The NEED TO
IN HIGHER

A Statement of the Problems and Policies Committee
of the American Council on Education

- A great and unique strength of American higher education stems from the historic coexistence of strong private institutions and strong public institutions. American society benefits from the maintenance of both types, each at its best. Rivalry among institutions, and between groups of institutions, is healthy when conducted in an atmosphere of mutual respect. But generalizations which attribute qualitative characteristics to institutions simply because they are public or private go beyond the facts. There are strong institutions and weak ones in both groups. Differences among the members within a group are much greater than are differences between the two categories. The strength and value of a college flow from what it is, not from the category to which it belongs. It is as shortsighted as it is false to promote one segment of higher education at the expense of another.

- American higher education is characterized by great diversity. Its institutions vary strikingly in size, in length and kinds of programs offered, in types of students enrolled, in emphasis on research, in forms of control, and in sources of support. It is an article of our faith, justified by our experience, that this diversity is a source of strength because:
  - It provides a rich variety of opportunities for students and for scholars of differing abilities and interests—and America needs many talents trained for many purposes.
  - It distributes the management and control of the processes of advanced education and research, and consequently minimizes the chance that a particular pattern could ever be centrally imposed upon the advancement of learning in this country.
  - It stimulates healthy experimentation and competition in the development of increasingly effective programs of instruction and research.

- The nature of the differences among kinds of institutions can be and has been misrepresented. For example, it is simply not true to say that large institutions inevitably ignore the importance of the individual student; that small institutions necessarily represent qual-
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ity; that private institutions are for the sons of the rich; that institutional expenditures for good education are any less in a public institution than in a private one; that one kind of American institution is "socialistic," the other not; or that non-church-related institutions are unavoidably "godless." Such false antitheses defeat understanding and jeopardize the honest rivalry which should characterize healthy competition in a shared endeavor.

* American higher education rests on the two pillars of quality and quantity. If our democratic society is to survive, it must utilize fully the abilities of each new generation. To assure appropriate educational opportunities for students of high academic ability is a vitally important objective but not the only one. Our society must provide opportunities through post-high-school education for the maximum development of people with many kinds and degrees of talent. Our rapidly changing needs for skilled manpower dictate the necessity for more and better education at every level. Both the citizens to be educated and the excellence of the educational process must be the shared concern of all institutions, public and private.

* Private institutions no less than public institutions are by their charters dedicated to the public service. Private institutions receive direct or indirect benefits from tax-supported programs of student aid; many receive state and federal grants for research and other purposes. Most public institutions have income from student fees and individual donations; many receive substantial contributions from industry and philanthropic foundations. Institutions of both types enjoy tax-exemption because of their public purpose. Hence, in terms of financial support, no institution is strictly private or strictly public.

* The times call for a greater investment in higher education as a whole. The crucial issue is not how many dollars come from private sources and how many from public sources but whether or not the total of these dollars will be sufficient to meet the challenges colleges and universities face. The basic choice for the people of our country is between expenditures for higher education and expenditures for other things. Financial support from all available sources must be greatly increased. This objective can be achieved only through vigorous, sustained, and united effort, based upon a deeper general understanding of the purposes and aspirations of American higher education.
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Other Investments Worthwhile
You cannot truly know a university from a description of its physical assets of brick and mortar, budgetary dollars, numbers of staff and students. Within limits, these are common to all universities.

It is the spirit behind all these things that gives a university its true stature. Consequently, I cannot tell you the full story of Notre Dame without trying, in some measure, to communicate to you a sense of its spirit.

Nothing is more difficult to describe than spirit, since spirit is by definition intangible. We can only know it by what it does, so I shall try to describe what the University tries to do with the thousands of young men who spend four of the most important, formative years of their lives with us.

I would like to summarize our task in three points. We receive from parents a boy of eighteen or nineteen. We hope, first of all, to return him to them at twenty-two or twenty-three a good man. We hope, secondly, that in his years with us he will attain some measure of professional competence, and, thirdly, that he will return home endowed with a sense of moral and social responsibility.

The result of training of both the mind and will might be best described as a good man, who is good in both mind and will, because he knows what God expects of him in life and he has sufficient character to follow God's will.

The second point in our efforts is to educate our students to some measure of professional competence. We are living in an age of science and technology. Many educators think that this should indicate a purely vocational purposefulness to education. To this extreme we answer that all of us should learn, first of all, how to be a man, with all that implies.

At the other extreme, there are those educators who shun vocational training as though there were something immoral about acquiring enough professional competence in some specific area of human endeavor to acquire a job and mature in it after four years of college education. Perhaps, it would be fair to say that we try to stand between the two extremes of this educational controversy, and to build a good measure of professional competence on a strong base of liberal education. We take this stand because we think that only a liberal education prepares a man to answer the really important questions in human life.

This brings us to the third and last manifestation of the spirit of Notre Dame: We are trying to engender in our young men a real sense of moral responsibility. We say this largely in reference to the social areas that will form the context of our students' lives following graduation.

In this atmosphere, a boy perceives that he cannot merely think of himself through life, that the social responsibility of leadership is one of the greatest opportunities that America affords. We try to develop this challenge of leadership and to direct it towards the three great areas that face our students upon graduation — marriage, business, and the community.

These are important and difficult goals: to produce good men, with professional competence, and a sense of moral and social responsibility, but whatever the difficulties, our goal at Notre Dame can never be less than this. Nor need it be more.
Notre Dame's Finance and Industry Forum recently held on campus as a University-sponsored public service attracted more than two hundred people from twelve states and Canada. They were informed about the many facets of estate planning by a nationally-recognized panel of six experts. In addition to the discussion on estate planning in general a variety of other taxation topics were explained including the use of trusts, deferred compensation, and charitable foundations.

