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After twelve years as President of Georgetown University, the Very Reverend Edward B. Bunn, S.J., will assume his new position as Georgetown's first Chancellor on December 3, 1964. The cover sketch is the work of the well-known artist, Bernard Godwin.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 22, 1964

Dear Father Bunn:

As you prepare to retire from the Presidency of Georgetown University, I am pleased to join your many friends and beneficiaries in tribute to your distinguished tenure. Georgetown's 175th anniversary theme, "Wisdom and Discovery for a Dynamic World," is a most fitting resume of your fine service to both its faculty and its students.

You have throughout these years adhered to the best of the past, while keeping alert to the demands of the present. You have impressed upon the students of Georgetown the responsibility that is theirs in a future which, God willing, will be better and brighter for all Americans.

With warm good wishes for your health and happiness,

Sincerely,

The Reverend Edward B. Bunn, S. J.
President
Georgetown University
Washington, D. C.
By Riley Hughes

On December 3, 1964, Father Edward B. Bunn, S. J., will present the University mace, symbol of the office of the presidency of Georgetown University, to his successor, the University's forty-fourth president and thirty-seventh man to hold that office, the Very Reverend Gerard J. Campbell, S. J.

With this gesture will end the longest presidential term in the institution's history of a century and three-quarters. And at this moment the man who has directed Georgetown's destiny for twelve years will begin a new era in her history by becoming her first Chancellor.

The events of the past twelve years on campus, in spite of their complexity and our nearness to them, provide their own perspective. It is not too soon to be able to descry the outline of a new Georgetown, one which came into being with Father Bunn's appointment to the presidency in 1952. The new Georgetown is not a matter of architectural profile only, or even primarily. The Hilltop, as viewed from the Potomac, presents the same majesty of towers and other landmarks familiar for nearly a century. The Healy spires and the white eggshell of the Observatory still frame the landscape from the Virginia shore. Hidden from view, Old North lives on in its eighteenth-century life, a reminder of all our yesterdays.

There are subtle moderations of the profile of course—the low-lying, severe lines of New South and beyond it the bright, challenging facade of the Reiss Science Center. To the visitor or returning alumnus these and other striking brick and mortar additions of the past decade will serve as compelling evidence of new strides in Georgetown's continuing history.

They are evidence as well of new perspectives. They obvi-
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ously bespeak a heightened interest in science and the healing arts, and they reflect the dimensions of a complex development of the concerns given initial impetus in John Carroll's prospectus of 1786, offering instruction in "the easier Branches of the Mathematics." Just as clearly the East Campus, in the Walsh Memorial Building, is testimony to an enhanced global commitment to the requirements of training in diplomacy and in linguistics. But these additions to the Georgetown campus scene do not indicate the full scope of Father Bunn's years of achievement. Georgetown has had "building presidents" before, and she will have them again. What Father Bunn has given to the University, it is already apparent, is more than the contribution inevitable in a steady growth in facilities and services. He has given the University a new direction; he has channelled the energies of this complex of men, buildings, and purposes and placed Georgetown on a new course. When today takes its place in the texture of the past, it will be increasingly seen that in her forty-third president the University had, in every sense, her fourth founder.

There were three others, each the right man at the right time in the right place. Their successes seem inevitable to us now, as we look around us in the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary year. Yet one must marvel, in looking back upon the University's history, at the extraordinary individual energies which were brought to bear at moments of crisis and decision. Perhaps this institution more than most has been, in Emerson's phrase, "the lengthened shadow of a man." Certainly Georgetown was born in the faith and vision of a single man. For John Carroll, in the anxious years of planning, his school was to be "the object nearest to my heart." In his long lifetime of service to church and country, in spite of the burdens of the episcopacy, Georgetown remained a primary concern of his "rare goodness and heart." And at the first it was he alone who took the long view and, with tact and patience, overcame innumerable obstacles.

To maintain that today's University, with its many divisions and facilities was explicit within the Founder's vision would of course be absurd. Nonetheless John Carroll foresaw that his "literary establishment" was to exert a profound effect on the country's lay and clerical leadership. He was by no means content to create a seminary upon European lines; in all matters his school was to be, in his delightful phrase, "calculated for the meridian of America." It is owing to Archbishop Carroll that Georgetown came into being and remained as a profoundly American institution in its regulations, discipline, and spirit. "Agreeably to the liberal Principle of our Constitution" runs a phrase in Father Carroll's prospectus of 1786; it was this accommodation to the American
scene and spirit that was the Founder's greatest of many gifts to his "Academy at George Town, Potomack River, Maryland."

The first two decades of the life of Georgetown College from 1791, the year of the appointment of the first president, Reverend Robert Plunkett, and of the arrival of the first student, William Gaston, were years in which the future, and often, the very survival of the new institution were in doubt. Father Carroll had become Bishop Carroll in the interval between the founding of the Academy and the successful search for a president. While still abroad for his consecration, the new Bishop had learned that the seat of national government would be placed on the Potomac, "either," he wrote, "at George Town or what would answer better for our school, within four miles of it." Although the Founder's choice of location now seemed to indicate a brilliant future for his school, financial difficulties, a fluctuating and often decreasing enrollment, and the difficulty of obtaining an adequate teaching staff led in the academy's early years to repeated suggestions for removal to New York or at least a temporary suspension. Thus Georgetown entered the nineteenth century tentatively and precariously.

At the darkest hour for the new Republic and for the College as well, Georgetown found in her ninth president, Father John A. Grassi, S.J., her much acclaimed "second founder." In the portentous year of 1812 he became, at the age of thirty-seven, president of Georgetown and shortly afterward superior of the "Society in North America." Father Grassi's contribution to Georgetown was to be one of restoration and renewal. It was under Father Grassi that the threatened removal to New York was finally and permanently abandoned. Under his vigorous leadership the physical plant was enlarged and, even more important for the future, the curriculum was overhauled and strengthened, particularly in the natural sciences. Owing to him the transition from academy to college was firmly and irrevocably made. Through the services of Georgetown's eminent first student, now a member of Congress, the petition for a Congressional charter was advanced. On the very date, March 1, 1815, of the Senate's ratification of the treaty of peace with Great Britain, President Monroe signed the act granting Georgetown her charter and the right "to admit any of the Students belonging to said College, or other persons merit[ing] academical honors, to any degree in the faculties, arts, sciences, and liberal professions, to which persons are usually admitted in other Colleges and Universities of the United States."

Only a year before, Father Grassi had witnessed the burning of the Capital by the British and had faced the problem, and possible disaster, to his College which would have been entailed had the national legislature been forced to move its sessions to the Hilltop. More than balancing the trials of these years was the joy of the Jesuits of Georgetown and of Archbishop Carroll at the restoration, during Father Grassi's term, of the Society of Jesus throughout the world. Just as he had shared in the restoration of the Society's fortunes, Father Grassi had been in large measure responsible for the permanent upswing in those of the College. By force of his energies and his unbounded optimism and enthusiasm he had prevailed. "He was fascinated," writes Father Durkin in Georgetown University: First in the Nation's Capital, "by the art of governing an educational institution. If other presidents of Georgetown regarded their office as a sobering responsibility, Father Grassi looked on it almost gaily, as an opportunity for solving new puzzles and for learning more about how to manage boys and men wisely. He administered the College with the Italian touch of easy grace and hard realism."

Over a half century was to pass—a period of steady, quiet development—before Georgetown, now grown to eminence, was to take a new direction. Under her twenty-ninth president, Reverend Patrick F. Healy, S.J., the College truly became Georgetown University. Once
again, curriculum reform was one of the chief factors of significant change. Father Healy was acting president at the time of the decision, pivotal in Georgetown's history, to make of a college with attached professional schools an institution of the first rank on the university level. Father Healy's strengthening of the curricula was felt on the undergraduate and graduate levels alike. For the A.B. degree the College now required twice as many class and laboratory hours in chemistry as Columbia, Yale, and Williams, her nearest rivals in the field; again, requirements in physics at Georgetown exceeded the number of hours in the subject possible to elect at Harvard. During Father Healy's presidency significant changes and improvements were also made in the postgraduate, medical, and law departments. In this period, when advanced and professional studies were almost everywhere in the hands of teaching, as opposed to research, faculties, Georgetown's offerings were at least comparable to those given elsewhere, and in some instances, notably in the modernizing of medical courses, to those of a half dozen larger and richly endowed private universities. As a symbol of Georgetown's response to new challenges, and as a vehicle of that response, Father Healy made the most significant single addition in facilities in the University's entire history with the erection of the magnificent building which, over his protest, bears his name. For his provision, both material and intellectual, for Georgetown's permanence as an institution and as a true university, Father Healy indisputably ranks as one of her great presidents and—in a very real sense—as her third founder.

Seven decades separate the end of Father Healy's presidency and the beginning of Father Bunn's, decades which were to change drastically the requirements and patterns of undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. These decades were, of course, periods of development and progress, in curricula and in the addition of new professional schools as the University enlarged the scope of her offerings—either pioneering, as with the School of Foreign Service, or supplementing professional offerings in the same broad field, as with the School of Nursing. Upon taking office in 1952, after a campus internship, so to speak, as regent of the Dental and Nursing schools since 1948, Father Bunn inherited a complex of schools modern in every sense of teaching and research activities, schools diverse in needs and goals. It was to be his task to consolidate and unify a variegated campus into "a finer Georgetown."

In his fact-finding report of 1948 as director of studies for the Maryland Province, Father Bunn saw that the prime requirement for Georgetown's growth and development was to be one of unification of the divisions of the University. Just as diversity of the schools had been the need of the past, for as they came into being they perforce needed to be independent and self-supporting, a consolidated university was now urgently required to enable Georgetown to continue to play a vital role as the modern university she had become. The schools of Georgetown had grown up in isolation from one another, and they had come, over the years, to share the same campus and the same general purposes, but at the cost of much overlapping of services and much unnecessary and expensive duplication of facilities and of effort. Father Bunn addressed himself to the task of bringing into being a vital and revitalizing unification of the schools which would unite them in a common purpose without a loss of their integrity or their identity. With the help of a Ford Foundation grant and a donation from an alumnus, he was able early in his term of office to turn a congress of schools and colleges into a viable university.

A change in the mechanism of an organization, however significant, is not ordinarily dramatic or even immediately visible. But the changes at Georgetown during the years of Father Bunn's presidency soon became both visible and dramatic. There is more than fiscal drama in the fact that in this period the research expenditure of the University rose from six hundred thousand dollars to nineteen million dollars. Even more striking is the fact that whereas the operating budget for 1952 was seven million dollars, that for 1963-1964 is twenty-seven million. Father Bunn, whose administrative career—following a fifteen-year teaching career—goes back to 1938, when he became president of Loyola College, has always followed a threefold principle as administrator: What education do you want? What facilities do you need in personnel and bricks and mortar? What is the cost of providing them? The bricks and mortar alone answer alone to these questions has meant the building on campus of a new School of Nursing; of the Edmund A. Walsh Memorial
Building for the School of Foreign Service, the Institute of Languages and Linguistics, and the School of Business Administration; the new diagnostic building for the Medical Center; New South residence hall, and the Reiss Science Center. In this 175th Anniversary year two new residence halls, one for men and one for women, have been erected.

As Father Bunn looks over the past dozen years of his administration and of Georgetown's growth and achievement in academic excellence, he has the enheartening knowledge that the University can, as he puts it, "face any of her sister universities of the highest reputation in any part of the United States." A university grows, he holds, "by pressures and demands," and Georgetown's preeminent position as the first university in the nation's capital has, in his view, meant that the demands upon her can be satisfied only by the highest achievement—in faculty, student body, and in intellectual environment, through study, teaching, and research. Georgetown, under his direction, has not sought growth in mere numbers, but rather the steady, normal growth of a student body of high qualifications. His goal and emphasis have always been the strengthening of the University as a community of students and scholars, for he sees the University in terms of its people. His greatest personal satisfactions as president, in
fact, have come to him from “the backing of the alumni and the winning of friends for the University.”

