



2009

You Are in the World: Catholic Campus Life at Loyola University Chicago, Mundelein College, and De Paul University, 1924-1950

Rae Bielakowski
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Bielakowski, Rae, "You Are in the World: Catholic Campus Life at Loyola University Chicago, Mundelein College, and De Paul University, 1924-1950" (2009). *Dissertations*. Paper 161.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/161

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © 2009 Rae Bielakowski

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

“YOU ARE IN THE WORLD”:

CATHOLIC CAMPUS LIFE AT LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO,

MUNDELEIN COLLEGE, AND DE PAUL UNIVERSITY,

1924-1950

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PROGRAM IN HISTORY

BY

RAE M. BIELAKOWSKI

CHICAGO, IL

DECEMBER 2009

Copyright by Rae M. Bielakowski, 2009
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe so much to the assistance of others! First of all, I would like to thank my dissertation director William J. Galush and readers Susan E. Hirsch and Lewis A. Erenberg for their guidance and constructive criticism. Philip Gleason's comments on an early version of Chapter 6 were of great help in the revision process. Patricia Mooney-Melvin of Loyola's Graduate School generously assisted me time and time again, while Lillian Hardison, graduate secretary of Loyola's Department of History, guided me through paperwork and kept me in communication with the department. Thank you all for your help, support, and patience.

This project could never have left the drawing board without the help of dedicated archivists, librarians, and public historians, including Kathryn Young; Elizabeth Myers; Kathryn DeGraff; Morgan MacIntosh Hodgetts; Joan Saverino; Max Moeller; Malachy McCarthy; and the late Br. Michael Grace, S.J.. Ursula Scholz and Jennifer Jacobs of Cudahy Library's Interlibrary Loan Department also went above and beyond to see that I obtained the necessary materials. In addition, Jeffrey V. Mallow and Loyola Hillel director Patti Ray provided me with crucial information and context regarding Chicago's Jewish students.

On a more personal level, I would like to thank Patrick Quinn, Janet Olson, Allen Streicker, and Kevin Leonard of Northwestern University Archives, who, when I needed

it most, gave me a job that exposed me to the challenges and opportunities of the archival field. Likewise, I am grateful to the Cudahy Library Circulation Department for employing me from 1999-2001, thereby allowing me to resume graduate coursework. After I left Chicago in 2001, Janet Olson and Carolyn DeSwarte Gifford opened their homes to me during various research trips. Here in Leavenworth, KS I have benefited immensely from the advice and encouragement of scholars at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College's Department of Military History. I am also very thankful for the prayers of members of Old St. Patrick's Oratory and the Confraternity of Christian Mothers in Kansas City, MO.

Throughout this entire process my parents Wayne and Lucy Sikula, my grandparents Helena and Stefan Lukaszewicz, and my uncle Richard Lukaszewicz helped me very much, not least of all through their unwavering confidence in my abilities. In addition, I owe a special debt of gratitude to my in-laws, Louis and Charlene Bielakowski, who gave me a place to stay while researching in Chicago and afterward managed many of my university errands.

Most importantly, however, I would like to thank my husband and colleague Alexander Bielakowski, whose encouragement, support, and extraordinary patience allowed me to re-enter graduate school and see this dissertation through to completion. In addition to sharing his life with me, he has turned my life around.

For Alex, who made me finish

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: STATUS AND “SCHOOL SPIRITUALITY” AT DE PAUL UNIVERSITY AND LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO, 1923-1938	26
CHAPTER TWO: “IT OUGHT TO RAMIFY”: THE ORGANIZATION OF CISCORA, 1926-1934	95
CHAPTER THREE: FROM “RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES” TO ‘CATHOLIC ACTION’: CISCA, 1934-1941.	161
CHAPTER FOUR: INCLUSION AND ELITISM	235
CHAPTER FIVE: ETHNICITY AND STUDENT ORGANIZATION	302
CHAPTER SIX: A “CHURCH MILITANT”: GENDER AND RELIGION IN DEPRESSION AND WAR	378
CONCLUSION	443
BIBLIOGRAPHY	455
VITA	466

INTRODUCTION

In March 1927 Vatican Secretary of State Rafael Cardinal Merry Del Val privately advised Jesuit Father General Wladimir Ledochowski that the Holy See viewed Jesuit universities in the United States as insufficiently Catholic in character. Ledochowski informed American Jesuit Provincials that, among the charges leveled, was that Jesuit educators exerted “practically no influence over the religious and spiritual welfare of the students.”¹ In Chicago, Loyola University administrators responded to this warning by enlarging the Loyola student Sodality’s newly-established Catholic Action program into a hegemonic presence, not only on the Loyola Arts campus in Rogers Park, but throughout Chicago’s network of Catholic schools. By 1928 Loyola students headed a federation of 52 Chicago-area Catholic universities, colleges, and high schools, initially known as the Chicago Intercollegiate Conference on Religious Activities (CISCORA). Under Vatican pressure to reassert a bishop’s catechetical role, six years later Chicago Auxiliary Bishop Bernard Sheil adopted the federation—renamed Chicago Inter-Student Catholic Action (CISCA)—as the official student Catholic Action unit of the Archdiocesan Catholic Youth Organization (CYO). Over the period 1928-1950 the Catholic Action federation operated as a conduit through which other Catholic movements, such as the Benedictine Liturgical Movement and Peter Maurin and Dorothy Day’s Catholic Worker, reached and influenced Catholic students in Chicago

¹ William P. Leahy, S.J., *Adapting to America: Catholics, Jesuits, and Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1991) 43.

This dissertation examines the interaction of organized student Catholic Action with the cultures that Catholic students themselves constructed on the urban Catholic campuses of Loyola University Chicago, Mundelein College, and DePaul University, with the goal of illuminating how collegiate Catholic Action impacted students' interpretations of Catholic student life over the period 1924-1950. Far from passive receivers of religious ideology, during the 1920s and early '30s Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein students—like those on college and university campuses nationwide—participated in an American collegiate youth culture that connected individual initiative, upward mobility, and self-sacrificial service to the prestige of the broader student community and its sponsoring institution. Often defined as the active participation of the laity in the mission of the Church hierarchy, the Catholic Action ideology of the “lay apostolate” co-opted student culture’s leadership drive and community “spirit,” but over the course of the 1930s it also introduced ideas concerning class, race, and gender ideology that challenged and sometimes even reshaped students’ vision of campus society and their own social roles.

One outcome was increasing tension and factionalization within Catholic youth culture. The Church hierarchy encouraged, but also limited, lay student initiative; religious pressures toward Americanization and interracialism discouraged ethnic expression; a strengthening “Mystical Body” ideology simultaneously collapsed and re-inforced social elitism, introducing new factions on campus; and wartime constructions of male spiritual superiority overshadowed Depression-era female leadership expectations, changing Catholic women’s interpretation of their collegiate experience.

These tensions presaged the watershed of change and experimentation that would follow upon the Second Vatican Council.

Periodization

The dissertation's periodization—from 1924 to 1950—begins with the initial development of visible and coherent student cultures at Loyola and De Paul universities and an increased devotional intensity inspired by the International Eucharistic Congress that Chicago hosted in 1926. DePaul and Loyola students inaugurated their campus newspapers in 1923 and 1924 respectively, thereby establishing their student community as a visible presence and—from a practical perspective--providing sources through which to examine it. On a broader scale, Chicago's International Eucharistic Congress mobilized Chicago's Catholics as a confident and coherent social force, thereby opening an era of increased Church publicity, self-consciousness, and Eucharistic devotion in Chicago.

The end date of roughly 1950 coincides with the final transfer of authority over Chicago's student Catholic Action federation away from the Society of Jesus, a development which, along with the ascendancy of the National Federation of Catholic College Students in Washington, D.C., ended the involvement of Chicago's Catholic college students in the CISCA organization.

Methodology and sources

Placing high emphasis on student discourse, this study draws heavily on Loyola, Mundelein, and De Paul student publications over the period 1923-1950, particularly the student newspapers *Loyola News* (Loyola), *Skyscraper* (Mundelein), and *De Paulia* (De Paul), in an attempt to identify changes in student extracurricular life and opinion on these Catholic campuses. Yearbooks offer important information regarding individual participation in student clubs, as well as statements on the history and mission of various campus organizations. Textual analysis of student fiction and poetry published in Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein literary magazines further enhances an understanding of Catholic student attitudes toward class, race, gender, and liturgical change. Similarly, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania's collection of ethnic student newspapers, such as *The Polish Student* and *New American*, provided editorials and fiction for analysis and comparison. In regard to the CISCA federation, the CISCA collection at Loyola University Archives includes correspondence, meeting agendas, speeches, and organizational histories that illuminate conflicts and developments within the citywide Catholic Action federation.

Chapter structure

Comprising an introduction, conclusion, and six substantive chapters, this dissertation attempts to incorporate both chronology and thematic development into its chapter structure. As a starting point, Chapter 1 analyzes Catholic students' religious re-interpretations of secular undergraduate culture on campus from 1923 to the mid-1930s.

Chapters 2 and 3 focus on the organizational and ideological development of the pioneering CISCORA/CISCA federation from 1928 to 1941. Finally, thematic chapters 4-6 address the Catholic Action federation's impact on Catholic college students' constructions of class, ethnicity/race, and gender from the Depression to 1950.

Drawing upon the insights of Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz's sweeping study of undergraduate culture,² Chapter 1 examines Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein students' basic adaptations of secular "campus life" society and values over the period 1923- 1937. Encompassed in the phrase "school spirit," values of individual initiative and self-sacrifice to student community interests increased a college or university's publicity as a prestigious and fun place to be, thereby increasing the value of institutional name recognition for students and alumni. Catholic students took the additional step of connecting Catholic college and university prestige to that of the Catholic Church in the United States, so that student support of an extracurricular activity such a dance, athletic event, or drama theoretically influenced Catholicism's status in American society. However, Catholic students' brash community-building campaigns also had the potential to conflict with administrative aims and relationships, necessitating increased administrative supervision and censorship of the student community's image, particularly at the Jesuit university of Loyola.

Chronologically divided into periods of 1927-1934 and 1934-1941 respectively, Chapters 2 and 3 focus on the student Catholic Action federation's development and increasing ascendancy on the Loyola, Mundelein, and De Paul campuses. Addressing the

² Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1987).

organization of CISCORA from 1927-1934, Chapter 2 shows that Loyola Arts Dean Joseph Reiner, S.J. co-opted the values and structures of “campus life” to support the construction of a citywide federation of student religious organizations based on a Catholic Action program inaugurated in Loyola’s Sodality in 1926. Beginning with Bishop Sheil’s adoption of the Catholic student federation—renamed CISCA-- in 1934, Chapter 3 shows that centralization of authority and changes in CISCA moderation made possible the implementation of an ambitious educational program, authored by Benedictine sister Cecilia Himebaugh, that extended Virgil Michel’s Liturgical Movement into the Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein campuses. By 1935 mandatory participation in CISCA-led events and programs made it impossible for any Loyola, Mundelein, or De Paul undergraduate to avoid some exposure to Catholic Action ideology.

