- "Supreme Court Pays Tribute to Judge DeCourcy." *Boston Evening Transcript* 27 June 1925: 1+.
- Tillman, Seth P. *Georgetown's School of Foreign Service: The First 75 Years*. Washington, D.C.: Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, 1994.
- Tompkins, Francis M. Letter to Edward B. Bunn, S.J. 5 Nov. 1957. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.

- Van Dyke, Henry. Introduction. *Recollections of a Happy Life*. By Maurice Francis Egan. New York: Doran, 1924. vii-xi.
- "Visual Arts of Japan." *Georgetown University Library*. Ed. David C. Alan. 1 Feb. 2007 <http://www.library.georgetown.edu/dept/speccoll/guac/japan_04/illustrations.htm>.
- Walsh, Edmund A. "The Aims of the School of Foreign Service." Georgetown University. 25 Nov. 1919.
- Walsh, Edmund A., S.J. Letter to Fr. (John) C(reeden). 23 Nov. 1918. Georgetown University Archives. Special Collections.
- "Walsh, Edmund (Aloysius)." *Who Was Who in America: A Companion Biographical Reference Work to Who's Who in America*. Vol. III. Chicago: Marquis, 1960. 886.
- "Washington Post." *Creeden, President of Georgetown U., To Be Transferred* 30 Apr. 1924: 2.
- Westcott, Allan. "Maurice Francis Egan." *Dictionary of American Biography. Biography Resource Center*. Thomson Gale. 2 Feb. 2007 <<http://infotrac.galegroup.com/itweb/?db=BioRC>>.
- "Weston Rites Tomorrow for Fr. Creeden." *Boston Herald* 27 Feb. 1948.
- "What' is a Dollar Worth?" *Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis*. 10 Feb. 2007 <<http://www.minneapolisfed.org/Research/data/us/calc/>>.
- "X-Ray Laboratory for Georgetown U." *Washington Post* 15 Jan. 1922: 54.
- Emily Solis-Cohen is a sophomore in the Georgetown University Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service studying international politics.*

Breaking the Chains
of Religious Intolerance

How a University and Students Can Advance Interreligious Understanding

Eric Wind

It was pitch black and the stench was overbearing. The cold iron chains on the two men's arms and legs were so tight that their skin was chafed to the point of bleeding. Their bodies ached and were weak from lack of exercise as well as improper nutrition.

The men were Father Andrew White and Father Philip Fisher (alias of Thomas Copley) of the colony of Maryland; their case being a modern echo of the imprisonment of Paul and Silas in Philippi many centuries earlier. One can hardly imagine the circumstances that these Jesuits faced in 1645 when they were taken in chains to England under the levied charge of high treason. Their treasonous act was being Catholic priests. Father White and Father Copley laid the foundation for Georgetown University, but their story is certainly not unique in world history or even today.

We live in a world fraught with interreligious misunderstanding. Even though we are living in the 21st century, wars and conflicts continue to be waged on religious grounds across the world.

Many people have given up hope that there can ever be peace and understanding between the diverse religions of the world. Others feel that promoting secularism and encouraging humanity to move beyond religion is the best avenue to peace. Yet, there are many that realistically believe interreligious understanding can be achieved. One education institution in particular has taken up the banner of this effort.

Georgetown University is at the global forefront of promoting interreligious understanding. It is uniquely situated in the capital of the United States as a Catholic and Jesuit educational institution with international standing. There have been a plethora of successes here from large international conferences to great classes on the topic to promote interreligious understanding. Campus centers such as the Berkley Center for Peace, Religion, & World Affairs and the Alwaleed Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding lead the charge under the direction of Georgetown University's President, Dr. John J. DeGioia.

Dialogue is one of the best ways to achieve interreligious understanding. In today's modern world many people believe that they are too busy to listen to others. Instead they rely on stereotypes, preconceived notions, and myths to drive their thinking. Clearly, this mode of thought is dangerous. When leaders think this way it often transfers to their followers, only further perpetuating the problem. A structured dialogue is often an important starting point. However, in the midst of this dialogue we must not forget the core values that animate and drive us. It is critically important to be honest about our beliefs, even if they run contrary to the beliefs of others. We are not seeking a unified world religion, but rather interreligious understanding.

Myriads of people dismiss academic institutions as being out-of-touch ivory towers where academics and students are protected from reality. This charge certainly has had some merit historically, but increasingly this is no longer the case. Many students have broadened their knowledge of the world through international travel and studies as well as new mediums of information such as the internet. In addition, academics increasingly have "real-world" and "practical" experience through working in the field. Any efforts by universities to isolate themselves from the real world today fail miserably.

Throughout recent history some of the most important political movements, both in the U.S. and abroad, have been led by students and universities. Even the unjust Apartheid government of South Africa felt the pressure of students and universities encouraging divestment from that racist regime. Academic institutions should stand up for what is right. They are not meant to be apolitical. We live in a world where many governments prohibit their citizens from freely holding or exercising their religious beliefs. This is unacceptable as intolerance only breeds further intolerance.

Thus, one of the most important aspects of promoting interreligious understanding is encouraging international religious freedom. When people have friends and acquaintances of other faiths, the likelihood of violence and intolerance is certain to decrease. Universities such as Georgetown should seek to promote religious freedom. To sit back and not encourage religious liberty around the world would go against the Catholic and Jesuit values that animate Georgetown University.

Of course, there are different approaches to doing this. One approach is to boycott and bash countries whose standards are not up to our definition of par. Another option is to work with countries to encourage a smooth transition to religious freedom. This seems to be the case in Georgetown University's partnerships with China's Center for Religious Studies of the State Administration for Religious Affairs (SARA), which was the first agreement of its kind between a university in the United States and SARA. This unique opportunity holds great promise for Georgetown to encourage China to allow religious freedom for its 1.3 billion citizens.