As the formal celebration of the University’s 175th Anniversary year comes to a close, Father Bunn, the oldest man ever appointed to the presidency as well, to date, the president to have enjoyed the longest tenure, stands at the beginning of a new career. It is given to few men to pioneer in the paradoxical context of a long tradition, but as first Chancellor of Georgetown University Father Bunn will have that opportunity. He sees his chancellorship as a challenge to serve in the furthering of the development of the University in all areas, but especially in relation to the concept of the consortium of Georgetown with the other area universities, with the National Institutes of Health, and with the graduate agencies of the federal government.

Where other university and college presidents have often expressed misgivings and even fears, Father Bunn has steadfast hope and conviction—he welcomes cooperation with government, and he sees no threat to the independence of private institutions in such a relationship. To the doubts of those who fear eventual government control of private education he opposes a distinction between integrity and isolation. Universities, he holds, must surrender their isolation, their sense of the academic ivy tower. But this is in no sense a surrender of a university’s integrity; it is, rather, the fulfillment of a proper mission. Education, he is confident, shapes a nation’s ideas in all areas of life and living. Excellence in the student body and validity and selectivity in research cannot fail, he holds, to result in courage and vision in public service. “In the dialogue with the marketplace, direction will come from the universities,” he says, “and their foresight and ingenuity will be their best guarantee of continuing independence.” He is convinced that the leadership for American society lies with the universities. “Unless education moves,” he adds, “somebody else will.”

In his plans to assist in the further development of an independent Georgetown, one continuing to contribute to the community, the nation, and the world, Father Bunn will concern himself not only with community relations but with campus development. He expects steady institutional growth on the Hilltop, and he looks forward to the building of a new library with the same zeal and determination he put in to the Reiss Science Center. “I have the absolute conviction,” he says firmly, “that the new library is essential and urgent.” He hopes that an art museum will develop as part of the new library structure, as part, now that the sciences have been given a proper ambiance at Georgetown, of a strengthened program in the humanities. As chancellor he will wish to concern himself with the establishment of endowed chairs of study in literature, history, classical languages, economics, and government. As an educator he sees his most exciting challenge and opportunity in focusing his energies on the University’s educational program, in helping to shape organizational studies which will enable Georgetown’s institutional objectives “to seep down to the marrow of the faculty and staff.” He sees seminars for the faculty on these objectives and eventually a faculty senate as steps to the realization of his goal on helping to energize the University’s personnel in the self-knowledge which will contribute to the “finer Georgetown” which has for two decades been his concept and his concern.

But most of all, as Father Bunn prepares for his new post he looks outward. His attention is fixed not upon the campus alone but on the community—and on the nation and world beyond. The potential greatness of Georgetown University, it is his strong conviction, will lie in what it can do in utilizing education for leadership. The trend of human affairs, he contends, is toward “a community of mankind.” It is therefore his fervent desire that Georgetown will fulfill her destiny—a destiny dictated by the logic of her traditions and of her geographical and spiritual position—by offering wise leadership in shaping the contours of this community. This is a sweeping concept, a broad charter of intellectual liberties and challenges. Most of all, it is a revitalization—in the terms of today and the unfolding tomorrows—of John Carroll’s pioneering faith and vision.
georgetown's second founder:
Giovanni Antonio Grassi, S.J.

by Paul Horgan
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If he should look out through one of the tall, narrow windows of his first sentence, the Very Reverend Father President of 1814 would be able to see his second.

"The College," he wrote in his flying script, with heavy, down strokes the lighter lines whipped upward, the whole giving an effect of animation of mind and gesture, "the College is an extensive and most convenient edifice. It commands one of the most delightful prospects in the United States, and its situation for health is exceeded by none. The garden and court where the students recreate are very airy and spacious."

He was writing the text of the College catalogue and the claims he made were intended to attract and reassure parents in the early years of his residence at Georgetown. And now he could look farther, to an educational advantage available to no other institution of learning. This was the United States Congress, the philosophical voice of that still-young marvel of the political world, the American democracy, which learned men crossed the ocean to examine. The Father President went on to say of Georgetown in 1814:

"Among the many other advantages which it enjoys, its contiguity to the city of Washington, the seat of the federal government is not the least considerable as the students have occasionally an opportunity of hearing the debates in Congress, it being only a pleasant walk from the college to the Capitol."

Even greater claims had accompanied the foundation of the College in 1788. It was to be a place where "an undivided attention may be given to the cultivation of virtue and literary improvement, "and where "a system of discipline may be introduced and preserved incompatible with indolence and inattention in the professor, or with incorrigible habits of immorality in the student." In fact, "the benefit of this establishment should be as general as the attainment of its object is desirable." Moreover, a breadth of charity must prevail, for "agreeably to the liberal principle of our constitution, the seminary will be open to students of every religious before the Father President's arrival, an august intention had accompanied the foundation of the college by Archbishop Carroll, who wrote in his proposals of establishment: "On this academy is built all my hope of permanency and success to our holy religion in the United States."

The Father President — his name was Giovanni Antonio Grassi—called upon Archbishop Carroll in Baltimore to pay his respects on arriving in the United States in October, 1810. He was assigned to the Georgetown Academy and two years later was appointed president. What a difference there was between the ideal and the real as he found these at Georgetown.

The College had not prospered, despite its great purposes. There were ten boarding students, and these with a handful of day scholars added up to "nothing," said the Father President, "but a crew of blackguard youths and boys." He had to admit that he found himself in a "melancholy situation, compelled to be a sorrowful spectator of the miserable state of this College. "There was much work to do and he fell upon it with all his uncommon energy.

On assuming the presidency he was thirty-seven years old, and was described as "a man of elegant manners and polished address, learned and able." He was of medium height, and his short-cropped cap of hair and his arched eyebrows were of auburn color. He had an intent gaze in his large, clear hazel eyes—the gaze of a man drawn by life's evidence all about him. His color was ruddy and his wide mouth and generous chin expressed even in repose a pleasant nature. If his movement expressed his qualities of mind, he moved rapidly, with precision, grace and economy. An Italian he was born at Bergamo in 1775, and at the age of twenty-four, moved by a dedication to a cause which seemed all but lost in 1799, he entered the Novitiate of the Society of Jesus at Colorno, in northern Italy.

Almost everywhere in the world the society was banned, having been dissolved in 1773 by Pope Clement XIV. Civil and religious governments refused organized status or canonical existence to the Jesuits everywhere but in Russia — but there under the patronage of Tsar Paul I, son of Cath-
erine the Great, the Father General of the society guarded for the future the live spark of the intellectual and spiritual tradition of the followers of Ignatius Loyola. Italian novices were sent to Russia for their training, and there went the young Grassi.

His ability—the style of his mind and energy—was quickly recognized. While still in his twenties he was ordained and became the rector of the College of Nobles at Polocz. Though in exile, as it were, in Russia, the society kept its gaze upon the larger world, and searched for work that needed doing. Father Grassi was chosen to accompany a mission to Astrakhan on the shores of the Caspian Sea, and fell at once to the study of Armenian.

The General assigned him to a mission preparing to go to Astrakhan on the shores of the Caspian Sea, and fell at once to the study of Armenian. But his plans were changed for him, early in 1805 and he was called to St. Petersburg where the General assigned him to a mission preparing to make its way to China. There was no assurance that once arrived at Pekin the missionaries would be received with good will or even in safety. But with two companions of his society, Father Grassi plunged into his preparations, and in mid-winter, dressed in Russian furs set out in a train of three sledges for Sweden. It was the beginning of a fantastic effort to reach China.

They took full sets of vestments, and sacred vessels, and medicines, and small religious images and objects to use as gifts, and secular clothing for risky environments, and the habit of their society for places where they might openly live in their profession, and letters of recommendation, and—for Father Grassi, who was scientifically inclined—various mathematical instruments and systems of apparatus to demonstrate physics and astronomy. They crossed Finland, and the Gulf of Bothnia, and came to Sweden, and after many days succeeded in proceeding to Copenhagen where they took ship for London, planning to sail from there for the Orient.

But despite cordialities from enlightened noblemen and courtesies from continental diplomats, the missionaries were frustrated in every effort to take passage for China by the East India Company, which controlled all the shipping for the Orient trade, and had no commerce with Jesuits. They finally sailed for Lisbon, where they hoped to be granted passage for Macao or Canton in a Portuguese ship. Here again they were denied what they needed, and two years passed in Lisbon until the missionaries obeyed orders from their general in Russia to return to England, before a threatened French invasion of Portugal should come off.

The settled at Stonyhurst College in England, a haven of their society. There they awaited further orders, but none came for years, and they worked as they could. Father Grassi pursued his scientific learning. He learned English. He observed much about the administration of an educational institution. And then, once again—and for the last time—China seemed to call. On April 10, 1810, the stalled missionaries received a letter from their Father General ordering them to return to Russia, where they were to arrange for a journey overland, across independent Tartary, to China. They prepared to go, but for Father Grassi, in any case, the five years attempt to reach China was at an end. New orders reached him at Stonyhurst. Under obedience, he proceeded to Liverpool, and on board the North Atlantic packet ship “Leda” he sailed in August, 1810, for America, taking with him what was described as his “fine collection of philosophical instruments.”

He has already told us with a sigh what he found on his arrival at Georgetown. But he was a most cultivated man, and such a man always does honor to the traditions of his vocation and his place. He could only give his best. Finding woefully little learned enterprise in his environment, he almost at once set to work, with the aid of a Jesuit lay-brother, to construct models out of wood to demonstrate the copernican system, and the movement of the planets, and the diurnal and the annual movements of the earth. He devised a terrestrial globe. In a room in the original building of the Academy, built in 1788, which had been visited with stately courtesy by General Washington, he set up a small museum for the display of his instruments.

These, the common necessities of his own intellectual life, were at once the marvel of the time, not only for the rascally student body, but for visitors. Commodore Porter came. Commodore Decatur came and presented to the museum a fragment of his flagship. Members of Congress came.

Education, abstract in its philosophical character, had also its visible virtues, some of which could be demonstrated.

It was not long until astonished students heard themselves performing for the college visitors a dialogue on the Copernican system composed by Father Grassi. He prepared them to perform chemical experiments for the public, and trained them to expound in elocution upon the "vicissitudes of the seasons." For himself, he took pleasure in calculating eclipses, and determining the altitudes of
the sun, and noting the results in his diary, where he also recorded in October 1812 that for supper the "boys eat their possum, which lives in the woods, and is found only in America."

By then he was the Father President, and had forty-two resident students in the College and seven day students, after which the enrollment figures steadily climbed. Archbishop Carroll visited the institution when he could, once gave a special dinner as a treat to the boys, for which the total bill was fifteen dollars and eleven cents, and declared in December, 1813 that "Fr. Grassi has revived the College of Georgetown, which has received great improvement in the number of students and course of studies." In his great hope for his faith throughout the nation, the archbishop could only have been encouraged by what he saw of the Father President's labors and results.

These were for a time shadowed by war, for the British, pursuing their land campaign in the War of 1812, maneuvered their forces near Bladensburg, northeast of Washington, in August, 1814, and on the twenty-fourth, defeated raw United States troops there. At the College a number of students were spending the summer vacation. Late in the day they saw American soldiers retreating through Georgetown, and when night fell they looked through the College windows and saw the sky over Washington break into firelight. The British were burning the Capitol. Soon afterward, the invaders put the torch to the White House, the Treasury Building, the Navy Yard, and shipping anchored in the Potomac. Someone said the firelight was so bright that those at the College could read by it.

When day broke the collegians saw British troops at work in Washington, and prepared themselves for the sack of Georgetown. Sacred vessels and plate were hidden and prayers arose in the chapel. Presently the enemy was seen to withdraw: thanksgiving was offered: and a week later, with a dissertation by the Father President, and the singing of the "Veni Creator," the College opened its next regular session on schedule. Present were five priests, two scholastics, nine brothers, nine secular masters and tradesmen, sixty-five students and twelve servants. The students wore the traditional Georgetown uniform of a coat and pantaloons of blue cloth with large yellow buttons, and a waistcoat of red kerseymere.