Extending the chronology to 1950, thematic Chapters 4, 5, and 6 analyze CISCA’s impact on Loyola, Mundelein, and De Paul student interpretations of class, ethnicity, and gender. Chapter 4 demonstrates that, while on one hand students’ experiences of economic dependence interacted with CISCA’s Mystical Body ideology and personalism to ideologically level class hierarchies, on the other hand increased inclusiveness in CISCA ironically heightened a sense of elitism based on intense ideological commitment. Chapter 5 shows that in the late 1930s and 40s CISCA’s ideological alignment with the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration led to the dissolution and/or relocation of ethnic student organizations that had flourished in the early 1930s, particularly at Loyola. While ethnic organizations lasted, however, Loyola leadership

applied Catholic Action student community-building strategies to the problems of Polish-American student organization at the national level. Addressing Loyola, Mundelein, and De Paul student expressions of gender ideology from 1930 to 1950, Chapter 6 suggests that the feminine imagery of the Depression-era Catholic Action movement supported female leadership ambitions that wartime constructs of male spiritual superiority later discouraged. Meanwhile, male CISCA students and alumni found it difficult to live up to expectations of “foxhole Christianity,” leading some to critique the home-front ideology.

Review of Literature

While studies of American collegiate student life tend to exclude religious students and institutions, Catholic college and university educators negotiated conflicts of “American” and “Catholic” identities that complicated their students’ relationship to the popular collegiate culture. By looking at the intersection of American youth culture and Catholic liberal thought in organized student Catholic Action at De Paul, Mundelein, and Loyola, this dissertation aims to explore the role of the Catholic campus in forming a middle class that could merge faith commitment with secular social and cultural participation, thereby helping to fill important gaps in the historiography of both higher education and 20th century American cultural history.

A number of studies of secular American undergraduate culture illuminate its core values and, in the early twentieth century, its increasingly collaborative relationship with administrative leadership. A broad social history of undergraduates in the United States

from roughly 1800 to 1985, Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz's *Campus Life*³ interprets the "worlds that undergraduates made" in terms of social status, personal freedom, gender, and relationship to faculty and administrative interests. Importantly, this study shows that in the early twentieth century American educators overall tended to co-opt student organizations, activities, and values in service to the educational institution, thereby converting the nineteenth century's subversive "campus life" into an extension of the university's curriculum and public relations. Throughout her analysis Horowitz remains sensitive to the goals and values of the students and to the impact of political and economic change as well as generational turnover. Her sources include memoirs, fiction, social studies of college life conducted in various decades, campus newspapers, and intercollegiate publications such as *The New Student*.

For the purposes of this dissertation *Campus Life* provides necessary context and background on mainstream collegiate culture in private colleges and state institutions, both represented in this study with admirable balance. Moreover, Horowitz's concept of "campus life" and its various social categories of "college men," "rebels," and "outsiders" (including Jews and scholarly "grinds") offers a method of analyzing the society of specific colleges and universities. Unfortunately, Horowitz pointedly excludes consistently religious colleges and religious students from her analysis, presenting religion as a social factor only in the division between Jew and Gentile.

Overall, most studies of American undergraduate youth culture are too broad to provide much detail on the social and cultural role of religion, particularly Catholicism.

³ Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1987).

Explorations of “campus life” at women’s colleges—for example, Horowitz’s *Alma Mater* (1984)⁴ and Barbara Miller Solomon’s *In the Company of Educated Women* (1985)⁵—make little or no mention of Catholic students or institutions as a distinct category, although Solomon’s study does briefly integrate Catholic female students into chapters on educational pluralism (145-146, 155-156). A classic examination of collegiate youth culture in the 1920s and 30s, Paula Fass’s *The Damned and the Beautiful* (1977)⁶ elucidates conflicts between administrative and undergraduate priorities and offers a brief but useful discussion of Depression-era ethnic fraternities. Also focused on American youth culture, Beth Bailey’s *From Front Porch to Back Seat* (1989)⁷ extensively analyzes changing gender roles in twentieth-century courtship, with particular attention to the influence of demographics on dating patterns. Like Horowitz and Solomon’s works, however, Fass and Bailey’s contributions include little discussion of religion’s conflict and convergence with the values of college youth.

Exceptionally, Lori Witt’s dissertation “More Than a Slaving Wife” (2001)⁸ examines fundamentalist Protestant college women’s response to the changing American gender ideologies of the 1920s, arguing that Protestant women at Baylor University,

⁴ Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Alma Mater: Design and Experience in the Women’s Colleges from Their Nineteenth-Century Beginnings to the 1930s* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984).

⁵ Barbara Miller Solomon, *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

⁶ Paula Fass, *The Damned and the Beautiful* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).

⁷ Beth L. Bailey, *From Front Porch to Back Seat: Courtship in Twentieth-Century America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989).

⁸ Lori Witt, “More Than a ‘Slaving Wife’: The Limits, Possibilities, and Meaning of Womanhood for Conservative Protestant College Women in the 1920s and 1930s,” (Dissertation, Loyola University Chicago, 2001).

Calvin College, and Wheaton College found ways of accommodating the freedoms of the “New Woman” within their religious identities. Relating religion to American culture within the collegiate experience, Witt’s dissertation both illustrates the conflicts between faith and secular change that religious students could experience, and indicates the extent and limits of their participation in secular culture.

As secular universities expanded and standardized in the first half of the twentieth century, Catholic institutions of higher education grappled with the sometimes conflicting imperatives of Catholic character and American institutional and intellectual context. Studies that address these conflicts usually exclude much analysis of Catholic students’ response to a complex cultural scene. For example, William P. Leahy’s *Adapting to America* (1991)⁹ explains how Jesuit university administrators in the United States institutionally negotiated American and Catholic culture—including the Society of Jesus’s political standing--over the course of the 20th century, but does not address the perspective of students. Focusing on the campus’s intellectual rather than social adjustments, Philip Gleason’s *Contending with Modernity* (1995)¹⁰ traces the struggle of 20th-century Catholic colleges and universities with “modern” intellectualism—characterized by empirical, secular outlooks—and its supporting institutions. As Catholic higher education adapted to the nationwide trend toward university-building and the development of accreditation boards and standards, Catholic educators and administrators promoted a Catholic intellectualism, based on Thomist philosophy, that ran counter to the

⁹ William P. Leahy, *Adapting to America: Catholics, Jesuits, and Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1991).

¹⁰ Philip Gleason, *Contending with Modernity: Catholic Higher Education in the 20th Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

culture of secular institutions. The Great Depression and the emergence of Communism and Fascism in Europe prompted “Catholic Actionists” to launch a Catholic critique of secular culture and promulgate a Catholic approach to social and cultural reform. After World War II, however, the dramatic expansion of Catholic universities and new concern for racial discrimination led Catholic intellectuals, notably John Tracy Ellis, to deplore the “ghetto mentality” that that (in their view) prevented American Catholics from realizing their ideals and meaningfully contributing to American culture (283-304). During the 1960s the Second Vatican Council’s dramatic changes re-inforced the educational trend toward openness and further intensified the “identity crisis” among American educators. Gleason’s study, thick with primary evidence from Catholic scholarship and periodicals as well as the archives of prominent educational institutions, is a stunning achievement.

This dissertation aims to connect the broad intellectual and institutional changes that Gleason traces to the specific situations of three inter-related Catholic universities and colleges, with primary emphasis on the perspectives of student publications and the social organization of students. For example, while Gleason devotes some pages (157-158) to the union of student sodalities known as CISCA (Chicago Intercollegiate Students for Catholic Action), this dissertation attempts to analyze what this regional organization—involving students of Loyola, Mundelein, and DePaul, among other schools—did, believed, and represented in the context of “campus life.” Emphasizing the intellectuals who developed and articulated ideology, Gleason’s book is crucial to a study of the students who received ideology and worked to relate it to their lives on campus.

Other important works examine address the development of 20th century Catholic intellectual and clerical liberalism, although usually relating it to secular American intellectualism rather than the training or experience of ordinary Catholics. For instance, John T. McGreevy's *Catholicism and American Freedom*¹¹ argues that in the first half of the 20th century Catholics and intellectual liberals—in spite of continued ideological differences and mutual prejudice--formed an uneasy political alliance for the promotion of economic planning, trade unionism, and Franklin D. Roosevelt's presidency (127-215). However, after World War II the politicized issues of contraception and abortion increasingly divided the Church hierarchy from secular intellectuals, and contributed to political divisions within the Church itself (216-281). In McGreevy's perspective, then, Catholic and non-Catholic intellectuals were politically more united before Vatican II then afterward, when the Church proclaimed and encouraged greater openness to modern life.

While Henry May wrote of an "End of American Innocence," Halsey's *The Survival of American Innocence*¹² interprets early to mid-20th century Catholic intellectualism as Catholics' effort to preserve "American" optimism, morality, and idealism against the growing influence of pragmatism and cultural relativism. Far from perceiving themselves as opponents of American society, Halsey argues, the "Catholic ghetto" of intellectuals sought to define itself as more authentically "American" than its non-Catholic contemporaries as it worked to perpetuate what was, essentially, the moral

¹¹ John T. McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History* (New York; W.W. Norton & Co., 2003).

¹² William M. Halsey, *The Survival of American Innocence: Catholicism in an Era of Disillusionment, 1920-1940* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980).

heritage of 19th century American Victorianism. Linking Catholicism with older American values, Catholic intellectuals drew upon neo-Thomist traditions that maintained ideas of an ordered, rational universe; man's ability to discern Truth through use of reason; and the stability and certainty of Truth. These ideas, rooted in Catholicism, had characterized the mindset of the 19-century United States. Therefore, argued American Catholics, to preserve and promote Catholic values was to preserve and promote America's founding principles (73-83). Elaborating on this connection between Catholic and American ideology, American Catholic intellectuals employed medieval metaphors to draw complex connections between defense of faith and the defense of country (66-70).

Since Catholic intellectuals perceived their neo-Thomist synthesis of the intellectual life as pure, important, and threatened, argues Halsey, they tended to write and think in isolation, promoting "Catholic" versions of many intellectual and cultural subdisciplines. Ultimately this isolation doomed neo-Thomism, as, beginning with John Tracy Ellis's famous critique of Catholic aloofness in 1955, neo-Thomism fell into disrepute as a backward-looking, intellectually inadequate mentality (175-177). Interestingly, Halsey's conclusion suggests that the Vietnam War represented for Catholics what World War I had represented for non-Catholics: an end of innocence (178-179).

Like McGreevy's study, *The Survival of American Innocence* appropriately concentrates on the conversation of Catholic and non-Catholic intellectual elites. Halsey's chapters address the intellectual and cultural projects of prominent, educated

Catholics such as literary critics George Shuster and Francis X. Talbot, S.J.; and writers F. Scott Fitzgerald, Thomas Merton, and Daniel Lord, S.J.. More ordinary voices are unheard. This absence—appropriate for Halsey and McGreevy’s projects in intellectual history—offers my dissertation a starting-point as it attempts to trace the influence of these writers and thinkers on urban college students’ shaping and interpretation of their campus experiences. Moreover, Halsey’s work warns that, when encountering the categories of “Catholic” and “American” in primary sources, historians cannot assume that these categories were understood as separable and opposed.

Highlighting the role of Catholic’s cultural agenda in re-structuring the relationship between Catholic and non-Catholic society, Arnold Sparr’s *To Promote, Defend, and Redeem*¹³ argues that American Catholic intellectuals sought to “promote the intellectual standing of American Catholicism, to defend the Catholic faith and its adherents from detractors, and to redeem what was seen as a drifting and fragmented secular culture” (xii). The idea of a redemptive “intellectual apostolate” faded in the Eisenhower administration, Sparr explains, due to American national prosperity and confidence; American society’s increasing acceptance of Catholics; and criticisms of a Catholic “ghetto” culture (164-170).