The panelists explored a hypothetical $1,679,500 estate of a 56-year-old manufacturer. Estate planning authorities who appeared on the program included René A. Wormser, New York City attorney and moderator of the panel; William J. Casey, William E. Murray and Carbery O’Shea, attorneys from New York City; James F. Thornburg, attorney, South Bend, Ind.; and Robert J. Lawthers, insurance executive from Boston, Mass. Roger D. Branigin, past president of the Indiana State Bar Association who practices law in Lafayette, Ind., was the Forum luncheon speaker.

Notre Dame was exceedingly privileged to present such a distinguished panel of the nation’s outstanding practitioners in estate planning. Mr. Wormser is a senior partner in the law firm of Myles, Wormser and Koch with offices in New York City and London, England. He is a well-known author of many books and other periodicals. He has written: Your Will and What Not To Do About It, Personal Estate Planning in a Changing World, Family Estate Planning, and Wormser’s Guide to Estate Planning. Mr. Wormser was formerly a member of the Planning Committee at New York University’s Federal Tax Institute and he has lectured on numerous occasions at this same institution on estate planning. Currently he is general chairman of the Advanced Estate Planning Courses held by the Practising Law Institute in New York. For several years he served as general counsel of the House of Representatives committee which was investigating foundations.

William J. Casey received his undergraduate degree from Fordham University and graduated from St. John’s University with a bachelor of law degree. He is with the law firm of Hall, Casey and Robinson in New York City. Mr. Casey has lectured in tax law at New York University and is a former special counsel to the United States Senate’s Small Business Committee. From 1950 through 1957 he was a lecturer in taxation law at the Practising Law Institute of New York. Mr. Casey is author of Tax Sheltered Investments; Tax Control; Estate Plans; Executive Pay Plans, and Life Insurance Plans. During World War II he was chief of intelligence for the Office of Strategic Services in the European Theater.
The panelists discussed a hypothetical $1,679,500 estate of a 56-year old manufacturer which also included information on trusts, deferred compensation and charitable foundations.

James F. Thornburg is an attorney and partner in the law firm of Seebirt, Oare, Deahl and Thornburg, South Bend, Ind. His background includes serving as an instructor in business law as well as a lecturer on law and taxation of C.L.U. for Indiana University Extension; also, he has lectured in the law of trusts and the law of federal taxation at Notre Dame's Law School. Mr. Thornburg graduated from DePauw University with an AB degree and in 1936 was awarded a JD degree from Indiana University. He was admitted to practice in the United States Tax Court in 1939. Mr. Thornburg is a charter life underwriter in the taxation section. He is a member of the American Bar Association, the Indiana State Bar Association and Phi Delta Phi.

William E. Murray is a former chairman of the Income of Estates and Trusts Committee of the American Bar Association. He is a tax partner of the law firm of Jackson, Nash, Brophy, Barringer and Brooks in New York City. He was tax trial attorney for the Office of the Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service. Mr. Murray has lectured at numerous tax institutes including: University of Southern California; North Carolina Bar Association Institute; and the University of Connecticut Tax Institute. His writings have included Short Term Trusts, The Taxation of Trusts and Estates, and Short Term and Controlled Trusts, appearing in the A.B.A. Journal. Mr. Murray received an LL.B. from the University of South Carolina and was awarded the LL.M. from Harvard Law School.

Carbery O'Shea is associated as a tax partner with the law firm of Donovan, Leisure, Newton and Irvine in New York City. He received his legal education at Georgetown University, graduating in 1929 with a degree in law. For many years Mr. O'Shea has been on the Advisory and Planning Committees of the Institute on Federal Taxation conducted annually by New York University, and he has frequently served as chairman and lecturer at sessions of the Institute. Mr. O'Shea is a member of the Committee on Stockholders Relationships of the Taxation Section of the American Bar Association and also a member of the Liaison Committee of the American Law Institute. He is a member of the Board of Editors of the Practising Law Institute publications.

Father John J. Cavanaugh, C.S.C.
Robert J. Lawthers is Director of Estate Planning Services of New England Mutual Life Insurance Company, with which he has been associated for 39 years. He is both an administrator and a technician in the fields of beneficiary and ownership provisions of life insurance policies and the tax aspects of estate and business planning. He appears frequently throughout the country as a speaker at tax institutes, estate planning conferences, etc., his most recent appearances having been on programs of the Tulane Tax Institute in New Orleans and the Practising Law Institute in New York. He has contributed papers to a number of publications including the Journal of Taxation, the C.L.U. Journal and TAXES... the tax magazine.

Roger D. Branigin, past president of the Indiana State Bar Association, was the featured luncheon speaker. He was introduced by Rev. Jerome J. Wilson, C.S.C., Vice-President of Business Affairs for the University. Mr. Branigin is senior member of the Stuart law firm in Lafayette, Indiana. He graduated from Franklin College with an AB degree in 1923 and later received a law degree from Harvard University. Mr. Branigin has been a trustee of Franklin College since 1937 and is a former trustee of Purdue University. During World War II he served as counsel to the Chief of Transportation of the Transportation Corps. His father was a lawyer, three of his brothers are lawyers, one of his sons is a graduate of Harvard Law School and the other son is a senior in the Michigan Law School.