Ultimately, no amount of books, reports, articles, or conferences purely by themselves will lead to interreligious understanding. Rather, it will take a new generation of educated leaders to advance the cause. The rough chains that bound Father White and Father Copley exist today in many forms and in many places. Georgetown University and our students should not sit by idly. As institutions and people we should seek to break those terrible chains and facilitate honest dialogue in order to advance interreligious understanding. Father White and Father Copley would want us to do no less.

Eric Wind is a junior in the Georgetown University Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service studying international politics.

2008 Tocqueville Forum Events

SPRING 2008

"Tocqueville on Greatness and Justice: Reflections on the Realistic Christian Correction of Classical Magnanimity"

January 24, 2008, 5:00 p.m.

Peter Augustine Lawler, Dana Professor of Political Science, Berry College, and member of the President's Council on Bioethics

Location: Mortara Center for International Studies, 3600 N Street, N.W.

(Forth lecture in the 2007-2008 series

"Tocqueville and the American Tradition," made possible by the generous support of the Earhart Foundation)

"America: Republic or Empire?"

A Cicero's Podium Debate

January 29, 2008, 7:00 p.m.

James R. Stoner, Jr., Louisiana State University *versus* Michael P. Federici, Mercyhurst College

Location: Marriott Conference Center, Leavey Center

(Co-sponsored with the Intercollegiate Studies Institute)

"Tried by War: Abraham Lincoln as Commander in Chief"

February 12, 2008, 5:00 p.m.

James M. McPherson, George Henry Davis '86 Professor Emeritus of United States History, Princeton University and author of *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (1989 Pulitzer Prize winner in history), *For Cause and Comrades* (winner of the Lincoln Prize), and the New York Times bestselling *Crossroads of Freedom: Antietam*.

Location: Copley Formal Lounge

"Does Globalization Trump Culture?: The Future of Music in a Flat World" *A Culture of Enterprise Lecture*

February 26, 2008, 7:00 p.m.

Tyler Cowen, General Director of The Mercatus Center, Director of the James Buchanan Center for Political Economy, and holder of the Holbert C. Harris Chair of Economics, George Mason University.

Location: Copley Formal Lounge

(Co-sponsored with the Intercollegiate Studies Institute)

"How Could Anyone Defend Slavery?: Moral Crisis in Antebellum America"

March 13, 2008, 5:00 p.m.

Andrew Delbanco, Julian Clarence Levi Professor in the Humanities and Director of American Studies, Columbia University and Time Magazine's "America's Best Social Critic" in 2001

Location: Wagner Alumni House Seminar Room, 3604 O Street, NW

"Living with the Dead: Why Cities Need Cemeteries and Nations Need Memorials"

March 17, 2008, 7:00 p.m.

Joseph Bottum, Editor of *First Things* and author of "Death & Politics"

Dana Gioia, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts (respondent)

Roger Kimball, Editor of *The New Criterion* (respondent)

Denis McNamara, Ph.D., Assistant Director of the Liturgical Institute (respondent)

Location: Intercultural Center (ICC)

Auditorium

(Co-sponsored with the National Civic Art Society)

“Tocqueville and the Prophecy of Democratic Gentleness”

March 27, 2008, 5:00 p.m.

Chantal Delsol, Professor of Philosophy, Université de Marne-la-Vallée and member of L'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques

Location: Mortara Center for International Studies, 3600 N Street, N.W.

(Fifth lecture in the 2007-2008 series

“Tocqueville and the American Tradition,” made possible by the generous support of the Earhart Foundation)

Student Fellows “Conference on the American Polity”

April 5, 2008, 10:00 a.m.-1:30 p.m.

Michael Brown '08 on “Tocqueville’s Democracy in America: Reflections on the Future of the European Union”

Tweedy Flanigan '09 on John Rawls and Allan Bloom, “Justice as Fairness-What the Metaphysics?”

Jeffrey Long '11 on “Edmund Burke and the Bedrock of American Conservatism”

Eric Wind '09 on “Turner’s Thesis and America’s Cultural Identity in a Global Age”

T. Wyatt Yankus '09 (Princeton) on “Separate and Dissimilar Bodies: The Senate, the House of Representatives, and the 17th Amendment”

Moderated by Patrick J. Deneen, Associate Professor of Government and Director of the Tocqueville Forum

Location: Philodemic Room, Healy Hall

(Co-sponsored with the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions, Princeton University)

Inaugural Schall Award Lecture

“There Was a Man! On Learning to be Free”

April 10, 2008, 6:00 p.m.

Ralph McNerny, Michael P. Grace Professor of Medieval Studies, University of Notre Dame

Location: Georgetown Marriott Conference Center

“Nixonland: The Rise of a President and the Fracturing of America”

April 14, 2008, 4:00 p.m.

Rick Perlstein, author of *Before The Storm: Barry Goldwater and the Unmaking of the American Consensus* (Hill and Wang, 2001).

Steven F. Hayward, F. K. Weyerhaeuser Fellow, American Enterprise Institute (respondent)

Location: Mortara Center for International Studies, 3600 N Street, N.W.

(Co-sponsored with the Department of History)

2nd Annual Carroll Lecture

“Natural Law, God, and Human Rights”

April 24, 2008, 6:00 p.m.

Robert P. George, McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence and Director of the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions, Princeton University

Location: Copley Formal Lounge

For more information on upcoming Tocqueville Forum events, please visit: <http://government.georgetown.edu/tocquevilleforum>