Placing the American Catholic intellectual/cultural ferment in the context of broader European Catholic movements, Sparr addresses not only the thoughts and ideas of American Catholics, but also their increasing drive to translate ideas into action. Here he begins to explore how Catholic ideas were understood and—sometimes—lived: For

Arnold Sparr, *To Promote, Defend, and Redeem: The Catholic Literary Revival and the Cultural Transformation of American Catholicism, 1920-1960* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990)

example, Sparr uses evidence from *Today*, the *Chicago Catholic Worker*, and Daniel Lord's publications to briefly discuss the social action careers of five Catholic student leaders, including Loyola's Edward Marciniak and John Cogley. (113-121). However, Sparr's individual approach stops short of attempting a broader analysis of Catholic student culture in Chicago.

While Sparr's study draws upon primary sources generated in Chicago in supporting an argument concerning the nationwide Catholic culture, by contrast Steven M. Avella's *This Confident Church*¹⁴ more strongly asserts that between 1940 and 1965 the worldwide florescence and transition in Catholic culture was fully reflected in (and intimately connected to) the microcosm of the Chicago Archdiocese. Pope Pius XII, insists Avella, had his local parallel in Cardinal Samuel Stritch; likewise, the progressive Pope John XXIII (famous for convening the Vatican II Council in 1962) had Archbishop Albert Meyer as his counterpart in Chicago (2). Indeed, Meyer—an advocate of interracial justice—played a prominent role in the Second Vatican Council's debates and documents, particularly *Lumen Gentium* and *Gaudium et Spes*. Meanwhile, local leaders such as Bishop Bernard J. Sheil and Monsignor Reynold Hillenbrand worked to implement the Vatican's call (articulated in papal encyclicals of the 1940s and 1950s) for the formation of a "lay apostolate" that would promote social justice, labor rights, and opposition to Communism. Outspoken on political and social issues, Sheil administered the popular Catholic Youth Organization [CYO], a recreational club that also included an educational division devoted to the city's social problems (109-149). Hillenbrand

¹⁴ Steven M. Avella, *This Confident Church: Catholic Leadership and Life in Chicago, 1940-1965* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992).

influenced future clergy through Mundelein Seminary's liberal programming and his application of a "Specialized Catholic Action" methodology, originating in Europe, to the organization of youth movements (151-186). As a result of the leadership of Sheil, Hillenbrand, and their students, broader initiatives such as Catholic Action, liturgical innovation, community organizing, and the Cana and Christian Family Movements thrived in Chicago (5). If Avella interprets "Chicago Catholicism" as unique and distinctive (as Edward Kantowicz argues in the *Forward*), then—paradoxically—the Chicago Archdiocese owed its uniqueness and distinction to its leaders' "confident" conformity to the Church's national and international agenda. In Chicago Catholicism, implies Avella, both the Church's problems and proposed solutions loomed larger than life.

In interpreting the archdiocesan leadership as a means through which new, European Catholic ideas influenced Chicago parishes, Avella's work suggests that the Catholic revival in Chicago was strong enough to have real impact on the experience of Catholic college students. However, as is appropriate for his project, Avella emphasizes the personalities and agendas of a few prominent leaders, placing them in the context of the city's social and political issues, Vatican and episcopal politics, lay organizations, and (to some extent) educational institutions. By contrast, this dissertation interprets a related chain of events with focus on the roles and reactions of Loyola, Mundelein, DePaul, and their students in a changing Church.

While Avella's work suggests the strength of clerical commitment to the redemptive agendas analyzed by Halsey and Sparr, studies by Jay P. Dolan, Eileen

McMahon, and (again) John T. McGreevy show that Catholic laity did not always accept the ideas and activism of their Church leadership. Dolan's short and sweeping monograph *In Search of an American Catholicism* adopts a social and cultural approach that relates Catholic intellectual developments to middle-class life, though not specifically student life. McMahon's *What Parish Are You From?* and McGreevy's *Parish Boundaries* both offer examples of conflict between liberal Catholic ideology and ethnic parish isolationism over the issue of race. Here again Catholic intellectuals appear have more in common with non-Catholic American liberal thinkers than with their own co-religionists, for whom ideas such as the "Mystical Body of Christ" fail to meet the practical needs of their parish neighborhoods.

By contrast, Jay P. Dolan's *In Search of an American Catholicism*¹⁵ emphasizes the role of early 20th-century Catholic intellectuals in encouraging isolationist Catholics to confront rather than avoid non-Catholic culture, a trend that culminated in Catholicism's organization into a non-Catholic society. Based mainly on secondary sources, Dolan's study aims to show how American culture—defined by Dolan as the values and beliefs by which Americans identify themselves as a group—influenced Catholicism in the United States from approximately 1780 to 2001. According to Dolan, in the early 19th century a monarchical, European style of Church authority came to dominate the more republican, lay-governed Catholicism of Enlightenment America. Soon waves of immigrant Catholics concentrated on preserving the faith and maintaining group cohesiveness in the face of perceived threats from secular American society and,

¹⁵ Jay P. Dolan, *In Search of an American Catholicism: A History of Religion and Culture in Tension* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

on occasion, from their own episcopal leadership. However, in the early 20th century “educated, American-born, middle-class laymen and clergy” advocated an activist “public Catholicism” intended to interact with the broader American culture and, indeed, to reshape it in the Catholic image. This effort, suggests Dolan, stressed the idea of religion as culture, thereby paving the way for the idea that Catholicism—like any culture in history—could change in response to surrounding conditions. By 1960 some American Catholics, influenced by ideas of democracy and religious freedom, quietly or publicly rebelled against the Church’s monarchical authority, gender ideology, and sexual morality, even as most Catholics continued their traditional religious practices. Overhauling the liturgy and opening the Church to ecumenical dialogue, the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) represented the culmination of many American Catholics’ desire for cultural adaptation even as it produced shock and resentment in those who understood the Church as unchanging. Throughout his study Dolan maintains that “American” and “Catholic” are dual but not incompatible identities, as each is a diverse culture capable of negotiating areas of conflict (3-8).

In contrast to McGreevy’s emphasis on intellectualism, Dolan’s monograph takes more of a cultural and social approach to American Catholic history by discussing at length the devotional and moral practices of ordinary laypeople as well as the concerns of prominent, educated leaders. Although necessarily broad, *In Search of an American Catholicism* provides context for an examination of intellectual and social environment in which the children of ordinary parishioners encountered and reacted to the ideas of the Catholic leadership.

Recently, a few innovative works have explored the interactions of Catholic cultural assumptions and American social change at parish level. For example, Eileen McMahon's *What Parish Are You From?* (1995)¹⁶ analyzes the reaction Irish-American parishioners to the perceived threat of African-American residents to their parish community, and, in the process, tests the strength and influence of the clergy within parish communities. Interpreting the migration of African-American Protestants as a threat to the parish community's culture and economic base, the Irish-American Catholics of St. Sabina's (in Chicago) were poised to flee the neighborhood when an ecumenical Organization of Southwest Communities (OSC) led by the Back-of-the-Yards organizer Saul Alinsky, St. Sabina's pastor Monsignor John McMahon, and Monsignor John Egan staved off panic with financial measures intended to thwart the shady real estate practices that promoted housing turnover and deterioration. Appealing to residents' self-interest rather than idealism, the OSC program placated a substantial base of St. Sabina residents until 1965, when the murder of an Irish teenager by African-American youths convinced parishioners that integration had doomed the neighborhood to crime and instability. Between 1965 and 1966 thousands of Catholic residents left the neighborhood suddenly and silently—perhaps ashamed, McMahon speculates, to admit their intentions to their respected though liberal pastor. While financial incentives and the parish authority structure contained potential for smooth community integration, McMahon concludes, ultimately the ideology of parish community limited the openness of St. Sabina's Irish-

¹⁶ McMahon, Eileen M. *What Parish Are You From? A Chicago Irish Community and Race Relations*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995.

American Catholics to residents of another religion and race, as well as to the efforts of liberal clergy members (117-189).

Expanding upon McMahon's local analysis, John T. McGreevy's *Parish Boundaries* (1996)¹⁷ explains Northern Catholics' resistance to racial turnover in terms of ethnics' construction of parish-centered communities with distinct geographic boundaries. Catholic neighborhoods, he emphasizes, were "created, not found"—the product of years of financial investment, residence, and a ritual use of space that sacralized the environment and bound neighbors together in their common experience of the liturgical year (21-28). As Catholics typically conflated the ideas of "race" and "ethnicity," they thought it natural to offer African-American Catholics the dignity of their own separate, national parishes, similar to those created by Poles, Italians, and Germans in earlier generations. African-American Catholics' insulted rejection of their parish enclaves stunned the Church hierarchy. Meanwhile, Catholic intellectuals' development of social justice theology, centered on the notion of the "Mystical Body of Christ" and promulgated by the youthful Catholic Action movement, increasingly challenged parish communities to adopt an international, interracial, and interethnic interpretation of their religious life (29-53). Growing perceptions of a Communist threat also encouraged more liberal Catholic intellectuals, priests, and lay leaders to view social justice theology as a religious alternative to atheistic socialism (64-67). Following World War II, a surge in African-American migration to Northern cities tested Northern Catholics' reaction to African-American neighbors who—more often than not—were

¹⁷ John T. McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996)

Protestant. Responses ranged from protests to missionary zeal, and the resulting conflict between liberal and conservative parish factions strained community relationships and, ultimately, fractured the majority of ethnic Catholic communities. Moving to the suburbs, white ethnics never re-claimed their former sense of parish community: here parish boundaries were indistinct, and post-Vatican II variations in liturgy made “shopping” for a parish a common practice. Catholics’ confrontation with race, concludes McGreevy, marked the end of Catholic community life in its traditional form, leaving many Catholics groping for new ways to strengthen family, faith, and community (249-263).

On the surface, McMahon and McGreevy’s studies of racial confrontation have little to do with Catholic college students. However, both *What Parish Are You From?* and *Parish Boundaries* discuss growing cultural divisions between Catholic intellectuals (including clergy) and uneducated Catholic laity in the pews of certain ethnic parishes. As institutions that accepted applicants from Catholic parishes and exposed those applicants to the ideas and attitudes of Catholic intellectuals, colleges and universities such as Loyola, Mundelein, and DePaul were locations of conflict and change in Catholic students’ perception of their faith. As with parishioners’ interpretation of their parish community and geographic space, students’ structuring of campus society, their religious participation, and their published discussions of faith and identity provide insight into their own negotiations of Catholic and American culture.

Finally, many highly specific studies of individual Catholic colleges and universities trace Catholic institutional development and—to some extent—student life,

but often tend to downplay issues of broader cultural and intellectual accommodation or conflict. Most relevant to this dissertation, recently faculty of DePaul University and former faculty of Mundelein College (now a department of Loyola University) compiled essay collections aimed at articulating their Catholic institution's heritage or historical experience. Hoping that *DePaul University: Centennial Essays and Images*¹⁸ might guide DePaul's future development as a Catholic university, editors John L. Rury (professor of education) and Charles S. Suchar (sociologist) frame thematic treatments of administrative history, student culture, and physical and curricular expansion with an overarching thesis regarding the re-interpretation of "Catholic identity" at DePaul. According to the contributors to *Centennial Essays and Images*, over the course of the 20th century DePaul adapted its religious identity to the urban educational marketplace by de-emphasizing obvious signs of Catholicism in favor of the Vincentian ethic of charity toward the community, regardless of creed. The University increasingly expressed its Catholicism through a "distinctive" willingness to meet the needs of American students rather than maintain a critical, countercultural distance from American society (Rury, ix). Evidence from DePaul's often-revised mission and policy statements, which justify the University's strategic planning through reference to Vincentian values, gives this thesis sounds support (5-51). Essays by Rury and Suchar also use oral history interviews (gathered for the project, and maintained in DePaul's archives), as well as student publications, to sketch social life at DePaul. In particular Suchar's concept of an "extended campus," involving the local businesses and entertainment venues patronized

¹⁸ John L. Rury and Charles S. Suchar, eds., *DePaul University: Centennial Essays and Images* (Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1998).

by DePaul commuter students, suggests student agency in a useful and exciting way that is even somewhat reminiscent of the community geographies claimed by *Parish Boundaries'* Catholic parishioners (Suchar 144-156).