And now, by a turn of events full of joy for the Society of Jesus, the Father President was in a position to proceed with a step of great importance to the College. Hitherto he could not conduct the College officially as a property of the society, for the society was not officially recognized by the church. Under this condition, in which local rather than general values must be obtained, the long view seemer foreshortened. Subject to chance and vagary, it would be difficult to claim for a still modest academy any kinship with the grand academic communities of an older world.

But now, in the summer of 1814, not long before the British lit up the skies of Washington, an immense change of climate occurred in the philosophic cosmos of the Vatican. Pope Pius VII, reversing the decree of his predecessor Clement XIV, restored the freedom, the integrity, and the open-gesture of the Society of Jesus throughout the world. It was a vast gain in great dimensions for Jesuits everywhere—and it had powerful effect in all possible local significance wherever the fellows of Saint Ignatius awaited their restoration in patience. To the Father President of Georgetown it meant, among other, and perhaps more general things, the occasion for identifying the College as a Jesuit institution in all honor and vitality: with the justification now of seeking official sanction for the granting of degrees in academic respectability.

He lost no time.

The first enrolled student of Georgetown was now a member of Congress—William Gaston. After suitable conferences and draftings, he presented in January, 1815, "the petition of the president and directors of the College of Georgetown ... to be invested with authority and power to confer the usual academical honors on those who by their proficiency in the liberal arts may be judged deserving of such distinctions. ..." Thirty-three days later, on March 1, 1815, President James Madison signed an act sent to him by the Congress which gave full powers to the College. It was also the day on which peace was ratified between Great Britain and the United States. The year held another act of momentous satisfaction for the Father President. On December 27, he wrote in his diary, "I was made a citizen at the court in Washington, "and by now, of course, he was John Anthony Grassi.

For the rest, the world was moving fast, and marvels were freshly at hand to be examined. At the Navy Yard a certain Mr. Rose showed the Father President and a group from the College an apparatus of "perpetual motion" and "explained in what it consisted." Students were given excursions on the Potomac in steamboats, daring the experience first known ten years before by Robert Fulton with his "Claremont" on the Hudson. They went as far as Mount Vernon, on one outing, and had a picnic on the shore below the famous old house, and were "kindly received by Colonel Washington, walked in the garden, saw the vault in which the general's remains lie," and sailed upstream again at four o'clock to arrive home five hours later. The use of the steamer cost five dollars for the day. Another expedition ran aground and the Father President
had to wait and wonder for his boys until midnight. Still, all believed that such outings demonstrated "that travel by steamboat was practicable, rapid and safe."

Natural wonders awaiting disclosure in other elements were also examined. Father Wallace, who taught mathematics, natural philosophy and chemistry, assembled his class out of doors on the Feast of St. Ignatius in 1816 and "sent off a balloon." If it carried no passengers—though in 1783 at Annonay in France a balloon had carried aloft the first creatures to be lifted skyward which were a sheep, a cock and a duck—Father Wallace's balloon was watched with such interest along its whole course that, he was gratified to discover, "it led to no little correspondence." It must seem that the arts of learning were in a lively condition under the Father President.

His own duties were various and demanding. In addition to his presidency, he served the office of Superior of his society in the United States, and the also went about on horseback to carry his priestly offices to the surrounding countryside. He often said Mass at the Alexandria Mission, where Madam Custis, General Washington's adopted daughter, heard him, and gave him "two pictures for the church." The Lees and the FitzGeralds received him, and when occasion required he took the last sacraments to their slaves, whose condition made him reflective. "The sad clang of servile chains he said may yet often be heard beneath the sun of liberty."

And indeed, all that he saw of life in the United States was of interest to him, and much of it was surprising. How utterly wrong was the general European idea of America, he said that "many Europeans imagine that a large proportion of the inhabitants of America are civilized aboriginal Indians," which of course was preposterous, when the population was almost entirely derived from European stock — the English, the Irish, the German, the French. And yet life in America was like life nowhere else, and he gazed upon it in fascination.

He saw no palaces like those in Italy, for example, in which many families lived. Here there was one family to a house, which was usually built of wood. The rooms were simple and clean, without any hint of "Italian magnificence," but instead held few pictures, and plain mahogany furniture. There were no courtyards or plazas with fountains. He thought the "arts of ornamentation" were held in little esteem, though he recognized that Benjamin West and John Trumbull were not only accomplished American painters but much admired ones. American interest ran to mechanical inventions, which did by machine the work for which there were not enough hands. In a society busy with trade and the desire for money it was, he thought, "not surprising that the flowers of poetic genius fail to flourish." He saw that there was "no lack of gifted men," but he thought they remained more satisfied with "a wide acquaintance of many subjects than a profound knowledge of any single field." He had to add that the educated ear was often astonished at the confident and decisive views uttered by less well-informed citizens.

He examined the New Englanders, and though he refused to think their practices characteristic of all the Americans, he had to recognize that Yankees, as he heard them called, were considered "the most knavish and capable of the most ingenious impositions," as they took their trading ventures everywhere. Though he found behavior "generally civil," certain niceties were wanting in manners. His fellow-citizens thought nothing of knifing away at their fingernails or combing their hair in public, or lounging about with their feet on another chair or "propped up high against the wall." It was sad, but he must admit that though newspapers were everywhere, and edifying literature was available, the "most popular reading" was "in novels which serve to deprave hearts and minds"—indeed, novels were read in "incredible quantities."

It was hard to believe, but Americans gambled and got drunk more often than Italians, with consequences which he must declare to be "fatal to individuals and to entire families." Dancing was the most general entertainment. The Father President thought that "the mania for jumping about in this manner" was "not less powerful than in France itself." He never saw such luxury as that available to any American. Why, they dressed as well in the country as in the city, and he concluded that the cost of "a holiday garment" was "no index of the condition" of the wearer. But if there was a veneer of well-being it did not in the end hide the waste which was "common in this country." Fortunately, bread was abundant. "Those who are not lazy will not be poor," he decided, "and will not beg in public." He was glad to observe that "civil order and tranquility" were generally well maintained. There was "much show of piety," despite "indifference.
as to sect," and "everyone reads his Bible," said the Father President, "and in New England they will not permit a traveler or allow a messenger to continue his journey on a Sunday," which seemed absurd to a cultivated Mediterranean spirit.

As for American education, he had many opinions. Education, he saw, was "far from neglected," though it was mainly sought "to maintain status or to earn a fortune." Everyone reached for education and families made sacrifices so that their young might rise. There seemed to be two general curricula—one of elegant learning for those destined for law or medicine—the professions: the other of simple value to those promised to agriculture or trade who would require little beyond a little arithmetic and a little writing.

It seemed to him that the American youth, on reaching a certain age, became "impatient with suggestions" and, determined to have his way, sometimes descended to "insubordination and to violent revolts against superiors." He must conclude that "such risings were not unusual in American colleges," and he shook his head over riots which only recently had occurred "in Princeton, in New Jersey and in William and Mary in Virginia," where "the students broke windows, chairs, furniture, and everything that came to their hands, and were at the point of destroying the very buildings." How could such things come about? He shrugged. "Since the people who preside over such places," he said, "gave small attention to morals and deportment, and concerned themselves only "with the injection of a little knowledge into the students," it need not have surprised anyone that the students should "bring themselves to certain excesses of behavior." These, of course, were "condemned by honest Americans." On this subject, the Father President resolved in conclusion: "The observers of American customs have always deplored the fact that the fathers, especially in the south, yield sadly and foolishly to their children whom they seem unable to contradict and whose capricious wishes they do not restrain.

Meanwhile, his College prospered. At commencement in 1817 the first baccalaureate degrees were conferred—two of them, which were received by brothers, Charles and George Dinnies. A few weeks later the Father President, on a delicate and complicated ecclesiastical mission for the Archbishop of Baltimore, sailed for Rome. He had lively plans for his return to the Potomac.

But when he reached Rome, he was informed by the Father General, who had returned from Russian Sanctuary, that he was to remain in Rome. The disappointment must have been keen; and later, for a little while, it seemed probable that he would after all resume his presidency at Georgetown. But in the end, reasons of health made a sea voyage precarious for him—he had always suffered excruciatingly at sea—and for his remaining thirty years of life he lived, and worked—for one could always be sure that he would work, with imaginative high spirits—in Italy.

One of his useful concerns was to bring knowledge of his transatlantic country to the old world. A confere wrote that Father Grassi was "doing much good in Rome correcting misconceptions about America." Father Grassi, in fact, lost no time in writing and publishing a year after his departure from the College a book which became briefly, famous, and which still engages scholars. He called it "various advices on the present state of the republic of the United States in North America." In four years it had three editions. He wrote it "to give Europeans a better idea of America. They had the wrong idea entirely," he said in a letter to the Archbishop of Baltimore.

His other late concerns included duties as rector of the College of the Propaganda Fide at Rome: Confessor to the King and Queen of Sardinia, to whose palace he used to walk instead of riding in the coach sent for him; and rector of the College of Nobles in Turin. He lived a rich life to a full age, and died in December 1849 at seventy-four.

As his beloved College prospered and grew, he became known as the "Second Founder of Georgetown"—Archbishop Carroll, of course, being the first. To the Father President, they said, Georgetown wed "its first great impulse and thorough organization." They said, "probably no other ecclesiastic of the day enjoyed in greater measure the esteem and confidence of the hierarchy" in America. Indeed, Bishop Flaget nominated him for the throne of the new diocese of Detroit. Everyone he dealt with seemed to feel the creative bounty of his nature.

It is good to think why. He believed in man's power to achieve unexpected ends under the blessing of good intentions.

From the beginning, it did not seem inplausible to him that two small structures measuring sixty-four feet by fifty, with ten pupils, unruly wretches, mostly, for the moment, should contain under God's grace the perfectly-viable seed of an institution worthy to rank one day with the great universities of the world. Possum suppers, wretches, and all, he proceeded on the assumption that the difference between his struggling Academy and the universities of Europe was only one of degree, not of kind.

His vision and his priestly faith met to foster his purpose. After his time, it would rest secure in the hands of his fellows in the Society of Jesus. They here remember him well, and so shall I, newly, and gratefully, a son of his Academy.
In the last grey negative light I lie on my stomach under Copley Hall maples where spiders embellish a parlor for a pair of college lovers and a Jack-o’-lantern who will not stare. An injured yellow jacket makes hypertension noises in the grass. The flip-flop of sandals passes with a negress and magenta shorts. “If our heart condemn us, Christ is greater than our heart”—is it Mauriac that nun is presssing into the youth whose day and face seem bothered by God? An insect strikes my ear, booms, and is gone. Inexorable toy over us all, and djevbies of all varieties strutting, loping, and limping—brushcut scholastic, Ph.D. lion, the dusty eyed (it is a fiction they have trained their Ark and Dove cannons on the Capitol); their Carroll repose comfortably in his founder’s bronze chair, serene as Pompeian-red geraniums sentinelled for action at his feet. Loopd arm in arm like Bobbie Burns and his auld lang syne acquaintance, two undergrads too friendly from their visit in The Tombs of the 1789 (or maybe the Scarlet Garter) trip onto campus when every pigeon-crumble stone crumbles tradition. There is a slight breeze, only one, pulling three flags I see patterned like a syllogism: our country’s, the college’s, and the shirtpants of a student—so plunged in self that he misses the vast professor whose butter colored tie is also melting. Losing the fuller context for a laundry truck, I hear “he picked the wrong vocation by being born” from the lips of a hard-to-guess her-age, though she sparks the rockpath with her heels. A bird warbles a trill or two before I spot him in his black eye-mask, but cannot name him for all his effete eastern equipment. Habits of Dominic, Benedict, Mercy, de Paul swish by and a barefoot friar cool in his “cool that beats out the heat.” Tennis court closing, and the moist young men drift to their halls; they gleam that mudgold hue of the Potomac on their hard bodies and they breathe heavily. Cars keep breathing or coughing by, a few headlights stabbing the dusk. The lightning bugs with their small torches pierce more gently, and several children with Mason fruit jars come to save them—“Our earliest childhood is so soft and full of light,” Bernanos nudges my aging ribs—like these two lovers on my forgotten left, too busy to see my eye possess them now. The girl wears a slip of pale moon in her hair, the boy’s face is sad as a poet’s and he knows in the serious dawn he will again meet the departing girl in her, though a locked future be still a future. Some stars wear through, a pair of searchlight chords touching and crossing above this couple helps me remember how I am a man having part of earth within, hurrying between the now and later of a promise. Before a day or dream shut down.