(Continued on page 13)
The author is an assistant professor in the Department of Geology. He received a bachelor of arts degree from Colby College, a master's degree from the University of Maine and has completed part of his advanced studies at Johns Hopkins University for a Doctor of Philosophy degree.

The Notre Dame Geology Department has gone through many changes necessitating increased facilities and additional space since it was established as a Department in 1946. This past winter the Department moved into new quarters previously occupied for many years by the Sisters of Holy Cross. The limited space allotted to Geology in the Main Building had long ago been filled, and many fossil, mineral, and rock collections of the finest educational value had to be stored away and, until the present move, were not available to the students.

Some of these collections were gifts to the University or specimens brought in by students and faculty who gathered up usable items as they traveled over the country and even around the world. Father Alexander Kirsch, who died in 1923, was perhaps the first and most ardent collector. He was a biologist by training, but had more than a passing interest in Geology. He studied marine life at Woods Hole, Massachusetts, for many summers and brought back to Notre Dame a sizeable portion of the New England states in the form of fossil shells, glacial pebbles, and granite.

Prior to World War II, geology and mineralogy were offered as part of the mining engineering curriculum taught by Professor (now Emeritus) Knowles Smith. The Geology Department did not exist as such. Dr. Smith also scores well as an ambitious collector and has left the Department with ore samples from many of the country's most famous mining areas, and especially from the copper district of Northern Michigan.

During the presidency of Father (now Cardinal) O'Hara, arrangements were made by foreign missionary Rev. J. M. Rick, C.S.C., for a collection of fossils and rocks to be sent from India, a gift of their Geological Survey. More recently rocks were given by Capt. William M. Hawkes, '33, from his expedition to the Antarctic. And continually the process is repeated, the most recent acquisition being asbestos samples collected by a student last summer from a newly opened Canadian mine.

At a Communion breakfast on the occasion of the dedication and blessing of the Geology Department's new quarters, Rev. Chester Soleta, C.S.C., vice-president of academic affairs, pointed out the tradition of service established by the Sisters of the Holy Cross during their many years in the Convent Building. In inheriting the physical structure where the Sisters labored so selflessly, the Department also hopes to capture the spirit of their dedication to Notre Dame. But its dedication is of a different sort. Notre Dame must produce worthy students in a world of science and technology where the "current of events" and new ideas flow so rapidly that a person must "paddle rapidly" just to stay where he is!
Thus far the record is good. In the past 13 years, 64 men have received their degrees in Geology. Most are employed by oil companies, a few in mining geology, several are in graduate school, and two teach at well-known universities. During the present school year, 41 students are majoring in Geology. The ratio of students to faculty is ideal, the staff being composed of five men whose different training and backgrounds represent a cross-section of the various fields of geology. Research leading to publication is actively engaged in, the students sometimes working with the professors on various projects. The American Association of Petroleum Geologists furnished eight speakers to the Department during the past school year. The American Geological Institute through the National Science Foundation also sponsored a visiting lecturer who spent three days at the Department discussing phases of economic geology.

To increase enrollment, especially in certain programs, and to gradually develop a graduate school are ambitious tasks for the future. A student may earn a degree in geology in one of three ways, each with distinctive course requirements. He may be registered in the School of Arts and Letters, and take relatively fewer science courses and more humanities; he may be registered in the College of Science and concentrate on scientific subjects; or he may take a combined Civil Engineering-Geology degree. This combined degree requires five years of study, but offers the student a maximum of job opportunities in the fields of engineering dealing with dam foundation and highway construction, and in mining and quarrying. The program is new and more students could be enrolled in it without taxing the Department's facilities.

To develop a Geology program in the Graduate School will be quite difficult. No Catholic university offers the Doctorate in Geology. Indeed, very few offer any degree in Geology and only one offers the master's. The reason for so little graduate work being given in Catholic schools probably stems from a lack of financial aid. The equipment for research and advanced studies is moderately expensive, although not nearly so costly as the materials required in the fields of atomic and rocket research. It is hardly necessary to point out the need for graduate work in any modern science as all thinking people are aware of it. In the Department's new location there is adequate space to develop an outstanding program in training the geology major and other students seeking a general background in "science of the earth."
Army ROTC students inspect a 75 mm. recoilless rifle.

Captain Boyd is giving instruction on a caliber .30 machine gun to student Army ROTC class.

General Sherman's coat is viewed by General Harper, deputy Commanding General of 5th Army, and Col. Grenelle, (left) commanding officer of Army ROTC unit at Notre Dame, in the Army's museum on campus.
Today at every class change it is quite normal to see Cadets, clad in the Army Green, moving sharply across campus to and from all the Colleges and the Army Science Building. This comes as no surprise since the enrollment in the Army ROTC at Notre Dame now numbers over nine hundred and forty cadets.

The present Army ROTC program (known as the General Military Science program) was developed in the Department of the Army and pioneered by Notre Dame in 1952-54 through the efforts of Rev. Robert W. Woodward, C.S.C., Director of Military Affairs, with the sanction and support of the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President. This program superseded the Engineer Unit installed in 1951 (cf: Vol 4, No. 4, Notre Dame December-January 1951-1952) and has since been adopted by eighty percent of the Colleges offering the Army ROTC program. Unlike the Engineer and other “branch material” programs, a cadet graduating after four years in the GMS program may choose and may be commissioned as a Reserve Officer in one of the branches of the Army closely akin to the field of his academic major. Thus the young officer may often enhance his knowledge and gain experience in his civilian profession while serving on active duty with the Army.