However, *DePaul University: Centennial Essays and Images* does not place the Vincentian mission at DePaul in the context of the 20th century's ferment of Catholic liberalism, including Catholic Action ideology and organization. In particular, John L. Rury's excellent chapter on "Student Life and Campus Culture at DePaul," which analyzes student life with reference to the broader collegiate culture documented by Horowitz, seems to underestimate or miss the possible influence of nationwide Catholic intellectual/cultural trends (such as the Catholic press movement and the Catholic interracial movement) on society and culture at DePaul. By contrast, this dissertation attempts to place Rury's analysis of DePaul's co-educational social scene in the context of broader changes in American Catholic culture and higher education, including the campus life of De Paul's Catholic neighbors, Loyola and Mundelein.

Like *Centennial Essays*, *Mundelein Voices* is an essay collection that aims to convey a sense of historical experience as well as to guide or inspire future research. Unlike Rury and Suchar's project, however, it consists largely of personal memoirs composed by Mundelein College faculty, administrators, and alumnae, whose memories collectively span from 1930 until 1991. Editors Ann M. Harrington, B.V.M. and Prudence A. Moylan, both professors of history first at Mundelein College and later, Loyola University Chicago, clearly arranged the volume with attention to balance between lay and religious views and the representation of faculty, student, administrative,

and male perspectives. Essays by lay alumnae Jane Malkemus Goodnow and Mercedes McCambridge, and religious alumnae Blanche Marie Gallagher, B.V.M., and Mary Alma Sullivan, B.V.M. vividly describe individual reasons for attending Mundelein, reactions to the Mundelein curriculum, and their experiences of Mundelein intellectual and social life. Harrington, B.V.M. draws upon memories and primary evidence from the Mundelein College Archives and B.V.M. Archives—including her own survey of alumnae in the religious life—to tell the history and distinct experiences of B.V.M. students at Mundelein between 1957 and 1971. History professor and dean of residence at Mundelein's Coffey Hall in the 1960s, Joan Frances Crowley, B.V.M., reflects upon student attitudes toward religion, sexual ethics, racism, war, and residential community. Contributions from administrator Norbert Hruby and faculty members David Orr and Stephen A. Schmidt offer male perspectives on the historically women's college. The memoirs are introduced by two scholarly essays: a history of Mundelein's founding (1929-1931) by Mary DeCock, B.V.M.; and Moylan's analysis of the organization and gendering of space at Mundelein College's main building.

Since the edited volume is primarily a collection of memoirs, it offers primary source material which—if used with care—could add a human dimension to future studies of the intellectual, cultural, and social life of Mundelein College, including this dissertation. The secondary essays provide valuable starting points for research into Mundelein College's changing philosophies, explicit and implied, of women's appropriate education and roles in society, as well as Mundelein's relationship with the city and neighboring Loyola.

Finally, *Born in Chicago*,¹⁹ Ellen Skerrett's recent history of Loyola University Chicago broadly relates the university's administrative development to the Jesuit mission of service--in this case service to the Chicago population. The overview of Loyola's history is fascinating and valuable as a reference, elucidating administrative and structural changes in the university over the period 1870-2008. Skerrett does offer a few sketches of students' extracurricular lives and expectations, and also intersperses the general text with insets addressing the contributions of individual alumni. Despite a one-page discussion of CISCA and Catholic interracialism, however, overall the broad purpose of her monograph necessarily excludes extensive discussion of the relationship of Loyola student culture to the growth of Catholic liberalism.

In linking 20th century American Catholic ideological and institutional developments to the collegiate youth cultures of Catholic students at three Catholic institutions of higher education in Chicago, this dissertation aims to address what I consider a key area of religious cultural transition—the social life of the Catholic campus. It is my hope that it will also help to illuminate higher education's impact on the American cultural mainstream, as well as the role that Catholic campus culture continues to play in testing and shaping students' individual religious ideals.

¹⁹ Ellen Skerrett, *Born in Chicago: A History of Chicago's Jesuit University* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 2008).

CHAPTER ONE

STATUS AND “SCHOOL SPIRITUALITY” AT DE PAUL UNIVERSITY AND LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO, 1923-1938

“The orchestra was hotter than a fat man wearing a fur coat in Egypt,” enthused the *Loyola News*. “Their tantalizing syncopation was tempting enough to make a man with the gout play hopscotch on a keg of nails and when they started going only the chairs stood still.”¹ On that Friday night in 1926 over 350 Loyola students had brought their dates to the all-university dance at the Loop’s new Oriental Ballroom, where, insisted the newspaper, the most popular jazz music met the “atmosphere of an elite home.” For \$2.50 (roughly four hours’ pay for the average working student)² the couples danced to the rhythms of the modish Russo-Fiorillo orchestra and, during intervals, enjoyed an African-American dancer’s demonstrations of the Charleston, the Valencia, and the new, risqué Black Bottom. “He ‘strutted his stuff’ standing up, sitting down, and lying down,” marveled the *News*. Meanwhile, davenport in “enticing spots” offered moments of privacy, interrupted only by wandering serenaders.³ Editors summed up the experience as “fun in an atmosphere of collegiate romance”—fun, that is,

¹ “All Departments Join in Frolic Fun in an Atmosphere of Collegiate Romance,” *Loyola News* (27 October 1926) 1.

² According to a 1926 survey, working students at Loyola earned an average of \$.67 per hour. “Many Loyola Men Work to Defray Education Cost,” *Loyola News* (17 November 1926) 1.

³ “News Holds Frolic Friday,” *Loyola News* (20 October 1926) 1; “Weather Report—Friday Warm; Friday Night—Much Warmer!,” *Loyola News* (20 October 1926) 1; “News Fall Frolic Smashing Hit,” *Loyola News* (27 October 1926) 1.

if one made up one's mind to forget the nagging concern of taxi fare and surrender to a "world... of Arabian Nights enchantment where you are a prince (or ought to be) and she is a princess."⁴

This glowing report did more than reprise students' good times and personal status fantasies; indirectly, it sought to elevate the reputation of the university community—and through it, the Catholic Church—by association with the fun and elitism of secular American "collegiate" culture. Historian Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz's analysis of undergraduate life at secular colleges and universities shows that in the first half of the 20th century the quality of an educational institution's extracurricular culture or "campus life" impacted the perceived class status both of the institution and its students. While aspiring middle-class men and women imitated the social rituals of prestigious eastern universities in order to assert individual class identity, they often viewed their participation in the campus social life as a selfless submerging of personal interests (such as academic pursuits) in promotion of the university community.⁵ In Chicago, Catholic cultural leaders of the 1920s took this idea one step further by encouraging Loyola and De Paul students to cultivate extracurricular activities as a means, not only of improving the university's reputation, but of increasing the prestige of Catholicism in the United States. Drenched in both Catholic and American popular culture, student leaders interpreted individual participation in dances, football games, publications, and debates not only as enjoyable indulgences, but also as moral and

⁴ "The News Frolic," *Loyola News* (20 October 1926) 2.

⁵ Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987) 118-120.

religious duties to be performed despite the loss of money, sleep, and study time.

However, as the decade matured, Catholic educators—the Jesuits especially-- came to recognize that students’ aggressive “school spirituality” had divisive as well as unifying potential. While common interest in situating the Catholic university within American “campus life” culture could ally students and educators, increasingly administrators sought to limit and control student initiative in service to the Church’s institutional relationships.

The Institutional Role of Student Social Life

American “campus life”—the distinct youth culture associated with undergraduate studies—was an outgrowth of the student-faculty relationship. While true, students had been organizing for mutual benefit since the formation of universities in medieval Europe, the social instability of Revolutionary and Early Republican periods offered American university students perhaps unprecedented motivation and opportunity to rebel against the discipline of America’s (then) Protestant educational institutions. Violent riots at North Carolina (1799), Princeton (1800, 1807), and Yale (1820s), among other universities, were quickly suppressed, but in their aftermath affluent students formed exclusive and often secretive fraternal organizations that supplanted eighteenth-century literary societies. Throughout the nineteenth century these undergraduate fraternities functioned as loci of covert opposition to faculty power, elevating the codes and loyalties of the peer group above institutional standards of conduct and scholarship. In their ongoing “war” with faculty, undergraduate organizations condoned hedonism,

enabled cheating, and constructed contact with professors as betrayal of student solidarity. According to Horowitz, this early incarnation of “campus life” eschewed religious values, which wealthy undergraduates associated with evangelical faculty and priggish ministerial students who, in violation of the undergraduate code, sought faculty mentorship.⁶

However, as the nineteenth century drew to a close, potential arose for more collaborative relationships between students and faculty. Venerable Eastern universities were swiftly secularizing, eroding the sharp cultural differences between religious professor and secular student. Meanwhile, the undergraduates of the mid-1800s had themselves become educators, bringing into the administration their prior fraternity memberships, memories, and awareness of student community strength. These sympathetic professors and administrators sought to redirect student organization toward support of the university institution through official recognition and token forms of power-sharing, such as the establishment of student councils. Controversially, these educators also began to argue that organized student activity offered practical lessons in leadership, civility, and organizational behavior that accorded with a university’s educational mission. By the 1920s codes of undergraduate loyalty and mutuality had coalesced around the institutional name, which student praised in song, cheered at athletic pep rallies, and pledged to enhance through present and future accomplishments. While friction between students and faculty persisted, consciousness of a common interest—the

⁶ Horowitz, *Campus Life*, 23-41

image of the university, which in turn reflected upon all of its associates—increasingly conditioned their relationship.⁷

Importantly, too, in early twentieth century popular novels such as Owen Johnson's *Stover at Yale* (1912) and F. Scott Fitzgerald's *This Side of Paradise* (1920), movies, and the growing prominence of organized intercollegiate athletics mythologized undergraduate "campus life" as an idyll of upper-class status, freedom, and youthful pleasures. Popular images of collegiate life conditioned interwar freshmen to anticipate the excitement of fraternity "rushing," football games, dates, and other social opportunities. Often separated from parental support and supervision, students likewise expected to encounter venerable undergraduate "traditions" and rituals that symbolized their acceptance by a nurturing peer group with a long and elite history—regardless of the campus's actual age and background. Increasingly both educators and students perceived a college or university's immediate and long-term prospects as partially contingent on the development of a "campus life" image that could meet the standards of American popular culture, thereby attracting promising students who would later contribute to institutional coffers and prestige.⁸

Dogged by religious prejudice, in the early twentieth century young Catholic universities—such as Loyola and De Paul--had particular reason to co-opt and control undergraduate "campus life" in support of institutional reputation. Widespread skepticism regarding the intellectual value of Catholic higher education led to feelings of

⁷ Horowitz, *Campus Life*, 52-55, 108-112, 119; Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (New York: A Knopf, 1962) 428-431.

⁸ Horowitz, 119-121, 125-131.

ostracism and insecurity in Catholic university communities. Catholic educational institutions had experienced slights which both students and educators interpreted as discriminatory. In the early 1920s, for instance, the University of Chicago prohibited Catholic schools from competing in its national basketball tournament; while as late as 1937 Loyola president Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. could complain that at a recent awards meeting the local Bar Association president had introduced the presidents of Northwestern and University of Chicago by their professional title of “Dr.,” while Wilson was introduced as “Mr.”⁹ Upwardly-mobile Catholics had reason to believe that American academics did not entirely respect their efforts and accomplishments.