Raymond Roseliep

The Reverend Raymond Roseliep is Associate Professor of English at Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa. One of the most significant Catholic poets in this country, he is the author of two books of verse and is preparing a third for publication. Father Roseliep was named Poet in Residence this past summer for Georgetown’s Fifth Annual Writers Conference. When Father Roseliep presented this poem at two public readings last summer at Georgetown, he carefully noted that he did not wish anyone to misinterpret his reference to the Jesuits “for whom I have the deepest love and reference.” He explained that the allusion to “the Jabbies” in his poem is simply a momentary description that fits the tone and the mood of the poem, and “For me the term ‘Jabbies’ in itself is always a word of affectation.”
The celebration of the birthday of a great university is always an important event, but the celebration of one here in Washington that came into being the same year as the Constitution of the United States arouses exciting thoughts concerning the past, present and future, not only of the University, but of the Nation itself. These thoughts run the gamut of climax after climax, successes, failures, and all our hopes for the future.

The theme you have chosen for your anniversary, "Wisdom and Discovery for a Dynamic World," is also productive of such thoughts because in every phase of modern life, we are in an age which cries out for discovery through Wisdom. The natural sciences and technology have made discoveries that have profoundly changed our way of life and the changes cry out for social adjustment to keep them in harness. In the political world, strange and bitter authoritarian ideologies have attempted to stop the march of freedom, and those who believe in the dignity of man and his right to live at peace in freedom are challenged to discover and effectuate the means of accomplishing this great objective.

New nations are rapidly coming into being after centuries of subjugation. They are looking not only for independence but for freedom and respect. In these circumstances we must even rediscover the elements of freedom and make them effective both at home and abroad. We are still paying the price of the slavery our Nation practiced at the time this University came into being, and we must discover the way to make meaningful in every respect the great principles that are symbolized in the words, "All Men Are Created Equal," and "Equal Protection of the Laws." A materialistic world has faced us with the challenge to rediscover through the Good Book the real meaning of "The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man" in the light of present-day conditions. I am sure those are the things you had in mind when you dedicated this anniversary to "Wisdom and Discovery for a Dynamic World." And wisdom it will take—all the wisdom we can muster.

I congratulate Georgetown University on the contribution it has made to such wisdom throughout the life of our Nation. Ever since George Washington selected the site for the "Federal City" of Washington in 1790 and construction of the Capitol was started in 1793, Georgetown has contributed men of high principle to the Government of the United States—hundreds of them—Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet Officers, Judges and other Government officials who often are not widely known, but without whom our Government could not have become great. These people have served well in every crisis through which our Nation has passed. Our Nation was born in crisis, and it has been our lot to pass through many of them to the one we face today. Of all of them, the worst was the War of the Rebellion. At that time, Georgetown was a thriving University. There were students here from all parts of the Union. When the drums of war rolled, hundreds of students left these halls of learning to enlist in the Armed Forces, some in the Army of the United States, others in the Army of the Confederacy. Georgetown never for-
got her sons, but on the contrary, after the War sought to reunite them in a spirit of unity and in loyalty to the Union which had prevailed. Today we all celebrate the centennial of one of those wartime classes — the Class of 1863. Among the members of that class was one who was destined to exemplify that unity in an outstanding way. He was Edward D. White, later to become Chief Justice of the United States. He was but 16 years of age when the War broke out. He was a Louisianan by birth, the son of a Governor of that State, a Catholic by faith, and the product of Jesuit teaching. Once home, he ran away without the family approval, and enlisted as a private in the Armed Forces of his State. Later, as a lieutenant he was captured by the Union Army at Port Hudson and was eventually paroled home. Sick and racked by fever, he wended his way home on foot to the point of utter exhaustion. He collapsed on the side of the road, and while he lay there it is said that a good Samaritan came along, took off his own blue overcoat and put it over the boy’s shoulders. It was at that moment he later stated that the future Chief Justice decided to devote his energies to a reconciliation between the North and the South. After the War, he became a lawyer and entered politics in the tradition of the family. He served successively as State Legislator, a trial judge, member of the Louisiana Supreme Court, and United States Senator. Then in 1894, White took his seat as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States under appointment by President Cleveland — a recognition of his outstanding service to State and Nation. In 1910, upon the death of Chief Justice Fuller, President Taft, at the request of all the other members of the Court, took an unprecedented step. He appointed Edward D. White to be the ninth Chief Justice of the United States. He thus became the first and with one exception the only man on the Supreme Court ever to be appointed Chief Justice. In that capacity he served with great distinction for the remainder of his life.

White’s 27 years of service on the Supreme Court were eventful ones in the development of our Nation. In this period, marked by two wars, America became a major world power. Domestically, the epoch saw enormous industrial and commercial development, and an increasing role by the National Government in the country’s affairs. Inevitably, the social and economic problems of the day were reflected in the litigation before the Court. White viewed the Constitution as an expanding document, flexible enough to respond to conditions not envisioned by the Founding Fathers. Rather than a “barrier to progress,” he said it was “the broad highway through which alone true progress may be enjoyed.” Though a devoted son of his native State and a proud warrior for the Confederacy, he realized that the survival and growth of a strong America required a

National Government with powers adequate to meet foreign and domestic problems effectively. More than 4,000 cases were decided by the Court during his tenure. Of these, he wrote more than 700 opinions on almost every phase of the law, many of them of great importance.

But the most important contribution White made to the Nation was the spirit of unity which he engendered on the Court and the reconciliation which he fostered throughout his long public career after the War. It was, indeed, a tribute to him, a former Confederate soldier, when all his colleagues asked the President of the United States to appoint him Chief Justice, something that as far as we know never happened in the history of our country. On the Court at that time was Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. Striking, indeed, was the friendship between these two. Both of them had known the rigors of the War, the one fighting for the Union, the other for the South. Holmes had been five times wounded and was discharged as a Brevet Colonel. White had almost died as he made his way homeward across a war-torn land. And yet these two, during clement weather, used to stroll frequently, arm in arm, from the Capitol towards White’s home. Theirs was an abiding friendship.

Perhaps more remarkable was the fact that White came to see that the greater values of the Constitution had to be preferred to the cause he had loved and fought for. This was touchingly demonstrated when in 1914 he said:

“Now with the mists of the conflict of the Civil War cleared from my vision, as my eyes fall with tender reverence upon that thin gray line, lo, the invisible has become the
visible and the Blue and the Gray, thank God, are one. I see it (peace and brotherhood) illustrated in that flag that stands behind me. . . In the clarified vision in which it is now given to me to see it, as I look upon its azure field, it is resplendent with the lustre of the Southern cross, and as I contemplate its stripes they serve to mark the broad way for the advance of a mighty people blessed with that plenitude of liberty tempered with justice and self-restraint essential to the protection of the rights of all. And thus again I see, although the Stars and bars have faded and forever, the fundamental aspirations which they symbolized find their imperishable existence in the stars and stripes."

What a profession of faith in the lasting unity and brotherhood of our Nation! He conquered his early prejudices and felt free to admit that the succession had been both unconstitutional and unwise. "My God," he once said in anguish, "My God if we had succeeded."

And his action fitted his words. When the Southern States attempted to avoid the proscription of the 15th Amendment to the Constitution which guaranteed the right of every American to vote without regard to "race, colour or previous condition of servitude," he stood squarely for the words of the Constitution. Some of the States, in order to prevent Negroes from voting provided in substance that all persons were eligible to vote if their grandfathers had been eligible prior to 1866 to vote. That was the year after the Constitution, through the 13th Amendment, prohibited slavery forevermore. This, of course, would have defranchised all the Negroes because their grandfathers had been slaves who had no voting rights. In the famous case of Guinn v. United States in 1914, known as the Grandfather Clause Case, he wrote the opinion invalidating the practice as being contrary to the Constitution of the United States.

When Chief Justice White wrote this opinion, he was not only making manifest his own strong and generous character, but he was reflecting the principles of this University and the teaching that he received here in the troubled days of the Class of 1863.

He was reflecting the spirit of unity that had guided the destinies of this School for generations. He was reflecting great credit on his University, and I am sure that everyone connected with it is today happy to celebrate the anniversary of his class and the anniversary of the abolition of slavery at the same time that you are celebrating the 175th anniversary of your founding.

We need that spirit of unity and reconciliation now as much as we did in his day. The world is divided by bitterness, and that bitterness has found its way into segments of our national life. Unrestrained by our better natures, it can do us untold injury. We are in another crisis as grave as that which brought the Constitution of the United States into being. It is a world crisis, and how long it will last we cannot know. It is a crisis that is born of bitterness and it is axiomatic that bitterness begets bitterness.

We don't know that if we are to play a noble part in the affairs of the world, we must be a united nation; united in spirit and united in action. It is the spirit of unity that has made us a great Nation, and nothing less than unity will sustain us as such in the future. If Chief Justice White and Mr. Justice Holmes, and many others like them, could cast aside their earlier differences and resulting prejudices and work together for the strengthening of the Union after having fought on opposite sides in a divisive war, certainly Americans of today should be able and willing to submerge their differences and irritations for the common good. Nothing less will serve the cause of America.

Immediately after the Civil War, Georgetown as a symbol of unity adopted the colors of Blue and Gray. It again brought together students from all parts of the land. For the last hundred years, they have come together here under those colors to the great enrichment of our country. It thus became in the educational world a symbol of unity as the United States became in the political world. As it projected its established principles, ideals and traditions to uphold our common heritage it combined religious and ethical values in a scientific and humanistic culture. These values are implicit in your motto, "Utraque Unum," signifying that spiritual and ethical values are at one with the scientific, cultural and political ideals of mankind. In such a tradition one can find the wisdom needed for this age that is upon us.

I congratulate you on your one hundred and seventy-fifth birthday, and I join you in honoring the memory of one of your students of the Class of 1863, a great American, the ninth Chief Justice of the United States, Edward D. White.
In setting about my task this evening I am em­boldened by the knowledge that this great univer­sity, to which I am already indebted in so many ways, has recently conferred academic honors on an old friend and confere of mine, the Reverend Gustave Weigel, S.J., who some days previously had been similarly honored at my own university.

So much of his work as a theologian has been in removing walls of misunderstanding and building bridges between different churches; and Yale has graciously honored him for his ironic spirit in which clear conviction is never sullied by the asperity of controversy. “You have broken through the Re­formation wall,” his citation ran, “and pioneered in Catholic-Protestant dialogue.” He and other Christian spokesmen, without sacrifice of principle,

have shown how pointless is the ancient vice of odium theologicum. And it is in the same kindly spirit of inquiry that I hope to explore the charac­ter and accomplishments of Catholic higher edu­cation in the United States. For the subject of edu­cation is only slightly less controversial—if at all—than theology and religion.

I cannot claim any special expertness in the field which has been assigned to me. Many of my con­temporaries were prone to a certain scepticism about the formal study of education. Was not the mastering of a field of knowledge—so the argument ran—more important that devising methods of imparting it? The aim of education was obviously the harmonious development of “the whole man”—and what “the whole man” was could be inferred with-
out too much difficulty from one’s philosophy. There was an emphasis on the wisdom of the past, on classical literature, not only as a discipline for mind and literary style, but as a depository of “the best that has been said and thought.” This is an over-simplification, to be sure, even a caricature. Certainly I would not repudiate my classical training. But as regards our present discussion, my own professional studies—apart from ecclesiastical subjects—have been in the field of political science rather than education, my teaching and administrative work has been practically all at one place. I can hardly claim, then, depth of knowledge or breadth of view. I can only offer you the reflections of one who is deeply committed to teaching and scholarship in a Catholic University which was called by the late Pope Pius XI “the Alma Mater of all Catholic colleges in the United States.”