The present Army ROTC program at Notre Dame is elective and provides training and practical experience...
Col. Grenelle “swears in” Stephen B. Pietrowicz, graduating senior, as a Second Lieutenant.

In leading and commanding men as well as instructing them in subjects common to all branches of the Army. Included in the theoretical instruction are such subjects as: Characteristics and Employment of Weapons (including missiles and nuclear weapons); Methods of Instruction; Evolution and Principles of Warfare; Organization and History of U. S. Army; Combined Arms Operations; Military Justice; Command and Staff Functions and Logistics. After being commissioned in the Army Reserve the young officer is sent to a service school of his branch where he acquires the special and technical knowledge required by his branch assignment.

Starting in 1951 with a strength of one hundred and fifty-five cadets, Notre Dame's Army ROTC Corps has steadily gained strength and now ranks third in the nation among elective Army ROTC Units, and includes over one-sixth of the University's undergraduate students. The co-curricular cadet activities include: the Cadet Brigade of twelve companies, commanded by Cadet Colonel Joseph R. Cornell, Jr., a senior from Boise, Idaho; the Sorin Rifles, a twenty-man rifle team; a Drill Team of thirty-two men; a Band of thirty-five pieces; the Sorin Cadet Club, of four hundred members; a Military Museum and Library and a newsheet, The Guidon. The Department of Military Science is supervised, instructed and administered by an Active Army Detachment of six officers, one warrant officer, six enlisted men and three civilian employees. Since the fall of 1956 the Detachment Commander and Professor of Military Science and Tactics has been Colonel Edwin W. Grenelle, Infantry. He is assisted by Major James M. Huddleston, Major George G. Grace, Captain John J. Brady, Captain John J. Fatum, Captain Michael A. Fucci and CWO Samuel S. Simon. Since 1953 the Military Science Department has commissioned four hundred and thirty-nine Second Lieutenants in the United States Army Reserve and thirteen in the Regular Army. An additional one hundred and twenty-five will earn commissions this year, representing approximately one percent of the total ROTC graduates in the Nation in 1959.

Military training was established at Notre Dame by Rev. Edward F. Sorin, C.S.C., in 1858 and the first company of seventy cadets (the “Continental Cadets”) was organized under Cadet Captain William F. Lynch in the Spring of 1859. Thus, Notre Dame prepared her sons to assume leaders' roles in the war which followed four years later. Most of the cadets entered the Army at the outbreak of the war and soon became officers. Outstanding among these were William F. Lynch '62, and Robert W. Healy '62, who became Brigadier Generals. In 1864 the War Department sent Colonel Elmer A. Otis, 7th U. S. Cavalry, to institute a course in Military Science for the Cadets.

After the close of the War Between the States, the Cadet Corps was again organized and in 1880 achieved Federal recognition under Rev. William Corby, C.S.C., President. The Cadet Corps was again reorganized in 1885 and the seniors were called “Hoynes Light Guards” while the juniors retained the designation of “Sorin Cadets.”

From the humble beginnings of 1859 Notre Dame's military program has indeed provided a wealth of training for her sons and enabled them to fill the Army leaders' role in the Spanish-American War, and World Wars I and II.

The objectives and endurance of a proud military tradition at Notre Dame were recently reaffirmed in the words of Father Hesburgh when he said:

"Since its foundation, one of the first aims of our University has been to train her sons in the art of governing men; for, by the time they graduate, they will have developed strong convictions and high ideals fired with an enthusiastic desire to impress these upon the persons and events of their times.

"To fully realize this objective, we have complemented our academic curriculum with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program. Thus, our students are afforded the opportunity of becoming accomplished leaders both in times of national emergency and in the peaceful pursuit of their chosen professions.

"It is through this means that our sons are developed as leaders who will be guided by principle rather than by self-seeking. This we believe is the true mark and measure of a Christian and a gentleman."
the BISHOP SHEEN SCHOLARSHIP

donated by
Mr. and Mrs. John J. Bundschuh

A scholarship honoring Bishop Fulton J. Sheen has been established at the University of Notre Dame by Mr. and Mrs. John J. Bundschuh of New York City.

According to Rev. Jerome J. Wilson, C.S.C., University vice-president of business affairs and chairman of the committee on scholarships, the Bishop Sheen Scholarship will be awarded to a Notre Dame undergraduate who is considering studying for the priesthood in the Congregation of Holy Cross. An initial grant of $1,000 for the 1959-60 school year will go to Jerry G. Florent, a senior in the College of Arts and Letters, from Michigan City, Ind., Father Wilson said. He explained that a principal fund is being established to provide an annual grant of $1,000 or more.

His Excellency is Auxiliary Bishop of New York and has been a frequent visitor to the Notre Dame campus for many years. On numerous occasions he has been a principal speaker at various University functions. In 1941 he preached the baccalaureate Mass to Notre Dame's graduating class and was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree at Commencement exercises.

Bishop Sheen is recognized as one of the world's outstanding speakers and has conducted many programs over radio and television networks. His Excellency is educated at St. Viator College, Kankakee, Ill., and at St. Paul's Seminary, St. Paul, Minn. He took additional studies at the Catholic University of America, the University of Louvain (Belgium) and Angelico University in Rome, Italy. He is the author of various books including "Lift Up Your Heart," "Thinking Life Through" and "Life Is Worth Living." Bishop Sheen has been extremely active as the national director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

Mr. and Mrs. Bundschuh, who are personal friends of Bishop Sheen, expressed the hope that the scholarship winners persevere in their studies for the priesthood and emulate the qualities and ideals of the New York prelate and especially his devotion to Our Blessed Mother. The Bundschnus operate J. M. Louden, Inc., a firm of consultants and advisors in corporate financial matters. Their son, John J. Bundschuh, Jr., is a 1954 Notre Dame graduate and is assistant vice-president of the company. The elder Bundschuh is a director of several firms including B. T. Babbitt, Inc., Eastern Industries, Inc., the Buck-eye Corp., Stylon Corp., and the Redondo Tile Corp. He is a board member of Our Lady of Consolation Home, Amityville, N.Y.