However, the competing De Paul and Loyola university administrations had different class aspirations which influenced the role and meaning of campus social life during the 1920s and early 1930s. In moving St. Ignatius College to Rogers Park in 1909, the Jesuits had hoped to escape a declining neighborhood and, in the words of the college consultants, attract “a better class of Catholics” from Chicago’s northern outskirts. As educational historian Lester Goodchild observes, this ambition accorded with the Jesuits’ traditional mission of educating future Catholic leaders. In addition, the newly-chartered Loyola University would have to negotiate intense international and local expectations for its Catholic identity and importance within the magisterial Church as well as the academic community. Oaths of loyalty bound the Society of Jesus to the Vatican and its vision of an international resurgence of Catholic culture. Simultaneously Loyola enjoyed the political and financial assistance of Chicago Archbishop Mundelein,

⁹ “The Annual Classic,” *Loyola News* (3 February 1926) 2; Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. to John J Mitchell (29 October 1937), Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 44, Folder 1, Loyola University Archives, Chicago, IL.

who viewed the university as the basis for a future union of the city's Catholic institutions of higher education into a single archdiocesan "Catholic University of Chicago," which, he dreamed, would become one of America's foremost Catholic centers of learning.¹⁰ Although Loyola had barely begun its career as an urban Catholic university, already it had both internal and external motivations to portray itself as upper-class and cosmopolitan.

By contrast, St. Vincent's College—not the Archdiocesan favorite, and therefore less fettered by magisterial obligations—responded pragmatically to Jesuit competition by emphasizing the traditional Vincentian apostolate of service to the local population. Re-chartered as De Paul University, the institution's new elective curriculum aimed to meet the needs of immigrant middle and lower-class Catholics by offering a Catholic education that was respectable yet practical. Goodchild terms the Vincentians' pragmatic, democratic approach as "Americanist" by contrast to the Jesuits' international and magisterial focus.¹¹ While De Paul still needed to remain competitive in the North Side educational marketplace, on the whole its administrators did not burden the school with the inflated expectations that the Loyola community struggled to meet.

Like their secular counterparts, in the 1920s Jesuit educators sought to use extracurricular activities to enhance prestige and instill institutional solidarity. At Loyola, a striking example of this endeavor was students' 1923 staging of *alumnus*

¹⁰ Lester F. Goodchild, "The Mission of the Catholic University in the Midwest, 1842-1980: A Comparative Case Study of the Effects of Strategic Policy Decisions upon the Mission of the University of Notre Dame, Loyola University Chicago, and De Paul University" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1986) 347, 355, 374.

¹¹ Goodchild, "The Mission of the Catholic University in the Midwest," 234-236.

Daniel Lord, S.J.'s *Pageant of Youth*, a production that modeled Jesuits' interpretation of ideal student-faculty relationships while also contextualizing Catholic education within American upper-class culture. Frankly prescriptive, the pageant genre in itself indicated a community-building intent. According to historian David Glassberg, in the Progressive era American Protestant elites had developed the genre of "community historical pageant" as a means of re-inforcing Anglo-American identity and social structures against the disruptions of immigration and industrialization. The pageants, generally consisting of "two hours of dramatic sketches held together by abstract symbolic interludes of music and dance," sought to interpret a community's overarching values—values that Progressives hoped would define the group and shape its future development—through reference to an idealized past. As pageant organizer William Chauncy Langdon repeatedly explained, "the place is the hero and the development of the community is the plot."¹²

Importantly, pageant narratives aimed to re-organize social relationships within the community. Typical story lines acknowledged divisions of class, race, and ethnicity, but obscured or resolved conflict in order to portray the community's different factions as functioning in a harmonious, stable hierarchy rooted in Anglo-American principles. Outsiders, when they appeared, were soon absorbed or structured into the pageant's community concept. For instance, the program of the 1911 *Pageant of Progress* in Lawrence, Massachusetts depicted a textile worker kneeling in homage to the allegorical figure of the city; while Boston's civic pageant of 1910 included a scene of "America"

¹² David Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century*, (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 78.

welcoming the representatives of different immigrant groups. Indeed, according to Glassberg, a pageant organizer's role included encouraging communities to use the pageant to identify and imagine solutions to the tensions in their local society.¹³

However, more than just a script for the ideal community, the pageant performance was an exercise in group loyalty and cohesion. Group members rather than touring entertainers assumed the various roles, played the music, and formed the audience, so that the production became a co-operative effort in which community members themselves relayed a message about the community to the community. This interaction within the group in theory strengthened the emotional bonds among individual members and encouraged identification with the pageant's narrative of consensus.

Pageant performances also carried an upper-class connotation that hopefully bolstered community self-esteem and generated positive publicity. By World War I pageantry had become a genteel art form, designed by a "pageant-master," at least nominally controlled and standardized by an American Pageant Association (APA), and involving a distinctive form of "story dancing."¹⁴ Then a lecturer and graduate student at St. Louis University, Father Lord first experienced a pageant in 1914, when St. Louis civic and social leaders produced *The Pageant and Masque of St. Louis* in an effort to improve the city's national image--which Chicago's economic success had somewhat eclipsed—and inspire St. Louisians to support and invest in new civic projects.¹⁵ No

¹³ David Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century*, (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1990) 39-109; 128-130; 79.

¹⁴ Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry*, 148.

¹⁵ Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry*, 159-162; Daniel A. Lord, S.J., *Played By Ear* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1955), 197.

doubt Lord was also familiar with St. Louis's annual "Veiled Prophet" celebration, through which, as historian Thomas M. Spencer argues, the city's Protestant elites asserted their social and cultural hegemony over working-class newcomers, many of whom were Catholic.¹⁶ Chicagoans, too, knew pageants: Northwestern University, for instance, staged *An Historical Pageant of Illinois* in the northside suburb of Evanston, IL as a Protestant charitable benefit.¹⁷ In co-opting the pageant genre for a number of scripts, including *Alma Mater* (St. Louis University Centennial Pageant, 1920), *Pageant of Youth*, and *Pageant of Peace*, Lord tapped into an Anglo-American entertainment trend that carried with it, not only educational and co-operative possibilities, but also an aura of prestige—an aura that Lord doubtless wished to offer Catholic institutions. After all, a community that staged a pageant, was a community that proclaimed its respectability.

Lord's script used allegory and anti-modern references to present a model of collegiate social relationships, characterized by reciprocal obligation, that had context both in American and in Catholic culture. The plot centered on a Catholic student, Youth, whom a loving Mother raised until Evil, in the form of Disease, ended her earthly life. Distressed at leaving her son alone to contend with Evil and his minions, the Mother prayed that the Blessed Virgin Mary would assist the Youth; in response, Mary commissioned a character called Heavenly Wisdom to descend to earth in the guise of "Alma Mater, Mother of Youth" to guide him until he had gained sufficient moral

¹⁶ Thomas M. Spencer, *The St. Louis Veiled Prophet Celebration: Power on Parade, 1877-1995* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2000), 18-19.

¹⁷ Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry*, 161.

fortitude to resist Evil's deceptions and sallies. Literally rescuing the terrified Youth from the grasp of Sin and Ignorance, Alma Mater offered herself as "Second Mother" to the boy, who in gratitude became a most loyal member of her campus community. On completion of his studies she judged that "thou hast come to manhood" and formally dubbed him her "Knight and Champion" in the battle against Evil, for which she armed him with a sword to fight injustice and armor to preserve his purity. Sent out into the world, Youth triumphed over Evil and his minions Pleasure and Ambition. On his return to Alma Mater, however, Youth found that an evil character called Poverty had captured and bound her in chains. The script's conclusion showed Youth freeing Alma Mater from Poverty's shackles and laying at her feet the gold and jewels that were the spoils of his life's battle.¹⁸

As with Protestant works, *Pageant of Youth* acknowledged an element of social division within the community—an element that the pageant swiftly resolved in a scene which Lord clearly intended to instruct its viewers on the proper approach to collegiate social life. The setting was a Catholic campus, where "Youth" and his "Companions" joined in extracurricular activities such as foot racing, pole vaulting, and dancing. Here Lord introduced a character named "Contempt"—a Catholic student, one of Youth's peers, who refused to participate in the campus community. "I'm sick of Alma Mater's apron strings," said Contempt. "I'll break them yet and fling my growing hate into her face..." He found the campus entertainments silly and facile, and considered his peers to be immature. "Oh, I am sick of infancy like this," he explained, "sick of the swaddling

¹⁸ *Pageant of Youth, A Musical Masque by the Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S.J., Presented by The Catholics of Chicago in the Loyola University Alumni Gym*, (Chicago: Loyola University, 1923).

clothes, the childish games, the never ending giggles—schoolgirls for playmates, when I should have men!” Defending the life of the community, Youth re-asserted the central assumptions of *in loco parentis*: “‘Til Alma Mater bids us face the world we are her boys, her sons,” he told Contempt. “And men can wait til we have tried our strength and made it firm.”¹⁹ True to genre, *Pageant of Youth* resolved the confrontation: Contempt, who wished to “match my waxing strength with men, not children,” consented to a wrestling match with an outsider named Ignorance—who, symbolically, broke Contempt’s spine.²⁰ As was typical in pageant narratives, prosperity depended on individual acceptance of one’s role within a stable social hierarchy.

In many ways, *Pageant of Youth*’s social model reflected mainstream America’s concept of collegiate hierarchy as interpreted by Horowitz. Like a mother—an Alma Mater-- the educational institution enriched students with knowledge, culture, and protection in return for students’ fealty, promotion of institutional values, and financial support. Participation in the campus extracurricular activities was an important demonstration of loyalty to the college or university. Involved students had the duty to encourage rebellious individuals to submit to community standards, which (in theory) existed for his or her training and protection.²¹

However, Lord’s *Pageant of Youth* further intensified the meaning of institutional loyalty by placing campus social relations within a cosmic hierarchy. According to Lord, the educational institution was no ordinary Alma Mater, but a representative of the

¹⁹ *Pageant of Youth*, 57.

²⁰ *Pageant of Youth*, 57, 61.

²¹ Horowitz, *Campus Life*, 108-112.

Blessed Virgin Mary herself, as well as, indirectly, of the students' own mothers. Since Catholic tradition often referred to the Church as a "mother on earth," Lord's play also implied a parallel between the Church ecclesia—a mediator between heaven and earth--and Alma Mater, Mary's earthly delegate. Defiance of the campus community therefore represented not only a rejection of one's role as student, but also of one's role as layperson within the Church hierarchy and as human being within the broader structure of earth and heaven. As a Jesuit—a member of an order bound to the Vatican by oath—Lord would have considered the idea of obedience to centralized authority as only appropriate to a religious community.

In this context, the scene of Contempt's defeat responded to the popular American argument that the Church's claims to doctrinal authority restricted free inquiry within the academic environment. Rather than encouraging students to think for themselves, critics suggested, Catholic education infantilized them—the very charge that Contempt leveled against the figure of Alma Mater. In Lord's perspective, however, human lived in the midst of a cosmic, intellectual battle between good and evil, in which unguided inquiry--inquiry made in solitary arrogance, uninformed by the Church's accumulated "Wisdom"--could lead students to fall victim to dangerous errors leading to the moral death of their souls. The triumph of "Ignorance" over a disobedient individualist also commented on the field of apologetics, suggesting that individuals who separated themselves from the Church's wisdom were less than intellectually competent while, by implication, those who submitted to the Church community eventually would be prepared to meet the challenges of "Ignorance." In short, Lord's pageant also presented its audience with an

allegorical argument for choosing Catholic education—the commission of “Heavenly Wisdom”—over the dangerous atmosphere of American public schools, in which inquiry took place apart from the context of faith.