What I shall attempt here is, first to state in general terms the problem of the Catholic educator in organizing his system; next, to outline enough of the history of the Catholic Church in this country so that the development of its educational system may be better understood; third, to examine several important characteristics of Catholic education; and finally, to indicate its accomplishments, with some attention to recent criticism from Catholic sources. Though the relation of these ideas to our conference theme is round-about, I believe that they may suggest a new dimension to our discussion. In any event, I am most grateful to Yale and the conference committee for the opportunity to address you on a topic of great intrinsic interest.

II.

If one’s idea of the state must be plotted with reference to two axes, a theory of man and a theory of the universe, so surely must one’s philosophy of education. If a man is merely a tangl e of atoms, fortuitously combined, fortuitously dissolved, if the grave is the ultimate fact of life, surely the principles, judgements and values conveyed to a student will reflect these suppositions. Fate or freedom, chance or choice, immortality or dissolution—these are quite dissimilar matrices, each with its consequences for ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics. Thus the bright dawn of Homeric Greece cannot quite outshine an underlying despair when we hear the great Achilles tell Odysseus,

“Seek not to speak soothingly to me of death... I should choose, so I might live on earth, to serve as the hireling of another, of some portionless man... rather than to be lord over all of the dead...”

How different the medieval vision as expressed in Beatrice’s speech to Dante and the hope implicit in it: “Admire how great the company of the robes of white, Behold our city, how wide it spreads its gyres.”

The Catholic educator, then, in framing an educational system to prepare youth for a full, responsible life in today’s world, takes as his point of departure traditional wisdom, illumined by faith, about man and his place in the universe. On the one hand, he is conscious that his is the oldest cultural heritage in the West, whose institutional embodiment is the Catholic Church. The Catholic’s system of thought is rooted in a spiritual tradition, leading him back through the ceaselessly varying patterns of concrete events, to a still, high plane of changeless principle. His view of life, the basic assumptions of his educational system, are founded ultimately on certain propositions about man and the universe—his relationship to God, for example, and to other men—that Catholics deem to be divinely revealed. From these truths, which are the objects of study, not of search, he arrives at others by using all the powers of his mind. But he will never discover a new state of nature, for example, as did Rousseau, or a new matrix for human development as did Marx. His life and all his striving is a testimony to the inquietum cor of St. Augustine. For him, man will ever be the creature of God, destined to find fulfillment in God. He can never “wipe the slate clean” and begin all over again.

Yet the Catholic educator is an inquirer, too. He classifies, forms hypotheses, generalizes. He works in the same framework of intellectual disciplines and cultural concerns as his contemporaries. Here at times a special difficulty may confront him. The Catholic thinker must explain not only his basic principles but often his terminology as well, for the very continuity of his tradition seems almost to have imposed on him an idiom of discourse quite unfamiliar to his contemporaries. I have particularly in mind some well-worn phrases of scholastic theology and philosophy.

Finally, he must develop the application of his principles to comprehend new needs, new facts, new situations. The rate of change in the modern world is exponential; ours is a conspicuously dynamic world. And if principles are ultimate, they are not therefore static, they should be capable of expansion and adaption. If it is true, for example, that the two great commandments of the Gospel point the way to peace and happiness, it is still necessary to discover how they may be applied, step by step, in the weighting of subjects in a curriculum, e.g., or in literary or artistic criticism, or passing judgment on social and international problems. The Catholic educator, then, must take care
that the continuity or perspective which his tradition should impart to his views does not issue in mere static generalities and solutions, empty because they are oversimplified. The words of the Gospel may very appositely be applied here: "Every scholar, then, whose learning is of the kingdom of heaven must be like a rich man, who knows how to bring both new and old things out of his treasure house."

III.

I shall return presently to the characteristics and aims of Catholic higher education. I believe, however, that such a discussion will be more meaningful if it is introduced by an historical sketch of the Catholic Church and its educational system in the United States.

Of the colonial period little need be said. Spain was the first European power to establish permanent settlements in what is today the United States. From the Florida peninsula, around through the Southwest and up into northern California, a network of missions, a fabric of civilization spread. Church and state were closely united; churchmen and Spanish government officials bitterly fought, but the primitive peoples of the area learned the arts of peace—agriculture, husbandry, the care of the vine, and all manner of handicrafts. We Americans—and I include American Catholics—are often quite ignorant of this fascinating history. It was an American Protestant scholar, the late Herbert Eugene Bolton of the University of California, former President of the American Historical Association, who did most to promote an unbiased view of Spanish America. Franciscans and Jesuits, men like Junipero Serra and Eusebio Kino, deserve a place in any list of colonial pioneers. They and their confreres were the explorers, the cartographers, and linguists, the anthropologists, the builders of this vast area, as were their brethren in Canada.

New France, the St. Lawrence and Mississippi valleys, the region around the Great Lakes, were the second great area of Catholic penetration in the colonial period. Here there was a greater degree of permanent settlement. Here too, the aborigines were often more warlike and more savage, and not only against the French explorer and colonist but against each other. Here the Recollets and Jesuits pioneered, and the names of Marquette and Hennepin appear on our maps, while the church venerates as saints and martyrs eight Jesuits put to death by the Iroquois in Canada and what is now New York State. France also established a settlement on the Gulf Coast, now known as Mobile, and the great colony of Louisiana.

English settlement of these shores was, of course, the most continuous, influential, and ultimately the most extensive. Both Anglican and Puritan agreed on one thing—their relentless opposition to Catholicism, which characterized all the colonies out of Massachusetts to Georgia. To this intolerance there were two brilliant exceptions—the colonies of Maryland and Pennsylvania. The former's founders, George and Cecil Calvert, the Barons Baltimore, were Catholics, and they were dedicated to the idea of religious toleration.

A majority of the first Maryland settlers in 1634 were members of the Church of England, but life in the early years of the colony was characterized by mutual respect and toleration. Charles M. Andrews rightly asserts: "In that respect, the settlement of Maryland holds a unique place in the history of English colonization." Puritan sabotage was soon to end this idyll. In spite of the Act of Toleration of 1649, drafted by Lord Baltimore and passed by an assembly composed of Catholics and Protestants, the Puritan victory destroyed the sanctuary of liberty, and presently the ruthless regime of English penal laws against Catholics was applied in all its rigor.

At about the same time that these events were taking place, a new colony was beginning to the North. William Penn had wanted to found a community where all who believed in God would enjoy freedom of worship and civil rights. So tolerant a policy did not commend itself to the government in London; nevertheless in practice the rule of the colony was generous to Catholics. Many Maryland families migrated there, and before the middle of the 18th Century, English Jesuits were active in the ministry. A few of their German confreres followed, for Catholic immigrants from the Rhine-land were settling on the fine farm lands to the west of Philadelphia.

Elsewhere there is hardly any record of Catholic settlement. There was the honorable but short-lived attempt in New York, under the governorship of the Catholic Colonel Thomas Dongan, to establish religious freedom through a Bill of
Rights adopted in 1683. The regime lasted for only five years; once more the Puritans triumphed, Dongan was hunted like a criminal, the Jesuits were once more put to flight. But if one would trace the ancestry of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, Lord Baltimore, William Penn and Thomas Dongan, a Quaker and two Catholics, are in the direct line. And what they attempted to do was not motivated by religious indifferentism but by realistic statesmanship and a sense of respect for the rights of the other party.

What wonder then that, when the Revolution broke in 1775, the Catholics rallied to its support—the Marylander, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, at their head? What wonder, either that the Catholic French of Canada, satisfied with their status under the Quebec Act, and alarmed at the anti-Catholic reaction the same act provoked to the South, refused to join the American colonists, in spite of the mission of Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Chase, and the two cousins Charles Carroll and Father John Carroll? What wonder, finally, that this same Father Carroll, soon to become America’s first Catholic bishop, should express the true tradition of his Maryland homeland and the full aspiration of his Catholic fellow countrymen, when he wrote in his prospectus for Georgetown College in 1787 that it would “be open to Students of every religious Profession”—a quite original gesture in American education.

Let me remark here that the American Revolution and the documents, state and federal, that bear it witness, were not secularist, still less antireligious. As the English historian E. E. Y. Hales has put it, drawing on the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of Massachusetts, and the Bill of Rights, “The American Revolution said, in effect, that God was real, was the author of justice, and ought to be worshipped.” The Constitutional Convention of 1788 was a far cry from the Paris convention of 1793, and a whole world removed from the Supreme Soviet of 1917.

Here, then, on the morrow of the revolution, was a small Catholic community—some 35,000 in all—mostly poor and undistinguished, with one bishop, John Carroll, and one college he had founded, Georgetown. Its purpose, like that of older colleges founded in colonial days, was in part to educate candidates for the ministry. Thus Carroll wrote to a friend: “On this academy is built all my hope of permanency and success to our Holy religion in the United States.” Perhaps it would be well to recall that of the 182 permanent colleges founded before the Civil War, 175 were under religious control. In all of these, the preparation of a learned ministry was a principal objective. It was almost universally taken for granted that there would be a strong spiritual bond, if not a formal legal connection, between church and college, and even college and state.

But the encouragement of priestly vocations was not to be Georgetown’s sole or even major end. Like the Jesuit colleges of an earlier day in Europe, it was to have a more comprehensive educational aim: “And though no member,” said Carroll again, “should take to the Church, we conceive this end alone worthy of our most earnest concurrence ...” the end, that is, of diffusing knowledge and promoting virtue.11

The position of Georgetown, then and the Catholic colleges which followed it was not unlike that of other denominational institutions—by far the majority at this time. All of them benefited from legally established freedom of religion. This status was not only a reflection of the sound principles of the founding fathers; it was a practical recognition of the impossibility of favoring one religion over another in the presence of such a variety of sects. As Hales puts it, “religious equality in the United States was the outcome of the play of historical forces; the union of so religiously divergent a people permitted no other solution.”

The early decades of the nineteenth century were characterized by a great religious ferment. To this the denominational colleges contributed greatly, and as the frontier mover ever westward, new foundations multiplied. Many of the great state universities also trace their origins to this period. The number of foundations, both Catholic and other, is astonishing; surely it reflects the enthusiasm of the founders rather than the resources available or the number of qualified students. A Catholic authority tells us that “of 42 Catholic colleges founded between 1786 and 1850 only ten were permanent. ... Although this was a high mortality rate, it was slightly lower than the rate for non-Catholic colleges which was about 80%.”

With the expanding frontier a missionary motive for founding colleges became prominent in the minds of educational pioneers, Catholic and Protestant alike. “The American college was typically
a frontier institution. . . . The unusually large numbers of small colleges founded in America constitutes one of the most distinctive features of our development in higher education." But another darker side to the bright picture of immigration and settlement showed itself as the nineteenth century moved on. It deeply affected the Catholic Church in America and its educational institutions, and though this is a sad page in our history—sad even as much of our inter racial history is sad—some mention must be made of it here.