Finance and Industry Forum

(Continued from page 7)

The estate planning panel discussed in detail various facets of the "Mr. Simpson Case." It was brought into account the fact that the manufacturer's wife was unable to manage her own finances. She also was attached to "an odd Eastern Cult" and her husband fears that she may be unduly influenced by its adherents. Mr. Simpson also wished to make provisions in his estate for three sons, one of whom is a partial incompetent, and two daughters, one of whom is unlikely to marry. Others included in the estate are an orphan grandchild, an aged mother-in-law and the manufacturer's alma mater. Mr. Simpson's total debts and obligations amounted to $85,000. An analysis was made of the liquidity requirements using the full marital deduction as well as no marital deduction.

The more than 200 persons in attendance included attorneys, bank officials, representatives of public and private foundations, corporation executives, accountants, investment counselors, life underwriters and government officials.

CORRECTION

The editor regrets that an alphabetical error occurred in the listing of a contributor to the University of Notre Dame as printed in the Spring, 1959 issue ("Corporations and Foundations Aid Higher Education at Notre Dame"). The correct information should have read as follows:

MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITHE FOUNDATION, INC., PARTNERS OF, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Our sincere apology to a loyal and generous friend of Notre Dame.

financial aid to attend college 13
Debating’s 60th Anniversary

by Robert N. Dempsey

The author graduated from Notre Dame as a political science major with the Class of 1959. He will attend the University of Chicago this Fall on a Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship. Mr. Dempsey is from New Ulm, Minn.

Following their annual banquet held recently, the Notre Dame Debate Team marked the conclusion of 60 years of intercollegiate forensic activity. Clashing again, as they did in that first meet in 1899, Notre Dame and Butler University came together in an exhibition debate to highlight the anniversary and express the friendship which the two schools have shared through their many years of competition.

From these early days when the University would engage in only one or two intercollegiate debates a year, the Debate Team has progressed to the point where it has an active organization of forty debaters participating in over 200 tournament debates a year and numerous exhibitions before thousands of people. The overflowing trophy case in the Forensic Room of the LaFortune Student Center testifies to the success of the Notre Dame Debate Team throughout its years of intercollegiate competition.

Throughout the years the debate topics have not varied greatly, despite the other numerous changes in style and format. In 1905, in a match against Oberlin College, Notre Dame debated the question of whether labor and capital should be compelled to settle their disputes through legally constituted boards of arbitration. Last year the topic dealt with the controversy over “right-to-work” laws. These annual topics, determined by a polling of the debate coaches from the various colleges and universities, usually concern political and economic questions, and in past years have included the question of the admission of Red China to the United Nations, the guaranteed annual wage, and the discontinuance of economic aid to foreign countries. The national debate question for this year was, “Resolved: that the further development of nuclear weapons should be prohibited by international agreement.”

The Rev. William A. Bolger, C.S.C., distinguished himself in the collegiate debating sphere in the early years of Notre Dame forensic activity. He served as debate coach from 1910 until 1928 and kept Notre Dame rising in the field of debate. Under the direction of Father Bolger the interhall teams were molded into the first university-wide debate team. From a group of from 50 to 60 students who took part in elimination rounds of competitive debating, he selected eight for his varsity team.

During this period the scope of debate began to widen. The duration of the debate season up to that time lasted approximately three to four weeks. The season gradually lengthened as interest increased and budgets expanded until today the official season begins in October and ends in early May.

In 1925 another step was made that would be instrumental to the progress of debate at the University. The Wranglers, now the oldest club on campus, were formed as a supplementary debate unit. Father Bolger was the first honorary president of the Wranglers. This group immediately rejuvenated the traditional custom of interhall debating among campus halls, and again revived campus oratory. The Wranglers worked to such an extent that within two years (1927) the Notre Dame team debated the University of Sydney, Australia, to a capacity audience in Washington Hall. Interhall debating, under the guidance of the Wranglers, increased the interest and importance of Notre Dame debating.

From 1928 to 1933, the Rev. Francis J. Boland, C.S.C., a former outstanding debater and professor of economics, assumed the coaching position of the team.
Forty Students Compete in over Two Hundred Tournaments Annually

Father Boland later became Dean of the College of Arts and Letters at the University.

Succeeding Father Boland was a man who had distinguished himself at the University as a student — Prof. William J. Coyne who held the position until 1942 when debating at the University stopped for the duration of World War II. Professor Coyne had been the first winner of the Dome award (the highest ranking student award given by the University) and had served as first president of the Wranglers.

With the end of the war came the reorganization of the Notre Dame Debate Team and the resumption of intercollegiate debating under the direction of Prof. Leonard F. Sommer who has continued in that capacity for the past fourteen years.