Nevertheless, Lord’s choice of medieval imagery endorsed the Catholic university’s dual identity as both “Catholic” and “American.” Educated Catholics of the 1920s generally romanticized the Middle Ages as a model of communal values, economic mutuality, and cultural achievement. Expanding this idea, Catholic intellectuals of the era defensively argued for a continuity between medieval political theory and American democratic thought as a means of reconciling their dual loyalties to Church and nation.²² In a sense, then, *Pageant of Youth* not only asserted Catholic respectability and distinctiveness, but also implied that, by virtue of their medieval tradition, Catholic colleges and universities had a natural place among “American” institutions.

When Loyola professor Claude J. Pernin S.J.—Lord’s former mentor—directed *Pageant of Youth* in 1923 at the university’s newly-constructed Alumni Gymnasium, his production heightened the script’s messages of Catholic hierarchical unity and civic context. The performance took place on the week of Thanksgiving, a national holiday unique to the United States; the performers, billed as “The Catholics of Chicago,” were Catholic grammar school, high school, and college students, with collegians—mainly from Loyola—in the leading roles. The script’s requirement for large numbers of dancers, musicians, and choruses allowed roughly 800 students from over twenty different educational institutions to participate, emphasizing the idea of hierarchical

²² Philip Gleason, *Contending with Modernity*, 128-129.

connection among Chicago's Catholic educational system. In addition to Loyolans with stage roles, 59 Loyola students supported the production as ushers, at the box office, and on a variety of production committees, further re-inforcing Loyola University's self-imposed role as educator of Chicago's Catholic leadership, and in Mundelein's eyes, the center of Catholic educational endeavor in Chicago. In sum, the pageant's performance evoked an image of Catholic unity as the sum of a vast structure of hierarchical relationships--the "pageant of youth" repeating itself endlessly in inter-related schools across the city.

Extracurricular pageantry likewise placed Catholic "school spirit" in an international context. Three years later the 28th International Eucharistic Congress reinforced the idea that service to alma mater was service to the universal Church. Hosting a Congress that the *Chicago Tribune* equated to an "Ecclesiastical World's Fair," Chicago Archdiocesan committees created a conference program structurally similar to many of the era's American civic celebrations, which broke a broader community into component parts for recognition and re-organization into the wider structure.²³ The schedule devoted each of five conference days to addressing a particular category of Catholics: for instance, after a first day of formal welcoming, the second day was designated "Children's Day"; and the third, "Women's Day," to be followed by "Men's Night." Each day began in Soldier Field with formal speeches and a Pontifical High Mass and proceeded through topical meetings conducted in sections specific to

²³ James O'Donnell Bennett, "World's Fair of Church Display is Called," in *The Eucharistic Congress as Reported in the Chicago Tribune* (Chicago: Chicago Tribune, 1926) 8.

language.²⁴ The fourth day, “Higher Education Day” gathered students of Catholic high schools, colleges, and universities in and near Chicago, including both De Paul and Loyola. Each school’s delegation processed formally onto the Field. “They came on the grounds in military formations, resplendent in bright uniforms or distinctive garb...” recalled the Congress’s official record. “Young men and young women, trained and prepared for weeks for this event, performed their share of the pageantry in thorough manner, until each was merged into the solid colorful section that was the bowl of the amphitheatre.”²⁵ As in civic pageants, individual groups were briefly acknowledged before the community—in this case, symbolizing the international Church—re-absorbed them in a visual demonstration of harmonious unity.

Like *Pageant of Youth*, “Higher Education Day” speakers entreated Catholic students to remain obedient to Church and institutional hierarchies as a bulwark against modernist individualism. In his opening address the Archbishop of Montreal reminded students that “[a]t a time when the need of discipline is imperative because overwhelming passions rule the souls of men and numerous theories unbalance their minds,” the Church alone provided “cohesion and efficiency,” possessed authority and inspired confidence.²⁶ Similarly, speeches such as Joseph Scott, K.S.G.’s reflection on “The Eucharist—A Factor in Our National Life” lamented the modern “revolt of youth” and encouraged upwardly-mobile young adults to serve their country by disseminating Eucharistic values

²⁴ “Official Program,” in *XXVIII International Eucharistic Congress, June 20-24 1926, Chicago II* (Chicago: XXVIII Eucharistic Congress, 1926) 51-61.

²⁵ *The Story of the Twenty-Eighth International Eucharistic Congress* (Chicago: 1927) 198.

²⁶ *The Story of the Twenty-Eighth International Eucharistic Congress* (Chicago: 1927) 203-204.

of obedience and self-sacrifice. “We are soldiers of Christ our King,” Scott declared to the assembled crowd of university, college, and high school students in an unconscious echo of *Pageant of Youth*’s primary metaphor. “When orders come to us from his eternal majesty through His vicegerent on earth, we must submit, however unworthy we may be to fulfill the duty assigned to us.” Citing the Bible, he reminded students to give what was due to both God and country; yet he urged them to resist the rebelliousness, arrogance, and skepticism that he saw in American culture. “In this age of lawlessness and insubordination and disrespect for lawful authority, our Eucharistic Lord will remind us that for thirty years of His life, He was ‘subject to authority’” Finally, Scott exhorted students to maintain Christian humility in the midst of their educational achievements. “Oh, we of puny intellects, however much we may exert them.... we who plume ourselves upon our intellectual attainments and our capacity for leadership among our fellows, let us return to the supper room [of the Catholic sacraments].... Verily, our Savior would remind us that ‘Unless we become as little children, we shall not enter into the Kingdom of God.’”²⁷

Homilies on submission and humility, however, applied only to individuals—not to institutions. Loyola University administrators had been eager to use the Eucharistic Congress as a means of promoting their Church and university before Catholics and non-Catholics alike. After all, “what can Catholic higher education in Chicago mean, if not Loyola University?” urged one *Loyola News* editorial, likely influenced by the faculty moderators. “As the finest example of this art, Loyola will naturally be on exposition before the world.... Will she pass the scrutiny of so many curious and probably critical

²⁷ *The Story of the Twenty-Eighth International Eucharistic Congress* (Chicago: 1927) 205-206.

observers?”²⁸ Determined to impress, the Loyola administration made great effort to beautify the Arts campus in Rogers Park, replacing “piles of lumber” with attractive grass and shrubs; creating a “tropical garden” before the Gym; laying sidewalks; and re-designing entrances. “The entire side of the road entering from Sheridan Road has been landscaped,” reported the *Loyola News*. “...A much-needed sidewalk has been laid from the West gate running the length of the roadway, and the upper part of the terrace facing the West has been completely replanted, taking away the old road leading to the northern buildings. When the remaining paths and terraces are completed with the planting of shrubs and grass, the campus will take on a beautiful aspect with which it will greet the coming thousands of visitors for the Congress.”²⁹

Students, too, were expected to display themselves for the occasion, even though Chicago would host its Eucharistic Congress during their summer vacation. Throughout the Higher Education Day festivities they would wear sashes of maroon and gold (Loyola’s colors), along with a button bearing the Eucharistic shield; seated together, they would join with other Catholic colleges and high schools in singing the Mass of St. Francis for the massive liturgy at Soldier Field. They would project a constructed image of unity, joy, and grandeur. “This magnificent spectacle should in [itself] make everyone desirous of the honor of being a participant,” declared the *Loyola News*. However, in case magnificence alone failed to lure students away from summer jobs and leisure pursuits, the newspaper also appealed to duty and group identification as motivating factors. “...[W]hen one considers that this is an integral part of a program which, if

²⁸ “Close at Hand,” *Loyola News* (26 May 1926) 2.

²⁹ “Campus Takes on Feature Aspects for 1926 Congress,” *Loyola News* (26 May 1926) 3.

successful, will mean so much to Loyola, then he can see that there is every reason why all real Loyolans should make it a point to let nothing interfere with their being present at that ceremony and doing everything in their power to make the entire congress a complete success.” To stress the point further: “Strong enough emphasis cannot be laid upon the necessity of every Loyola student aiding in every possible manner and in assisting the university authorities in the huge enterprise which will be undertaken next month by the Catholics of Chicago.”³⁰ Participation in this extracurricular, then, was service to the school; and service to the school, was service to the unified, hierarchical Church bureaucracy that included Loyola, and which the Eucharistic Congress would promote.

The Community and the Individual

Emphasis on “school spirituality” also served students’ class insecurities and aspirations. “A famous and well-known college will add to the credit and honor of every student who leaves its halls,” argued *De Paulia* in 1924. “If we help our Alma Mater, we also help ourselves. This is not designed as a sentimental expression of collegiate loyalty. It is the practical truth.”³¹ Loyola and De Paul’s Catholic students shared with their secular counterparts the conviction that university prestige could assist individual upward mobility and confirm personal claims to social status.

By enrolling in college during the 1920s, Loyola and De Paul students entered an elite but expanding social class—elite both statistically and in terms of popular

³⁰ “Loyola Practices for Eucharistic Congress,” *Loyola News* (26 May 1926) 4.

³¹ “Support the Annual,” *De Paulia* (12 March 1924) 2.

perception. According to Horowitz, for their parents' generation higher education had been extremely rare, with only 3% of American youth between the ages of 18 and 22 attending college in 1890. While twentieth-century college enrollments steadily increased, in 1920 still only 8% of American youth attended college, a proportion that would increase to 16% by 1940.³² In accessing higher education, Loyola and De Paul students claimed campus territory formerly dominated by the affluent and carrying popular connotations of privilege, extravagance, and storied respectability.

However, while most Loyola and De Paul students were financially secure, they largely represented the expanding ranks of middle-class families rather than an established upper class. Judging by their parents' occupations, the majority of De Paul Arts students came from middle-class backgrounds even in the midst of the Depression. Enrollment statistics show that while in 1938 approximately one third of the parents of incoming Arts freshmen performed unskilled, miscellaneous, or "unknown" labor, still close to 60% of parents worked in small business, clerical, or skilled occupations. About 10% represented the professions or, in the terms of the report, "semi-professions," which included engineering and schoolteaching.³³ Unfortunately similar statistical reports are not available for earlier years, nor for the downtown campus. Historian John Rury speculates that while in earlier years the socio-economic profile may have been

³² Horowitz, *Campus Life*, 5-6.

³³ Study of Freshmen (1938), Academic Enrollment, De Paul University Archives, Chicago IL, Box 3, 1-8.

somewhat more blue-collar, it is likely that in the 1920s middle-class students nevertheless dominated De Paul's student body.³⁴

Likewise, cross-referencing Loyola's 1926 Arts junior and senior classes with the 1920 U.S. Census suggests Loyola University drew its Arts students primarily from the ranks of small business owners, clerks and managers, office workers, salesmen, and other middle and lower-middle class occupations. Of the 18 of 26 seniors identifiable in the 1920 census record, 83% clearly hailed from a middle-class background, with fully 50% representing white-collar clerical, retail, or service occupations. In addition, the fathers of 22% owned small businesses, such as tailor shops or dry goods stores, while 11% represented the legal and medical professions. Only three students, or 17% of the sample, had parents employed in blue-collar occupations, and of these at least one was a skilled laborer.³⁵ The 17 of 24 identifiable Arts juniors were also overwhelmingly middle-class in background, with 58% of parents engaged in miscellaneous clerical and management occupations; 12% owning small businesses; 12% in the professions; and 12% on the city police force. Only one parent was a laborer.³⁶ Judging by occupational backgrounds, then, overall the majority of Loyola and De Paul Arts students were modestly middle-class: white-collar in background, but likely with little family wealth to support their studies, entertainments, or future endeavors.