In sixty years from 1790 to 1850, the Catholic population grew from 35,000 to over 1,600,000. In the single decade 1850-1860 this number doubled again. The Catholics of the colonial and early Federal periods were, by and large, homogeneous with their fellow citizens, except in their religion; but the great influx of Catholic immigrants inevitably had for its effect the setting apart of their Church as a foreign thing, and the intensification of the already deep prejudice against this alien, exotic body. Agitation and incitement against Catholics became so violent that on one occasion (in August, 1834) a mob, stirred up by the eloquence of a well-known minister, burned down the convent of the Ursuline nuns at Charlestown, Massachusetts, a highly regarded school attended by many non-Catholic girls from Boston. Hales's comment is eloquent: "For this event only one man was brought to trial, and he was acquitted. But the Massachusetts legislature saw fit to set up a committee for the inspection of convents." Similar violence threatened later in New York. But there, the redoubtable Bishop John Hughes vindicated the rights of his flock. When the authorities refused to guarantee protection, he stationed armed guards around the churches, warning the Mayor and his Council that his people should not be provoked. "If any Catholic Church is burned here, New York will be a Moscow," said Hughes. Billington comments: "Such an attitude, belligerent as it was, was necessary, for only through open threats could bloodshed have been averted in New York in those troubled days . . . Bishop Hughes deserves credit for saving New York from a period of mob rule, . . ." In the end, New York calmed down and avoided the unfortunate example of Philadelphia, where during the course of a three-day riot in 1844 two churches and a seminary were burned as well as rows of houses, thirteen lives were lost, and fifty men wounded. To summarize briefly, the 1840's and 50's witnessed anti-Catholic riots, burnings of churches, attacks on convents on a widespread scale throughout the land.

It is necessary to recall these unhappy events of the Nativist, Know-Nothing movement because the immediate occasion for much of the agitation, particularly in New York and Philadelphia, was the question of public support for church schools, and also of the availability of the Douai Bible to Catholic children in public schools. This was the period when, had a more tolerant attitude prevailed, it might have been possible to work out arrangements similar to those of other countries of mixed religion, where all schools meeting prescribed standards receive state support. One writer comments that the most lasting effect of the nativist movement "has been to prevent any religious instruction of any kind from being given in state public schools . . . lest public money might be found to be spent in support of Catholic teaching." The argument which prevailed in New York "was not the argument that it was impracticable for the state to provide for Catholics, Protestants and Jews alike, but rather the argument . . . that it was immoral for any public money to be spent in any way that might assist popery. 'If the fearful dilemma were forced on me [said one minister] of becoming an infidel or a Roman Catholic, according to the entire system of popery, with all its idolatry, superstition, and violent opposition to the Bible I would rather be an infidel than a papist'."

Though these disputes concerned elementary schools, it may easily be inferred how the deep cleavage produced by the nativist movement forced Catholics to think of themselves more and more as a beleaguered minority, encouraged a defensive mentality among them, and provided an additional motive for the development of Catholic colleges—the protection of the faith of those under attack. As time went on, this motive may have become unduly prominent in the minds of many Catholics.

Further to prolong these historical considerations would be to distort the emphasis of this paper. But it is important to point out that education not only shapes society but is shaped by it. Catholic education would not have taken the somewhat separatist form it did had it not been for the oppression of Colonial times, the joyful victory of religious freedom after the Revolution, followed by renewed intolerance under the impact of the immigration and nativism during the 19th Century.
So spurred on by a new challenge, Catholic schools and colleges multiplied across the land. It has been by no means an unqualified success story—and certainly not such in material terms. Power lists 268 Catholic Colleges for men founded from 1786 until 1956; of these, only 82 survived as of that date. This number of institutions and the variety of fields offered is astonishing, especially when one considers the limited resources of the Catholic community and the many importunate demands on it—not forgetting the claims of the tax collectors. So fastidious a critic as Evelyn Waugh has summed up the results: “This achievement is indeed something entirely unique. Without help from the state—indeed in direct competition with it—the poor of the nation have covered their land with schools, colleges and universities, boldly asserting the principle that nothing less than an entire Christian education is necessary to produce Christians. For the Faith is not a mere matter of learning a few prayers and pious stories in the home. It is a complete culture infusing all humane knowledge. . . . The Englishman, who can boast no single institution of higher Catholic education . . . can only applaud what American Catholics have done in the last one hundred years.”

IV.

Early in this paper I observed that one's view of man and his place in the universe determines one's educational objectives. Catholic reason illumined by faith is quite clear about these points. In referring to them, one would not expect acquiescence in the Catholic view, but a realization at least that it embodies a cultural heritage of considerable standing, from the New Testament, through Augustine and the Schoolmen, to Newman and our own day, with converging streams from Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics. It has often been said that Catholicism is not only a creed but a culture. That is, it is not merely an assent to a number of propositions dealing with man's relation to God, implemented, so to speak, by a certain ritual of worship. It is an attitude toward the whole of life, inspired by religion. From the Catholic's religious convictions there springs a hierarchy of values and priorities, and I shall attempt at this point to distinguish some characteristics of this attitude. In so doing, I shall be describing what Catholic education strives to impart, higher education in particular. It may well be that these objectives are not quite fully realized nor adequately achieved. They are none the less the ideal—laid up, perhaps, in heaven.

Probably the most important characteristic of the Catholic view of life and Catholic education is totality. It would strive to encompass not only sensible reality but the immaterial world as well—nature, man and God. “Admit a God,” says Newman, “and you introduce among the subjects of your knowledge a fact encompassing, closing in upon, every other fact conceivable.” Not that education begins and ends with theology. As Newman puts it elsewhere, “. . . the object of the Catholic Church in setting up universities . . . is to reunite things which were in the beginning joined together by God, and have been put asunder by man. Some persons will say that I am thinking of confining, distorting and stunting the growth of intellect by ecclesiastical supervision. I have no such thought. Nor have I any thought of a compromise, as if religion must give up something, and science something. I wish the intellect to range with the utmost freedom, and religion to enjoy an equal freedom; but what I am stipulating is that they should be found in one and the same place and exemplified in the same persons. I want to destroy that diversity of centres, which puts everything into confusion by creating contrariety of influences. I wish the same spots and the same individuals to be at once oracles of philosophy and shrines of devotion. It will not satisfy me, what has satisfied so many, to have two independent systems, intellectual and religious, going at once side by side, by a sort of division of labor, and only accidentally brought together.”

In this total, theocentric view of life—and hence of education—is to be found the Catholic's integrating principle. He is a creature of God, a child of God, destined to find fulfillment in God—as are all men. From this principle also springs his belief in the unique value of the human person, endowed with rights which are not created by society but are implanted by the loving hand of the Creator and Father.

Many critics have deplored the lack of any similar integrating principle in American culture and education at large. Walter Lippmann, for example, as far back as his Preface to Morals and as recently as his Public Philosophy, expresses his concern about the virtual disappearance of an agreed framework of values for both public and private life, founded in the rational faculty of man. “If,” says Lippmann, alluding to Sartre, “what is good, what is true, is only what the individual 'chooses' to 'invent,' then we are outside the tradition of civility.”

Here is to be found a second characteristic of Catholic education, its rationalistic emphasis—the conviction that, after all these centuries, there are some things that are proven; and while we may penetrate more deeply into their meaning, we are not going to have to discover new things in their place. The imprint of Plato, Aristotle, and the Schoolmen is strong on Catholic education, and Catholic colleges require a substantial amount of formal schol-
actic philosophy in their curriculum.

It seems to me that a healthy insistence on the value of reason is of particular importance in a democratic society. Decisions must be made rationally, discussed rationally—not merely in terms of “I will” or “I like.” There must be a sense of lawfulness—of fas—to which decisions can be referred. All the hidden persuaders, attitude manipulators, propagandaists must be held accountable to reason. “The rule of reason” is a lawyer’s commonplace; the classical definition of law—all law, divine or human—enshrined in Catholic philosophy describes it as “an ordinance of reason.” The Catholic educator believes that truth is attainable; that inquiry must somewhere have an end, must lead at last to a verifiable conclusion.

One must single out other characteristics of Catholic thought—a certain respect for tradition, for example, which might be described as pietas, reverence, a sense of one’s place in the scheme of things. Or one might notice an awareness, both in life and literature, of a life to come. As St. Paul said: “We have an everlasting city, but not here; our goal is the city that is one day to be.” These attitudes stem from the conviction that human history is linear, a steady progression from divine creation to fulfillment in the divine.

Let me emphasize the fact that none of these characteristics is uniquely Catholic. I believe, however, that the combination of them and the degree of intensity with which they pervade the Catholic mind is the mainspring of Catholic culture. These are the attitudes that should color the Catholic educator’s interpretation of reality and his presentation of it to his students. He would argue that his interpretation of reality would be less than adequate if it did not reflect these characteristics. So he does not view a Catholic college program as “secular” subjects plus the formal teaching of religion, or a Catholic college as a hothouse, still less a stockade, within which youth are to be sheltered from the hostile world. It is rather a place where this Catholic attitude towards life as a whole may be communicated. And I think you will agree that, to the degree that this communication can successfully take place, the result will be anything but parochial, one-sided, or inadequate. It will be humane, in the poet Terence’s sense and Catholic in the most complete sense.

V.

Such is the aspiration; what of the achievement? Well, “A man’s reach must exceed his grasp.” The road has been a difficult one. I have noted already the large proportion of foundations that did not survive. Yet the tendency to expand continues. According to the latest figures, there are at present 36 accredited Catholic universities, 53 four-year colleges for men, and 127 four-year colleges for women; their total enrollment is 321,284. Like their counterparts under other religious or secular auspices, these institutions vary in quality and scope. What is important is the steady improvement, particularly since World War II, which shows itself in improved curricula and greatly strengthened staffs. Though most of these colleges are principally concerned with Liberal Arts courses, there has been considerable development in professional departments as well, beginning with the establishment of Georgetown’s School of Medicine, in 1849—now the nucleus of a center comprising a 400-bed hospital, a School of Nursing, and a School of Dentistry.

There are five other medical schools and 21 law schools under Catholic auspices, as well as other professional institutions. What will be of more interest to this gathering is the extent of doctoral programs in academic fields. There are ten Catholic graduate schools (six of them under the direction of the Society of Jesus) which offer the Doctorate in three or more areas. Together, they offer a total of 25 fields (I am not distinguishing the various specialties within fields as for example in Biology or History). Oddly enough, perhaps, the most frequent fields are chemistry, history, and philosophy, offered by nine of the ten schools. Next come English and Physics, offered by seven.

It would take far too long to describe curricular development and to present statistics of various programs and enrollments. Catholic education has often been charged with inadequate achievement in the field of natural sciences. This may well be a valid observation. I suggest, however, that it reflects a shortage of material resources rather than cultural unconcern. This shortage is now gradually
lessened as government and private foundations distribute their support more widely. It is hard to break out of the iron circle of poverty. Grants are bestowed where fine scientists are found; but they are attracted where fine facilities exist—which facilities are attainable only through grants and large capital gifts. It may be mentioned in this context that there are Nobel Prize winners at Fordham and St. Louis Universities, while at Georgetown there is a brilliant young experimental physicist whose scientific contributions include the method of detecting nuclear detonations anywhere in the world.

In recent years there has been considerable criticism, from Catholic sources, of Catholic intellectual achievement and hence of Catholic higher education. Two of the most important critical statements have come from Monsignor John Tracy Ellis, Professor of American Church History, Catholic University, and my confrere, Father Gustave Weigel, S.J., Professor of Ecclesiology in Woodstock College. A debater would point out that both Monsignor Ellis and Fr. Weigel are products of Catholic colleges and universities, from their lowest degrees to their highest; but what of their arguments?

Monsignor Ellis, writing in 1955, deplores the scarcity and lack of influence of American Catholic intellectuals. He speaks of a Catholic “self-imposed ghetto mentality,” and draws on a number of statistical studies (based, it must be said, on data already fairly old at the time of his writing) which purport to show the mediocrity or worse of Catholic intellectual attainment.

Father Weigel, in an article published in 1957, does not concern himself with statistics. Instead, after some important observations on the general problem of the relation of theology and the Church and secular knowledge, he offers some well-taken criticism of inadequate teaching of philosophy and religion in Catholic institutions, suggesting, however, that such teaching is typical. He remarks that, in America, “the weak presence of Catholics in national scholarship is a Catholic problem.” His article is studded with brilliant insights; the general effect, however, is to leave a somewhat sour taste. He goes so far as to state as a postulate (sic) that the “general Catholic community in America does not know what scholarship is.” I wonder whether, if one changed the adjective “Catholic” to Baptist or Presbyterian or indeed any other minority designation, the proposition would not be equally true; and therefore whether it really means very much. One may experiment with this statement, varying the religious group and the country named, and find that it is one of those generalizations that has a stunning verbal effect but little meaningful content.