Faced with many obstacles after the war, Professor Sommer was compelled to begin forensic activities on a small scale. Despite these difficulties, however, the debate team soon grew in numbers as well as proficiency. Aided by increasing University funds, the Notre Dame Debate Team was enabled to travel long distances to participate in national tournaments. By 1948 the debate team was not only competing in these tournaments but also showing a consistent record of victory. Under Prof. Sommer Notre Dame teams have won 2,210 debates and lost 469 up to this date. In this time they have qualified eleven times for the national championship tournament held at West Point.

In 1953 Prof. Sommer started Notre Dame's own National Invitational Debate Tournament, which hosts each year approximately forty of the top debating schools throughout the United States. Such schools as Army, Navy, Miami (Fla.), Duke, South Carolina, Marquette, Northwestern, Utah, Brooklyn, Pittsburgh, Merchant Marine Academy and the Air Force Academy make it a point to attend the Notre Dame Tournament each year.

Debate has come a long way since its inception in 1899. In the first issue of the Dome published in 1906 one can find the following statement. "Debating has always formed a part of the curriculum at Notre Dame."

Today Notre Dame is prepared to pit the strength of her forensic program against that of any school in the country." Fifty-three years later this continues to be true. The University debaters are proud of their national reputation. But their pride is not centered in victory for its own sake, but in the realization that their success contributes to the living tradition which has bound Notre Dame debaters together for 60 years — the tradition of winning for Notre Dame.

Richard Schiller (right), assistant debate coach, congratulates incoming vice-president John Whitney for winning first place in the Notre Dame National Invitational Debate Tournament in 1959.
Problems of Immigration Are Outlined In Recent Notre Dame Symposium

The impact of immigration on American Catholicism was explored at a symposium held recently at Notre Dame. The sessions were a continuation of an earlier symposium on “Roman Catholicism and the American Way of Life.” The University's history department and the Faculty Seminar in American Civilization sponsored the two-day program.

“The Immigrant and the City” was discussed by three Chicagoans at the opening session. Saul D. Alinsky, a sociologist and co-founder of the Back of the Yards Neighborhood Council, spoke on “The Urban Immigrant.” Rev. Rollins Lambert, of St. Dorothy's Church, chose “The Negro and the Catholic Church” as his topic. “The Latin-American Catholic Immigrant” was the subject of Rev. Gilbert Carroll, coordinator of the Cardinal’s Committee for the Spanish Speaking in Chicago. Rev. Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., head of Notre Dame's history department and director of the symposium, presided at the opening session.

The second symposium session was concerned with “Complications of Language and Tradition.” Judge Juvenal Marchisio, national chairman of the American Committee on Italian Migration, New York City, discussed “The Italian Catholic Immigrant.” The problems of the Polish immigrant were described by the Very Rev. Msgr. Aloysius J. Wycislo, assistant executive director of the Catholic Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, New York City. Rev. Colman Barry, O.S.B., professor of history at St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn., analyzed the status of “The German Catholic Immigrant.” Presiding at the second session was Dr. John J. Kane, head of Notre Dame's sociology department.

“The More Permanent Aspects of the Immigration Problem” were studied at the final symposium session held under the chairmanship of Prof. Aaron I. Abell of the Notre Dame history department. The Very Rev. James P. Shannon, president of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn., spoke on “The Italian Catholic Immigrant.” Dr. Willard E. Wight, of the department of social sciences at Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, discussed the relationships of “The Native-Born American Catholic and the Immigrant.” The final symposium paper, “The American Historian Looks at the Catholic Immigrant,” was presented by Dr. Vincent P. De Santis, associate professor of history at Notre Dame.

Father Lambert, a convert to Catholicism, said that the Catholic Church is particularly appealing to Negroes because of its “universalism” and its extensive educational system.

“The Church has been gaining a name for itself among Negroes in that it accepts all classes of people,” Father Lambert said. He claimed that many non-Catholic parents want their children to have a Catholic education “to protect them from the vicious conditions often prevailing in Negro neighborhoods. The parents cannot escape these conditions by moving away,” he observed, “so they give their children religious training.”

Sharing the platform with him were Mr. Alinsky and Father Carroll.
According to Father Lambert, there are two major obstacles to the conversion of the Negro. He cited the attitude of many white Catholics "who offer no encouragement or inducement to join the Church, or even rebuff prospective converts because of their racial prejudices." Another difficulty, he said, is that many Negroes have contracted second marriages after divorce. This is adultery, according to divine law, and such persons cannot become Catholics, Father Lambert asserted.

"Despite such obstacles," the Negro priest predicted, "the day is arriving when the catholicity of the Church in America will be evidenced not only by its diverse nationalities from European nations, but by numerous dark-skinned members as well."

Alinsky told the symposium that the so-called "national neighborhoods" in our big cities were destined to disintegrate following the end of immigration in 1929. Only the depression and the housing shortage of World War II delayed the inevitable process, he said. The Chicago sociologist contended that present population shifts such as the mass migrations of Negroes to the north or of Puerto Ricans to the west are not responsible for the disappearance of "neighborhood stability."

Alinsky said that "tremendous advances in transportation and communication" also have affected the so-called "stable community." These developments, he said, "have extended the horizon of interest of many persons whose interests, habits and religion previously had been relatively circumscribed within their local physical community." He declared that all institutions, whether they be political parties, labor unions, or churches, "can no longer afford to think in terms of the past, a past which was marked by isolation and separatism."

Father Carroll, who works among Chicago's 30,000 Puerto Ricans and 70,000 Mexicans, declared it is "not enough" for the Church to provide sermons in Spanish and arrange for confessions to be heard in the Latin-Americans' native tongue.