³⁴John L. Rury, "Student Life and Campus Culture at De Paul," *De Paul University: Centennial Essays and Images*, (Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, 1998), 181.

³⁵"Seniors," *Loyolan* (1926): 86; *Fourteenth Census of the United States* [1920], Chicago, Cook County, Series T625, Rolls 306-362.

³⁶"Juniors," *Loyolan* (1926): 90; *Fourteenth Census of the United States* [1920], Chicago, Cook County, Series T625, Rolls 252-357.

Certainly both De Paul and Loyola students themselves worked to help defray their educational expenses. According to a 1925 student survey, over 80% of the combined students of all Loyola colleges worked for pay in addition to studying.³⁷ In the following year a *Loyola News* survey of Loyola's Arts and Sciences college showed that 30% of 319 survey respondents financed all or part of their education through paid employment, often at locations ten or fifteen miles from the Rogers Park campus. "The varieties of endeavor are not great," reported the newspaper. "Practically all are engaged in clerking in drug, department, and chain stores. The rapid transit, theaters, and orchestras employ the rest." Some students rose in the early morning and worked until class time; others, mainly the musicians (for instance, Loyola student "Tweet" Hogan, who led the Miralago club's popular band), earned most of their pay at night. Their hourly compensation averaged 67 cents. Theater employees earned the lowest wage—sometimes as low as 25 cents per hour—and invested between 40 and 50 hours in their jobs each week.³⁸ Employment for Arts and Science students was thought to average 15 hours per week, while evening Law students reported working 40 hours per week.³⁹ At De Paul, too, "Many of the full-time students divide their time between book and time-clock in order to make a living."⁴⁰ In 1936 students at De Paul's downtown Liberal Arts campus (distinct from the Liberal Arts campus in Lincoln Park) reported working as lawyers, master mechanics, store managers, clerks, stenographers, janitors, and stock

³⁷ "Final Student Survey Results Interesting," *Loyola News* (29 April 1925): 1, 4.

³⁸ "Many Loyola Men Work to Defray Education Cost," *Loyola News* (17 November 1926) 1.

³⁹ "Final Student Survey Results Interesting," *Loyola News* (29 April 1925) 1, 4.

⁴⁰ "Analyzing the Causes for the Lack of School Spirit," *De Paulia* (5 March 1927) 2.

boys, among other professional and non-professional occupations.⁴¹ Even in the prosperous 1920s, student employment was so widespread as to attract administrative attention and concern. “I have noticed that the health of a number of the students has been injured by too much outside work,” Loyola’s Dean of Arts and Sciences observed while introducing a new student loan program in 1926.⁴² For such students, higher education offered the possibility of future professional or business careers that would increase their class status, thereby justifying present financial burdens.⁴³

Although not poor, many De Paul and Loyola students were well aware of the contrast between themselves and the image of upper-class student decadence depicted in popular novels and movies. “We know nothing of afternoon teas, we do not wear handpainted galoshes on the campus, and we do not compete with each other for first place as the best dresser of the school,” declared one student. Rather, “Most of us have to work for our expenses in school....”⁴⁴ Even graduation would not immediately increase the students’ economic status, since even in the 1920s a university diploma did not guarantee middle-class incomes after graduation. As first-generation college graduates discovered that their A.B. degrees did not necessarily translate into high positions in the business world, advocates of higher education began to argue that a college graduate’s main advantage was not greater practical skill but the acquisition of that ineffable something known as “culture” which could elevate the graduate above his work routine.

⁴¹ “Statistics Show Variety in Occupation of Students,” *De Paulia* (5 March 1936) 1.

⁴² “Establish Loan Fund to Assist Arts Students,” *Loyola News* (15 December 1926) 1.

⁴³ Horowitz, *Campus Life*, 6-7.

⁴⁴ “Student Comment,” *Loyola News* (29 April 1925): 1.

“The ambitious, educated man, by reason of his education, will probably rise to a position of prominence, but, like his less learned brother, he must begin at the bottom of the ladder,” observed the *De Paul Quarterly* in spring 1929. “Not in the mere consideration of dollars and cents, then, lies the value of a college education, but rather in something which has a far more enduring effect on the lives of those who possess it. For want of a more connotative term we call that something culture.”⁴⁵

No wonder that the students, insecure in their class status, expressed such fascination with social class and its cultural constructions. Student fiction published in the *De Paul Quarterly* suggested that inter-class contact created in students a mixture of revulsion and good will, distaste and fascination. In 1929, for instance, De Paul student Gladys Reynolds described the migration of lower-class rural dwellers into her family’s middle-class neighborhood near Lyons, IL, on Chicago’s southwest side, some ten years previous. According to Reynolds, established residents had hoped to socialize the roughshod newcomers into the middle-class community. “...[W]e could uplift them, comb the family hair, and part it in the middle,” she explained. “So thought Our Street, and smiled benignly on the ‘furriners’ (as they styled themselves)... seeing distant visions of transformed Perkinses with smooth hair and smoother manners.” In spite of these hopes, the lower-class Perkins family remained indifferent to community standards of cleanliness, socialization, and financial independence. They “flapped their rags and managed to live with even less sense of responsibility than the cornfield scarecrows whose counterparts they were,” Reynolds criticized, noting that the Perkins frequently imposed on the Reynolds family for favors that they accepted casually, almost as their

⁴⁵ Editorial, *De Paul Quarterly* (Spring 1929): 57.

due. “They annoyed us.... beyond endurance.” Still she admired, even romanticized them; she found them “exotic,” fascinating, courageous. “With them, they brought a tang of their lawless hill country,” she wrote, “a flavor of wood-smoke and wild herbs, of illicit ‘moonshine’ ...and an untamable spirit that would be different, that would not conform.”⁴⁶

Other students enthused over class diversity, displaying an aesthetic appreciation that nevertheless distanced them from their lower-class subjects. For instance, in 1929 De Paul senior Gertrude Yore attempted to capture the essence of the city in an essay celebrating Chicago’s stark contrasts of rich and poor, Gold Coast and ghetto. “Chicago is a great city, and no city is great that is not beautiful and squalid, rich and poverty-stricken...” she wrote. “...’Little Hell,’ ‘the Ghetto,’ the vague but horribly real Underworld, all have the terrors, the filth and the bravery that make part of the soul of the city.” To be sure, her essay briefly criticized the wealthy, portraying industrial leaders as “comfortably ensconced in palatial mansions... made possible by the misery back o-the yards and the slavery within them” and describing Chicago’s leading families as “society dictators.” Social criticism, however, was not Yore’s point: The city’s contrasts excited her. “Chicago!” she exclaimed, “[a] word that conjures up visions as startling, as varied, as colorful as any seen at the rub of Aladdin’s lamp.”⁴⁷ While Yore perceived an injustice in class differences, she viewed the problem from a distance that enabled her to speak of them with a sense of exhilaration. To her virtue resided in the middle class, the “happy mediums” who formed “the backbone of Chicago.” “There are baby faces in the

⁴⁶ Gladys Reynolds, “Our Neighbors,” *De Paul Quarterly* (Spring 1929) 37-41.

⁴⁷ Gertrude Yore, “Chicago,” *De Paul Quarterly* (Fall 1929) 187-190.

windows, toys strewn on minute yards, ‘dads’ swinging eagerly up the street, glad to be free of a crowded ‘L,’ and as quickly imprisoned by sturdy young arms, close-clasped about their knees.”⁴⁸

Overall, students were aware that in the city, where strangers of various employment and income levels literally rubbed elbows on buses and in movie theaters, self-presentation was an important factor in the construction of class identity. While urban anonymity made facts regarding a person’s family, profession, and financial status less accessible, a person’s clothing, manners, social skills, and choice of friends provided an immediate basis for categorization.

This could work to a student’s advantage. Drawing upon a vast popular literature of working-class social mobility, De Paul student fiction interpreted higher education as an opportunity to rise in status through cultivation of social connections and conformity to social norms.⁴⁹ For example, in 1929 senior Margaret Neville imagined a socialite mistaking a carpenter’s daughter—who also worked as a kindergarten teacher-- for a real-estate heiress. The young teacher, explained Neville, had attended an elite school, where she had formed a close friendship with the daughter of a prominent family. As a result of this advantageous connection, she procured an invitation to an upper-class dinner party, where she enamored the son of the mistaken socialite. “She’s a perfect lady,” he observed to his parents, who also considered her “very cultured.” Of course, upon the

⁴⁸ Gertrude Yore, “Chicago,” *De Paul Quarterly* (Fall 1929) 187-190, 188.

⁴⁹ See Nan Enstad, *Ladies of Labor, Girls of Adventure: Working Women, Popular Culture, and Labor Politics at the Turn of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999) 48-84; Michael Demming, *Mechanic Accents: Dime Novels and Working Class Culture in America* (London: Verso, 1987).

revelation of the young teacher's true background, his mother objected to the match—but her son professed that education and manners were more important factors than money or profession. “Her family is far more refined than those society birds that mind everybody's business but their own,” he argued. Neville's short story expressed the dream that higher education, in forming students' tastes and exposing them to a wider society, could raise even working students to the level of the social elite.⁵⁰

Similarly—but with an interesting twist on gender--De Paul senior Bernice Colins wrote of a college-educated secretary who assumed that her charming date was a college man and athlete. Appearances, however, had deceived her: He turned out to be a bell-hop at a hotel. In contrast to Neville's hero, who had argued that profession was irrelevant to class, Colin's heroine decided that her boyfriend's humble employment rendered him ineligible for marriage, or even for romantic daydreaming. “If only, she reflected... he had been a chauffeur or even a laborer—one read stories about them once in a while—but a bell-hop! Of all insignificant things to be!” Colins cynically observed. Nevertheless, for a brief period the young man's clothing and manners had enabled him to pass as the sort of educated, prosperous bachelor that would interest an ambitious young woman. If this story had a moral, it might be that one could not be certain of anyone's identity—not in these days, at least.⁵¹

Indeed, De Paulites' stories suggested that urban students feared as well as welcomed class fluidity. It made identity unstable, subject to factors of perception and context that students could not always control—factors that might as easily sink them as

⁵⁰ Margaret Neville, “An Investment at Rysmeer,” *De Paul Quarterly* (Summer 1929) 103-112.

⁵¹ Bernice Colins, “Call for Mr. Nelson,” *De Paul Quarterly* (Winter 1930) 258-262.

raise them in the eyes of others. Katherine Wilson's aptly-titled "Not Suited," for example, told of a wealthy, carefree college grad who on a sudden whim accompanied a poorer college friend on a job-hunting excursion from Chicago to St. Louis. The wealthy man's tuxedo looked out of place on the dirty train; it seemed even less appropriate when, after mistaking his stop, he found that he had left his friend, identification, money, and coat on the train, and indeed had nothing with him but a lady's fur coat. Lost and alone, he wandered the streets through a daylight snowstorm. While in Chicago on the previous night friends had accepted him as a member of the social elite, now, in a different context, the St. Louis police mistook him for either a thief or a lunatic.⁵² Accidents of location and dress determined how others categorized Wilson's protagonist; actual economic and social background, as represented by the lost pocket money and identification card, were less pertinent than the image that he happened to project.

Similarly, De Paul student Cornelius McQuigg envisioned an eccentric professor who, in order to gather material for work of fiction, left behind his money and identification and, dressed as a bum, presented himself at a Chicago Avenue homeless shelter in the hope of gaining acceptance among the lower class. He passed.⁵³ Even Neville's heroine could be the carpenter's daughter or the demure, mysterious debutante—and the bellhop could seem to be the "college man"--depending on the context in which others observed them. While education had the power to fit students' knowledge, characters, and manners to a higher socio-economic class, students had the responsibility of dressing the part and presenting themselves in the appropriate venues:

⁵² Katherine Wilson, "Not Suited," *De Paul Quarterly* (Spring 1929) 9-19.