However valid or otherwise these and other similar criticisms may have been (and I am convinced that even when they were put forth they needed considerable qualification), there is evidence that they are now definitely out of date. A sociologist at the University of Chicago, the Reverend Andrew M. Greeley, working in the National Opinion Research Center, has offered excellent statistical evidence to show a marked improvement in the quality of Catholic college graduates. This material is in the writer’s doctoral dissertation, presented in 1962, and in two articles based on it. The “anti-intellectualist” view of Catholics would have it that graduates of Catholic colleges are less likely than others to go to graduate school, less likely to choose academic fields—above all, the natural sciences—than vocational fields, less likely to be religious, loyal to their Catholic college, and so on. Greeley’s studies show rather the reverse. They are based on an investigation made by the National Opinion Research Center of the career plans of some 35,000 college graduates of June 1961. To summarize some of the more important findings, the statistics indicate that Catholic college graduates of that year were more likely to go to graduate school than Protestants. If they had decided on graduate work they were more likely to choose the academic fields than their Protestant and Jewish classmates. Whether these Catholic graduates had
attended Catholic colleges or non-Catholic private institutions made no difference: the percentage of those planning graduate work was the same in each. Both of these groups appeared more likely to plan graduate education than Catholics in public colleges. And, as a final indication, one-third of the academic graduate students from the Catholic colleges planned to study in the physical sciences. Greeley concludes: “Perhaps no statistical argument ever proves anything with certainty; however, it is quite clear what the NORC study does not prove. It offers not a bit of evidence for the alleged intellectual inferiority of Catholics or of Catholic schools. Those within the Church who feel that the inferiority does in fact exist are now in a position where they must bring up new evidence or at least retreat into silence.” As Greeley points out, enrollment in graduate school is not the same as receiving the doctorate, and receiving the doctorate is not a charisma of scholarship. But there is now a large starting field in the race. Few ever achieve greatness; perhaps, at any rate, more Catholics are now approaching it.

VI.

This survey, superficial as it has necessarily been, must now be brought into relation with the Conference theme, “Education in a World of Crisis.” The qualities which I have mentioned as characteristic, in their combination, of the Catholic attitude toward life, are particularly relevant to this theme. Catholic education should impart perspective, a willingness to strive, a positive acceptance of each man’s obligation to face life and its problems, individual and social. The world has faced crisis before; one might argue that that is our normal stance. The Catholic’s theocentric view should give him stability and ultimate confidence in contending with the world’s evil. He will not seek solutions in better technology, but in improving the quality of mind and will that employs material resources. Above all, he will never be content to stay with things as they are; nothing but the best efforts, the best achievements of humanity are worthy of humanity’s Creator.

I have perhaps given a somewhat idealistic picture of Catholic higher education. Yet I believe that it is not a misleading one. No true educator will ever be satisfied with the present; he will constantly urge himself forward, redefining and clarifying his aims. Such definition and clarification lead the way directly to better performance.

That this is happening now is not hard to discover. For example, America has been in a debtor relationship to the old world where scholars and scholarship have been concerned. Catholic higher education has probably been proportionately a greater importer of intellectual capital than other sectors of American education. My own university from its very beginning has been vastly enriched by professors who came to us from abroad and Americans who completed their studies abroad. Now the balance is changing, the debt is being repaid. I can speak with some authority of Georgetown, but I believe that our situation is not unique. We are being approached by many countries of South America and Africa with proposals to initiate college — and university-level courses in languages, the medical sciences, the social sciences. It is worthy of note that some of these countries want privately controlled education, not state education alone. I remarked early in his paper that my direct participation in such matters is limited to one place, and I trust that you will not feel that my references to Georgetown are excessive. I mention it only as evidence that, in addition to achieving at least an adequate level in liberal and professional education and looking forward to new responsibilities in international education, it has made some unique contributions to American education. Such, I believe, was the concept of a specialized School of Foreign Service which was inaugurated in 1919, and the modern approach to the teaching of languages in our Institute of Languages and Linguistics founded in 1949. And this year, a new research organization has been inaugurated, the Georgetown University Center for Strategic Studies, to be headed by Admiral Arleigh Burke, USN (ret.), former Chief of Naval Operations. The purpose of this center is to conduct studies of the strategies by which free societies may utilize their total strength to preserve and develop the values underlying Western civilization. It will be a cooperative organization in which it is expected that Georgetown scholars will collaborate with consultants from other universities throughout the world. Other Catholic universities have also made significant new contributions to American cultural life. I have in mind the tremendous project of St. Louis University in microfilming the Vatican archives and housing this magnificent collection in a new library under ideal conditions for research. It may be fairly claimed, then, in the light of all that I have said, that the achievement of Catholic education up to now has not been altogether inconsiderable. I believe that it will make a steadily greater contribution to American life in the future.
We live in a rich society and the United States of the 1960's is rightly viewed, the world over, as the model of an affluent society. Yet poverty persists, and many are left untouched by the general upward movement of our economy. Recent history and the permanence of a large number of poor have shattered our belief that a sufficient enlargement of the economic pie will do away with most poverty. Having heard so much about the problems of poverty and the development of society in other nations, we are shocked and confused at discovering our own.

The call to do away with poverty "here and now," is loud and clear. President Johnson's State of the Union Message was a declaration of war on poverty, in line with America's broadest and best values. Yet victory in this war calls for more than the conviction that we are doing the right thing and the knowledge that our economy can afford to do away with poverty. Since doing away with poverty will require voter approval and support to change the levels and types of public expenditures, this war will also require broad public support and an emotional and intellectual commitment to battle and victory.

The necessary commitment can be achieved only by spreading an understanding of what poverty is, of how it is to be fought, and of what not winning this war might mean. At this time there is no agreement in the country on a definition of poverty, the size of the problem, or actions to be taken. In Washington, in state capitols and in city halls debate is rampant on priorities and methods. Programs allegedly meant to do away with poverty and those designed to help "all of society" are pitted against one another and against fiscal and monetary efforts aimed at insuring higher rates of economic growth. Perceptions of poverty and the hard facts of poverty appear to be in conflict. Rural poverty as a condition of particular localities is overemphasized but the extent to which it is an urban and metropolitan phenomenon, and the problem of special groups, have been underplayed.

Traditionally, poverty has been considered to be the condition of persons whose resources are insufficient to satisfy minimum needs. He who is poor is found to be the individual living below "minimum subsistence," the individual who does not live "adequately" or who lives in "deprivation." But, having agreed that no one should live below the level of subsistence or that no one should be deprived, we seem, as a nation, unable to agree on what subsistence or adequacy means.

The strategy and political economy of the war against poverty
Individuals differ in their ideas of need, their feelings of justice, their values. Their subjective estimates of need will differ according to whether they are themselves poor or not poor, thrifty or lax, interested in things or in ideas, conversant with or ignorant of the lives of the poor. Their explicit and, even more, their implicit notions about the workings of the economy and society become crucially important. They will view levels of poverty as unacceptable on the basis of whether they are economists, sociologists or engineers; whether they were trained at Harvard or Chicago; whether "survival of the fittest" sums up their social outlook or whether they conceive themselves as their "brother's keeper."

From such differences in judgment stem the many recent and varied estimates of the number of poor in the United States. The figure of thirty million has been receiving increasing currency and it is a good one. Yet the various statistical studies prepared for 1960, the last census year with very detailed data, estimate the poor variously as between twenty and seventy million.

There is also disagreement on whether there are now more or fewer poor than in the past. Here differing judgments about how the comparisons are to be made explain the differences. Should the standards of the past be taken as a guide and, having been corrected for changes in the value of the dollar, applied to the present? Or should the opposite be done and current standards be deflated and the extent of poverty of the past be so measured? By taking standards that go back far enough, we are bound to find that there are no poor today. Conversely, by taking present standards and projecting them backwards we would find, for instance, that Roosevelt's "one-third of a nation" would be more likely one half of the nation. Either exercise tells us more about changing standards than about the number of the poor. If comparisons are to be made they must be made in terms of contemporary standards and what needs to be measured is the number considered as living, say "below adequacy" by 1947 standards, compared with the number of those living "below adequacy" by 1960 standards. When this is done, we find that the number of poor—those who are living "below adequacy" and minimum comfort levels—has not changed very much. The story is different when abject poverty is involved. Here, when the numbers of poor—those who were living at or below minimum subsistence in 1947 and 1960—are compared we find that the proportion decreased from fifteen to eleven percent while the number moved only from twenty-one to twenty million.

It is also argued that the poor are still with us, so to speak, by definition. If we define the poor as making up some part of the bottom of the income distribution, some kind of lower fifth, eighth, tenth or whatever fraction you will, their eternal permanence is guaranteed. To develop a strategy to fight against poverty the problems of income distribution must be separated from those of poverty. Not that policy concern with income distribution is not important (nor can we forget that income distribution has recently become less egalitarian) but rather, income distribution should be kept what it is, namely, a derived aspect of poverty rather than, so to speak, its definitional cause.

The slope of the line tracing income distribution becomes unimportant when it is located above socially determined standards of sufficiency. With respect to both standards and numbers, what is important and significant in studying poverty and in mobilizing opinion for anti-poverty action is not any change but the lack of change. To note that for many in America the conditions of prewar years have disappeared is of no more use than to note to the man working in a poorly lighted room that a hundred years ago the very rich also worked by candle-light.

To decide on policies and to carry them out effectively it is important to identify the characteristics of individuals whose chances of being poor are particularly high. For most of the history of the United States, poverty was the fate of a large part of the population. The old and the young, man and woman, farmer and city dweller, black and white, North and South—all shared in the national insufficiency; for some the risk of poverty was greater but not much greater. The postwar situation is quite another story. As the overall impact of poverty lessened, poverty became increasingly a burden carried by select individuals. In the United States of the 1960's, poverty is most usefully viewed as the problem of certain specific people whose personal, social, and demographic characteristics must in some way be altered; otherwise, these people will be poor permanently.

In our own study for the Twentieth Century Fund we have developed a relatively simple measure of the association between possessing a given characteristic and having an income below certain specific levels. This permits us to make year-to-year comparisons of a given characteristic and among characteristics. Coefficients of several characteristics for families and of six characteristics for individuals were calculated for the postwar years for which data was available.
First, except for the characteristic male head of family over sixty-five, the risk of being poor for the characteristic studied has increased from 1947 to now. Second, the risk of poverty has remained relatively untouched by the “ups and downs” of the economy. Expansion does not reduce the risk of poverty nor does contraction increase it by very much.

Our tools of analysis are far from delicate and whatever conceptual clarity we have striven for is obscured by the roughness of the data. Yet one conclusion is inescapable: an anticyclical growth policy, no matter how aggressively waged, is not enough.

What is crucially different about our high-income economy is the fact that high rates of economic growth do not do away with poverty. Similarly, it is clear by now that significant rates of economic growth can be achieved without proportionate increases in the employment of human beings. We also know that rates of expansion in employment that are even larger than they have been historically do not necessarily mean decreases in poverty.

In this light, it is fatuous at best to debate about the relative contribution to the elimination of poverty of aggressively pursued monetary and fiscal policy leading to full employment as contrasted to the contribution of large expenditures on housing, health, education, welfare, etc. Obviously, both are required. It is useless to rely on the multiplier effect of even massive governmental spending if current poverty cannot be blamed on a nonexistent deficiency in aggregate demand. Nor can the blame be placed fully on the timidity of our monetary authorities or the unwillingness of Congress to amend the fiscal structure, when, even if we were to grant that achieving full employment meant doing away with poverty, it would take a growth rate of about ten percent per year sustained at least until 1975 to bring about full employment. This means that in spite of the very large number of poor, poverty cannot be viewed as a mass phenomenon. Policies aimed at the economic improvement of the total society and believed therefore to help the poor are of very limited use in the fight against poverty.