He described a program, now underway for three years, in which approximately 2,000 Puerto Ricans in Chicago have been organized into eight clubs. These are not primarily religious clubs, he stressed, but are intended to deal with all the needs of their members. The Puerto Rican clubs, he said, give their members "a sense of community" and help them get certain things done that they couldn't get done alone.

The problems of the Mexican community in Chicago are being approached differently with organization from the top rather than from the grass roots, Father Carroll said. He pointed out that there has been a sizeable group of Mexicans in Chicago for one hundred years and that there are many third generation Mexicans in the city. Accordingly, the Church has helped organize the Mexicans' own organizations into a federation of religious, social, cultural and athletic groups. The federation, he said, has given Mexicans "a better name" in Chicago and helped them carry out city-wide programs and activities.

"Catholicism, the traditional faith of Poland, has been the most important force in the shaping of Polish-American life," according to Msgr. Wycislo.

Msgr. Wycislo said Polish Catholics of older generations found their religion a "unitive force" which "had its influence in the Catholic Church in the United States, which recognized a difference in customs that were never alien to the substance of faith."

For the Pole of later generations, he stated, religion "has been an integrating force."

"A new generation of priests is leading the Polish Catholic, formerly so attached to his language and customs, to new acquaintance with the customs and practices of other groups." Older Polish-Americans, he added, view with alarm the loss of language and custom, but the new generation insists "our faith is the faith of our fathers; its doctrine and practice are the same; we have reshaped our tools to fit the way of life in America."

He termed "significant" the fact that "second and third generation Poles in the United States, most often Catholics without special ties, came forward with the greatest number of offers of homes and job opportunities for the displaced persons and refugees who formed the latest surge of immigrants to our shores."

"Here the common bond of faith was expressed in action toward those helpless victims of the last war, whose language and customs were alien to those of their sponsors."

The New York priest suggested that Polish immigrants who came to America as refugees in recent years were "luckier than (their) predecessors of a hundred years ago" because they "came to a land where the years had indeed refined the process of acceptance and identification."
One of the stern rules of commerce says that a business stands to make more money as it attracts more customers; build a better mousetrap and you'll get rich from crowds that beat a path to your door. With proof of this formula's success strewn from one end of our economy to the other, it's understandable that people tend to look toward the campus with a questioning eye. In spite of a record 3,250,000 enrollment—in fact, because of it, to judge from their claims—colleges are sailing troubled financial waters. And nothing unnerves an educator more than the prospect of this attendance doubling by 1970.

On the surface of it, someone seems to be fumbling a golden chance for profit. But in this case the symptoms are misleading. Educators are not the poor businessmen they might appear, since in truth they aren't businessmen at all and never intended to be. Service, not profit, is their goal. Colleges are less concerned with getting money out of a customer's pocket than with putting knowledge into his head, and they're determined to hold that aim even if it bankrupts them.

It might, too, since they currently foot most of the bill. Private schools pay an average of 45 per cent of each undergraduate's expenses; state colleges pay about 82 per cent. The combined college students of this country are charged only one-third the cost of the education they receive. (These figures exclude room and board, which are usually provided at cost.) A committee appointed by President Eisenhower to investigate the situation found that teachers are stuck with most of the deficit. By working for disgracefully low wages, they "donate" $800 million a year to their students. This is over $3,500 per teacher. "The plain fact is," the committee reported, "that the college teachers of the United States, through their inadequate salaries, are subsidizing the education of students, and in some cases the luxuries of students' families, by an amount which is more than double the grand total of alumni gifts, corporate gifts, and endowment income of all colleges and universities combined."

How come? If, as surveys indicate, a bachelor's degree carries with its larger rewards the promise of an extra $100,000 in lifetime earning power, why should those who supply it have to pay for it as well? Obviously, they shouldn't, and the fact that they do shows the need for a clearer public understanding of what's going on.

This, in a nutshell, is the situation: Few students (or their families) can pay for an education while they're getting it. If tuitions were raised to meet expenses, only the richest—and not necessarily the best—scholars would survive. Therefore, colleges quietly make up the difference between the price and the price tag, and hope to be remembered when students emerge from their lean years. Unfortunately, it doesn't always work that way. After receiving their sheepskins, many graduates quit town never to be heard from again, leaving in their wake an institution impoverished by their stay and that much less equipped to give future students a proper schooling.

If this sounds like a man running off with a dishwasher before making the payments, that's a fair analogy, but there are two differences. First, an education can't be carted back to the store and resold; and second, an alumnus isn't always aware that there are payments involved.

For this latter condition, colleges willingly accept the blame. Until recently, they failed to publicize the debt incurred by earning a degree. Why? For one thing, endowment income, alumni contributions, and community support often kept pace with expenses, so there wasn't so great a burden. For another, teaching is a proud pro-
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fession not given to dunning graduates or begging for handouts. In short, the schools preferred to suffer in silence rather than play the nagging creditor.

But there is a limit to how much even a teacher will endure, and since the recent growth in enrollment has not been accompanied by a comparable rise in revenue, some important changes are being made.

As a first step, colleges are advertising how they finance every education, explaining that without the assistance of Alma Mater there would be far fewer students than there are. Hopefully, they think this might touch alumni consciences and increase their gifts — or, more accurately, that more alumni will face up to their debts. Some schools have started classes in college finance. Teachers, administrators, and undergraduates talk over the economic facts of life — not only to encourage generosity in the future, but to help students appreciate their education now. Early returns have been encouraging. A number of new graduates, for instance, now take out low-payment life insurance policies naming their college as beneficiary. But not all of them keep up the payments, and even when they do the school can't expect to get the money for many years. What happens in the meantime?