High levels of economic growth are the prerequisite—the necessary but not sufficient condition to do away with poverty. For the latter we need specific, focused action. Poverty obviously has a geographic dimension. Thus, Southerners and those who live in Appalachia run a greater risk of being poor. But the locational notion of poverty is of limited use for policy. The notion of pockets of poverty is helpful only insofar as it locates the area of action. But the cause is not the location. Certain areas have a larger number of poor because a higher proportion of their population possesses the personal traits that link the individual to poverty.

From the work on poverty that has been “seeing the light” recently, from our own identification of poverty-linked characteristics, from the work of others we know that, in the strictest sense of the word, the poor of today are the underendowed. “Underprivileged” has long been a fashionable word because it seems to offend less than the crasser one “poor,” and it means underendowed. On the whole, until we became a truly affluent society, the word was an inappropriate euphemism. Now if it fits. It means less endowed and less able to participate.

Indeed, the poor are out of the main stream of America. The underprivileged are not of, even though they are in, the market society. They sit outside—Harrington called them “invisible”—marginal sellers and not very good buyers. Yet, they are buyers more than sellers as transfer payments fill the gap and avoid, or at least postpone, decreases in aggregate demand. Often they are physical or mental invalids. They are economic invalids displaced by the market or never placed in it. Their income is greater rather than smaller than their marginal contribution. Their lesser income is linked to their smaller endowment. What makes the poor of the affluent society different, more than anything else, is the fact that they lack the personal assets which produce income. That the culture of the poor has its own vitality and in many aspects may be worthy of imita-
tion, need not be gainsaid in the recognition that they are deprived of precisely those assets, which, in the "here and now," makes it possible for them not to be poor. What is required then is the enlargement of the personal patrimony with which the poor can face the labor market successfully.

Studying the causes of lagging rates of economic growth, economists and other social scientists have been puzzled by rates of output and growth that are larger than observed increases in measured capital investment. The solution of the puzzle seems to be in the contribution to economic growth of individual human assets. While talk of investment in human capital is relatively recent it is not a new idea. What is new is only the terminology and the econometric method applied. As we have learned that the growth patterns of various societies reflect different rates of investment in human beings, we can conclude that given a high-income economy, different rates of investments in human beings determine who in that society is and who is not poor.

There is little doubt in my mind that poverty in America will be done away with by mobilizing the community to the notion that human beings must be enriched by a series of specific expenditures on education, health, housing, mental health, and so forth. Poverty will be eliminated primarily by energetic action along the lines on which we are already working—education, civil rights, retraining, slum abatement, and the rest.

Consider one specific form of investment in human beings. To the best of my knowledge, the world over, irrespective of economic conditions, the healthy, the happy, the well-educated and the well-brought-up child never ends up poor. Why don't we take the census tracts of the 133 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, and select in each the three poorest tracts and place in each of them at least three of the very best child-care centers that our knowledge can devise. Let us set up and equip, or re-equip, day-care centers with a truly excellent and comprehensive plant to which children between the ages of two and twelve who live in families—or with mothers—earning less than $5,000 per year can come and stay from early morning to late evening. Let us provide these children with the best in medical care, with wholesome food, with a good nursery and with a school that will stimulate them with faith and prepare them to face the world. These day-care centers can provide them with the health and the higher horizons that the deprived environment of their homes is denying them.

The construction part of this kind of investment will provide employment in areas which most need it. The centers will also provide employment and serve as training centers for nurses, teachers, dietitians, therapists, and guidance counselors—all of whom are in short supply. Further, it might free mothers to go to work and, if necessary, to get themselves retrained.

What I am proposing is neither aid to education nor federal intervention, because these day-care centers could be financed by a multiplicity of sources and through many jurisdictions. What I am proposing is a frontal attack on poverty by what I judge could be the best and fastest single step that could be taken to reduce future poverty. Can anyone argue that in our society youngsters brought up in such facilities will share the fate of their parents?
Fulbright-Hays Scholarship
Awards Announced

The Reverend Gerard F. Yates, S.J., announced on September 1, 1964, that six students have been awarded Fulbright-Hays Scholarships. The recipients of the awards are:

Charles Hall Daugherty (Graduate School, working toward Ph.D. in Government), Rockville, Maryland; to study Political Science in Brazil.
Edward Bernard Fallon, A.B. ’64 Grand Rapids, Michigan; to study History, University of Strasbourg, France.
Arthur Benjamin Gunlicks (Graduate School, working toward Ph.D. in Government), North Platte, Nebraska; to study Comparative Government, University of Gottingen, Germany.
Maura Earls Hurley (Graduate School, working toward M.A. in History), Washington, D.C.; to study Latin American Affairs in Venezuela.
Judith Ann Wineburg (Graduate School, working toward M.A. in Latin American Area Studies), Utica, New York; to study education system of Argentina, University of Buenos Aires, Argentina.

A total of 19 students from various departments of the University filed applications, out of 35 to whom forms were issued by the Fulbright Program Adviser. Prior to selection, the nineteen applicants were interviewed by a Campus Committee composed of Professors Castiglione, Gaghan, Yoklavich and Yates.

Moran Addresses CAIP

Speaking on the topic, “American Attitudes to World Population—The Challenge to Catholics,” William E. Moran, Jr., Dean of the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, addressed the 37th Annual Conference of the Catholic Association for International Peace on October 24, 1964. Dean Moran is President of the Association and was Chairman of the Conference. Other speakers included the Reverend George H. Dunne, S.J., Assistant to the President for International Affairs, Georgetown University and the Honorable Sargent Shriver, Director, Peace Corps.

Inter-Library Loan Established

Four University Libraries in Washington, D.C. (American, Catholic, Georgetown and Howard University) have agreed to make significant portions of the resources of their respective libraries available to each other on Inter-Library Loan for the use of graduate students and faculty members.

Beginning October 12, 1964, a thrice-a-week delivery service will be inaugurated among these four libraries to facilitate the interchange of library books and journals. The four libraries have agreed in principle to a very liberal policy on the lending of materials.
It is hoped that the sharing of existing resources will open the way for closer cooperation in the near future in the acquisition of all library materials and the elimination of unnecessary duplication of specialized and little used materials.

**College Awarded Phi Beta Kappa Chapter**

Early in September, it was announced that a chapter of *Phi Beta Kappa* had been awarded to the College of Arts and Sciences. Entrance into this most prestigious of the national fraternities has been seldom granted to Catholic schools, only three of which had preceded Georgetown into the fold.

**Georgetown Alumni Club Established in Lebanon**

A casual remark made last July by Dr. Hassan Saab, lead to the founding of the *Georgetown University Alumni Club* in Lebanon. It all started when the cultural attaché at the Lebanese Embassy in Washington, D. C., vacationing in Beirut, suggested to Alexander Nader, General Manager of Overseas Brokerage Services, that a few alumni gather for lunch to meet the visiting Director of International Relations at Georgetown, Father Gerard Yates, S.J.

Putting words into action, Nader organized the first meeting of the alumni association which held a luncheon honoring Father Yates, Monday at the AUB Alumni Club.

A group of 21 alumni and friends gathered to meet the visitor who was on a tour of the Middle East as a guest of the American Friends of the Middle East (A.F.M.E.). This organization, headquartered in Washington, D. C., grants scholarships to Arab students in various American universities.

In a few casual remarks the Director explained the purpose of his visit, "I am here as a guest of the American Friends of the Middle East in order to become more familiar with the conditions of education in the Arab countries and to promote educational exchange programs."

"Today at Georgetown there are 7,000 students, of which 600 are foreign students and 50 are from Arab countries—mostly from Lebanon and Iraq," continued Father Yates.

Looking over the faces in the audience he recognized former students who attended when he was Dean of the Graduate School. Among them was Dr. Saab. The speaker also singled out a Georgetown faculty member, Dr. Hisham Shirabi, Associate Professor of History who was there on a visit.

Among those attending was Dr. Pierre Nys, director of the American Friends of the Middle East in Damascus who accompanied the visitor to Beirut, Dr. Burton Thurston, vice president of AUB, Dr. Charles Malik, former president of the U.N. general assembly and professor of philosophy AUB, Russell Lynch, cultural attaché of the American embassy, Dr. Fouad Boustany, president of the Lebanese University, Miss Khalida Showker, and Joseph Salm of Tapline.

**Limited Football Returns to Georgetown**

On November 21, the Hoyas played their first intercollegiate football game since 1950 and defeated New York University 28-6 on Kehoe Field at Georgetown.

Georgetown had scheduled a game last year with Frostburg State Teachers College but had to cancel it because of the assassination of President Kennedy.

Jack Hagerty, director of athletics at Georgetown, emphasized that the New York University game was a one-time affair with no commitments and after the NYU game, "we'll play it by ear."

The Hoyas have now played NYU 15 times in a series beginning in 1928. Georgetown holds a 9-4-2 edge in this series.

Over 8000 students and alumni participated in the pre-game festivities and a victory celebration following the game.
Though I am not an alumnus, I am grateful for the opportunity to say a few things about Fr. Durkin’s book, though what I will say will probably sound more like my personal reminiscences than a review. For, though I am not a son of Georgetown, I really am some sort of blood relation—a sort of son once removed, as the Irish might put it. Three brothers were graduates—two in law, one from college and in medicine, and had I not “taken the veil” immediately after graduating from Gonzaga High School in 1922, I most certainly would have followed their wise steps. So—Georgetown is quite a bit in my blood, and even more so after reading Fr. Durkin’s excellent digest of the history that is so rich.

First impressions... How in the world did the College ever survive? Not only because of the frequent and serious crises of finances, the Civil War and other minor disturbances, but above all because of the schedule the students followed in those early days: up at 5 or 5:30 (summer, winter), Mass and a happy hour or so of study before breakfast, more and seemingly endless study until night prayers and bed at 8:30! Well, the boys—and the College—weathered this Spartan regime for a long time, and if it would be madness to try to impose such a regime in these days, at least Georgetown got off to a start that very likely put into the whole institution the moral fiber that is still, we like to tell ourselves, evident in the quality of the instruction and the students even in the 1960’s.

But the early days were not in every aspect that austere. They even had student riots—and with good reason, we are inclined to say. But the riots seem never to have been about the rising hours and other matters of discipline. In fact, it’s a little hard to discover just what they were about, as is generally true of any and all student demonstrations. Another interesting similarity between the past and the 20th century crops up in the remarks of President Fr. McGuire after the return of the students at the close of the Civil War: “They are more studious, more obedient, and they all feel the necessity of hard work.” Can you remember something like that being said when the GI’s returned to their interrupted studies or began them under the GI Bill?

There are many such parallels that emerge throughout this book, and they serve as reminders that the work Georgetown set upon 175 years ago is still going on; superficial customs and attitudes have changed, of course, but the fundamentals are still there.

Father Durkin manages to pack a lot of information into the relatively few pages of this book. Mention of the great Presidents—and Georgetown has had a splendid roster of them; the development of courses and the various schools; the great teachers; outstanding students and much more is deftly interwoven into the lively text. But above all, Fr. Durkin manages to catch the flavor that is distinctively Georgetown. I am quite sure that I cannot catch in a phrase just what that flavor, that tone is—after all, I am only a son once removed—but perhaps it was caught by Chief Justice White, who is quoted (p. 86) as saying, in part (he was comparing the goals and purposes and the operation of the U.S. constitutional system with the goals and operations of his Alma Mater):

“So as I turn my eye from this statue and this building (he was speaking at the unveiling of the statue of John Carroll on the campus), I see with my mental vision the building upon Capitol Hill. They seem to me the one the complement of the other; to me they seem to be one, the necessary result of the other; and when the work done here has failed or ceases to produce its effect, the work done there will pass away and our institutions will perish.”

Fr. Durkin’s lively story is a reminder that the work of forming Christian and Catholic citizens is still the dynamic soul of Georgetown’s life—and will be for the next 175 (or 475—why not?) years.

Harold C. Gardiner, S.J.
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