There are several possible solutions, one of which might be called "Learn Now, Pay Later." This plan would boost tuition to ease the teacher's burden, with students financing their education by long term loans. However, there's a natural reluctance for banks and loan associations to lend money to men and women with no security and an uncertain future, and since higher tuitions will probably wait until all students who need creditors find them, this project might be some time coming.

Outright federal aid enjoys some popularity, and so does indirect aid through tax exemptions to students or their families, but not much of it comes from government officials or educators. Private colleges are anxious to maintain their independence, and many legislators think its enough that the public already supports about 60 per cent of all college students through state taxes. If there is to be federal aid, majority opinion seems to favor a loan fund, with the government acting as creditor for needy undergraduates.

How about scholarships? One camp says there aren't nearly enough to go around, another camp says that nevertheless there are already three times too many. The first judgment is both obvious and true. The second is equally valid, though, since most grants cover only the student's share of expenses, not the college's. Aimed at helping students to get a good education, straight tuition scholarships really make it increasingly hard for colleges to give one. Fortunately, many awards are now divided equitably between the school and the scholar, but this increases the drain on the donor and sharply reduces the number of recipients.

Make no doubt of it: colleges need every cent they can get, and all of these plans will help, as will several other similar ones. But neither singly nor in combination will they do the job. To stay on their feet, schools need more vigorous support from students — past, present and future. Those who reap the greatest benefits from higher education are being asked to play a bigger role in financing it, and this, after all, is as it should be.

Roughly 20 per cent of today's alumni make regular contributions to their Alma Mater; 80 per cent do not (45.8% of Notre Dame's alumni contributed $695,620 to the University in 1958). In addition to those who still aren't fully aware of their debt, this large majority of non-contributors holds a few graduates who honestly can't afford the expense. But most of them just don't want to. There seems to be a variety of reasons. Some of the guilty parties apparently face such a backlog of neglect that they're afraid to tackle the job of making amends, preferring to carry the burden of troubled consciences. Others seem to consider it a mark of their own cleverness that they slipped through school at reduced fare, and summarily reject any moral or financial claims. Not only do colleges have to plead for what little cash they get from these people, but not infrequently they have to stand still while the old grads tell them how to spend it. Only with the firm promise that it goes to a pet project will some alumni part with their money — money they probably made as a result of an education they never paid for. And, regrettably, the needs of the school are often subordinate to any fame that might attend the gift. So it is that a vain alumnus often invests in shiny buildings (which have bronze plaques holding contributors' names in dubious immortality) rather than in shabby teachers (who so far haven't started to wear sandwich boards advertising to the world their former students' generosity), disregarding the more desperate need on most campuses for adequate faculty pay.

There was a time in this nation's history when all it took to combat problems of this magnitude was to make them known. With freedom's taste fresh on men's tongues, there was little danger of apathy competing with action. The way of life born in that spirit now faces a crisis that must be met in that spirit. America's survival — and mankind's — seems more and more to hinge on the ability of our colleges to develop people clever enough to devise instruments of awesome power and wise enough to use them properly. Since the effectiveness of the colleges depends on public support, the real question is whether or not we are too bored with freedom to take steps that might assure its continuation.

While the rest of us think it over, while we juggle issues, weigh pros and cons, and leisurely ponder whether or not to chip in, the teacher sticks to his thankless task of holding our colleges together on chewing gum and bobby pins. For this we should be humbly grateful. It is no small thing in these times for a man to throw up his chance at fame and fortune so that someone else's son might get a decent education.

By Gordon Greer

Reprinted from Better Homes & Gardens magazine
**Notre Dame's**  
**1958-1967 Program:**

1. Endowment for Increased Faculty Salaries $27,000,000  
2. Contributions for Research $11,000,000  
3. Student Aid $5,000,000  
4. Special Funds for Administrative Purposes $5,000,000  
5. New Buildings $18,600,000

Additions to
- a) Commerce $500,000  
- b) Law $500,000  
- c) Engineering $500,000  
- Library $55,000,000  
- (2) Graduate Halls $2,500,000  
- Priests' Faculty Building $1,500,000  
- Maintenance Center $600,000  
- Auditorium $3,300,000  
- Fieldhouse $4,000,000

**TOTAL — $66,600,000**

---

**Administrative Special Funds $5,000,000**

Notre Dame's progress during the past 117 years has been aided by many factors including dedicated service of the priests and brothers of Holy Cross, loyalty of its faculty and the devotion-to-duty of an experienced lay administrative staff.

In 1958, Notre Dame announced a goal of $66.6 million to provide the University with required financial support in the forthcoming decade. At that time Father Hesburgh stated that "we look with confidence to our alumni and friends, to corporations and foundations, whose growing generosity provides the means to realize Notre Dame's hopes for tomorrow."

One of the major categories in the general development program consists of an appeal totaling $5,000,000 for 'administrative special funds'. Approximately 1,600 men and women comprise the University's lay staff. Just as it is vital that top-caliber individuals be assigned to teaching positions, so too must the University have competent lay administrative personnel. To forestall competition from other fields, Notre Dame must be prepared to meet the cost-of-living index with increased salaries and to formulate a much-needed retirement plan for the administrative lay staff.

A minimum capital investment of $500,000 (plus $50,000 annually) is necessary to initiate a pension plan for eligible employees. This is classified as a 'critical item' in Notre Dame's appeal for funds to obtain $66,600,000.