⁵³ Cornelius McQuigg, "Professor Gets Material," *De Paul Quarterly* (Spring 1929) 29-35.

Class, after all, was a slippery quality, as dependent on others' perceptions as on one's inherent qualities.

The importance of image and perception in the social construction of class became a motivating factor for administrators and students eager to establish "campus life" at Loyola and, to a lesser degree, at De Paul. While promoting their school to potential students, many Loyolans and De Paulites were selling (or hoped to be selling) access to an elite society that invoked the rich-kid mystique of the older, increasingly secularized Eastern universities. Ideally, that society must appear to offer students a stable social context as "college men" and "coeds"—by virtue of enrollment, the equals of privileged youth at Harvard, Yale, and Dartmouth—while training the students for social acceptance among the established elite. As the *De Paul Quarterly* argued in 1929, "...[I]n order to be able to mingle with all classes of people in his later life, the student must get a taste of the world's affairs during his college days. And are not social activities a great part of the world's affairs?"⁵⁴

In attempts to build status and ensure a "taste of the world's affairs," extracurriculars involved an element of display and publicity that, hoped students, would associate their university with wealthy Eastern institutions, thereby attaching prestige to the "De Paul" and "Loyola" names and boosting the status of alumni. Prestige, students realized, depended in part on building the perception that a school provided entertainments equal to those represented in novels such as *This Side of Paradise* and *Stover at Yale*. "Harvard has its Junior Prom, Yale has its Junior Prom, Princeton has its Junior Prom, and these great traditional universities with their wealth of social

⁵⁴ "Blue Laws for Our Colleges," *De Paul Quarterly* (Summer 1929) 150.

experience, their massive student bodies and their unlimited resources endeavor each year to make this annual affair of theirs the most elaborate of all their social functions, but to compare the Junior Promenade of Loyola with those of the above universities, is merely putting the affair in its proper place,” boasted Loyola’s 1925 yearbook.⁵⁵ Even student publications demonstrated a school’s social importance. “Every large university that has a national reputation publishes a year book or annual,” argued *De Paulia* editors in 1924. “. . .An annual will help to make the fame of De Paul national and increase its prestige.”⁵⁶ Similarly, in 1927 *Loyola News* editors argued that “the position of Loyola as the second largest Catholic University in the country makes it imperative that it be represented by an outstanding paper.”⁵⁷

As exemplified by Notre Dame’s growing prominence, athletic victories also could place a school’s name in the local or national spotlight. Student editors at both De Paul and Loyola fretted that the Chicago press did not give adequate space to their successes, and often that it gave too much support to their rivals. For instance, in 1924 *De Paulia* editorials complained that Loyola’s National Interscholastic Basketball Tournament garnered so much media attention as to threaten De Paul’s position in the city. “The publicity given this event would make one think Loyola to be the nation’s leading Catholic college, at least from the athletic point of view,” wrote “E.C.H.K.” “That the public credits it as being the leader in Chicago cannot be denied. Oh yes, when they talk about Chicago their thoughts go to Loyola. De Paul has been forgotten... Just a

⁵⁵ *Loyolan* (1925) 219.

⁵⁶ “Support the Annual,” *De Paulia* (12 March 1924): 2.

⁵⁷ “The *Loyola News*,” *Loyolan* (1927) 262.

little patience,” he concluded. “[W]e shall soon be reduced to a par with the business colleges.”⁵⁸ While this dire prediction may seem humorous, it reflected a real concern for the influence of extracurriculars on a school’s reputation and fortunes—and through this, on the status of students and graduates.

More than publicity stunts, however, many extracurriculars also were exercises in the atmosphere, manners, social graces, and grooming that would identify students with the American elite. As at secular schools, formal promenades and dances offered Loyola and De Paul students the opportunity to rehearse the appearances of wealth and consequence. “Long Joe of De Paul U is going to the dance,” a student satirized in *De Paulia*’s humor column. “Long Joe of De Paul U is struggling with his cowlick. . . . Long Joe’s cursing is not confined to ‘heck,’ as he fits a fourteen collar to a number fifteen neck.”⁵⁹ Like “Long Joe,” many students might have been uncomfortable in dress clothes, requiring a few trial runs in order to achieve a respectable appearance. For the ambitious, style and social instinct could be serious matters, as mistakes in dress had the potential to push a play for prestige into the realm of humor. “We noticed a large number of the boys in Tux,” observed a *Loyola News* reporter concerning a fundraising dance at the Aragon ballroom. “As of yet we have not been able to determine whether they [only] wanted to make known the fact that they [the tuxedos] belonged to them before the Junior Prom....” However, if the tuxedo-wearers had hoped to boast of their socio-economic status, the strategy backfired: “We were standing next to a husky looking young fellow from the West Side; he was wedged into one of those contrivances too, and another of the

⁵⁸ E.C.H.K., editorial, *De Paulia* (9 April 1924): 2.

⁵⁹ “Spillway,” *De Paulia* (5 March 1924) 2.

stronger sex approached him and ordered a fruit lemonade.”⁶⁰ Not surprisingly, the *Loyola News* included many advertisements from local clothiers promising a “correct” look, or the latest in “collegiate style.”

Finally, extracurricular activities offered exercises in leadership to socially ambitious students, who—through connections, energy, talent, the right clothes, or sheer power of personality—became the recognized “big men” of the campus. According to Horowitz, many university students of the 1920s believed that prominence and popularity on campus were stronger determinants of post-graduation economic success than grades or work experience.⁶¹ In 1925 ambitious Loyola students formed an all-university Booster Club (later affiliated with the Blue Key national honor society) with exclusive membership standards intended to identify and honor student leaders for their extracurricular “service” to the university, a distinction that non-members resented at least as much as they coveted. While the Booster Club and Blue Key originally intended to promote Loyola activities as well as recognize leadership talent, by 1930 the *Loyola News* would upbraid Blue Key students for apparently regarding membership as an individual status symbol rather than a means of improving the school’s social life.⁶²

Certainly Loyola and De Paul had their “big” men and women. A glance through Loyola’s yearbooks shows that a handful of students occupied a disproportionate number of leadership positions during the 1920s. For instance, in 1924 senior Edward C. Krupka’s long list of activities and accomplishments included Senior Class treasurer,

⁶⁰ “Aragon Party is Historical Event; Reporter Reports,” *Loyola News* (11 April 1928) 2.

⁶¹ Horowitz, *Campus Life*, 114-116.

⁶² “Honor Societies,” *Loyola News* (21 May 1930) 2.

yearbook editor and advertising manager, assistant manager of football, debate team, drama club, and executive secretary of the *Pageant of Youth* production. Over the course of four years Senior Class vice president Bernard McDevitt, Jr., was also debate team president, drama club and glee club member, managing editor of the *Loyola Quarterly* literary magazine, printing chairman of the yearbook, and costume chairman of the *Pageant of Youth*; while Student Council president Philip H. Sheridan was managing editor of the yearbook, a member of glee club and Sodality, and on the *Pageant of Youth* Executive Committee. Student leaders were not exclusively literary, religious, or athletic in their accomplishments, as exemplified by a number of students who participated in sports as well as holding executive positions in student publications, religious organizations, dramatics and other endeavors. An athlete on the basketball and baseball teams, Gerald G. O'Neill was a glee club officer, Sodality member, and chairman of the *Pageant of Youth's* music committee; another athlete, Bernard F. Dee combined football, baseball, and basketball with the freshman, sophomore and junior class presidencies, the Student Council vice presidency, advertising management of the *Quarterly*, Monogram Club, and *Pageant of Youth* photography.⁶³

Nor did a pious reputation injure a student's leadership potential during the 1920s. At Loyola the Sodality—the Society of Jesus's lay religious organization—provided leadership opportunities for religious students who also enjoyed collecting honors and responsibilities. Indeed, even before the Sodality adopted a new, aggressive approach to campus culture in 1927 (chapter 3), a student's interest in religion might have increased his chances of appointment to other key positions at Loyola, including publications

⁶³ *Loyolan* (1924): 49-50, 52, 54.

editorship and the Sodality presidency and membership, which were controlled by the Jesuit faculty and administration. Sodality president Charles Gallagher, for example, was also yearbook editor, president of the drama club, secretary of the debate team, and winner of the coveted Nachten prize in debating. That his peers elected him to Student Council office also suggests that fellow students liked and respected him. Throughout the 1920s Loyola's student leaders were more likely than others to join the Jesuit order after graduation. When in 1926 five Loyola alumni entered the Society of Jesus's seminary in Florissant, MO, the *Loyola News* praised the novitiates—particularly Thomas Stamm, a former football player and Student Council president—for their popularity and prominence on campus. “It is a significant fact that the Loyola novitiates were all leaders here,” proclaimed the newspaper. “It reflects much credit to Loyola and great advantage to the Jesuit Order...”⁶⁴ Robert Harnett, who in 1923 played the role of “Ignorance” in Pageant of Youth, later became chairman of the Booster Club, president of Sodality and the all-city Catholic Action organization, and eventually a Jesuit priest.⁶⁵

In the late 1920s and early '30s social fraternities played an increasing role in this concentration of leadership, as the exclusive organizations of students and faculty sought to garner influence and status both by helping fellow “brothers” to leadership positions and pledging dynamic student leaders as they emerged. Published and unpublished commentary on fraternities suggests that at Loyola, as at other universities and colleges, independents viewed fraternities as analogous to political machines determined to capture the local positions of power. For example, when a Loyola student publicly alleged that

⁶⁴ “Five Former Loyola Men Join Jesuits,” *Loyola News* (29 September 1926) 2.

⁶⁵ *Loyolan* (1924) 45.

members of the Arts social fraternity Pi Alpha Lambda had conspired to monopolize the role of dance chairman (as well as embezzle from the dance fund), at least some students found the theory plausible: A letter to the *Loyola News* editors termed the situation the “neatest piece of political rottenness ever heard of at Loyola” and a “perfect bit of intrigue,” while calling Pi Alpha Lambda “nothing better than a political hall gang.”⁶⁶ In another instance, *Loyola News* editorials contended that a “caste system” in Loyola’s medical school favored members of the Phi Chi medical fraternity in Blue Key elections. This allegation—which created a row among Loyola administrators—was not without foundation: As *Loyola News* moderator D. Herbert Abel privately pointed out to president Robert M. Kelley, S.J., ten out of twelve medical student elected to Blue Key had been Phi Chi members.⁶⁷ In response to the perceived nepotism, medical school students voted in favor of Junior Class president Camillo E. Volini’s proposal to request that medical faculty appoint their Blue Key members, rather than allow Blue Key students to elect medical students to membership—a measure that at least one Phi Chi student adamantly opposed.⁶⁸ In 1934 even faculty members suspected that Pi Alpha Lambda’s domination of the Loyola yearbook staff involved discrimination against other

⁶⁶ “Investigate Soph Protest at Commerce,” *Loyola News* (24 March 1931) 1; “Student Comment: Prom Profit,” *Loyola News* (21 April 1931) 2.; “Student Comment: The Cotillion War,” *Loyola News* (31 March 1931) 3.

⁶⁷ “Have We a Caste System?,” *Loyola News* (21 April 1931) 2; D. Herbert Abel to Robert M. Kelley, S.J., (2 May 1931): 1, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 13, Folder 1, Loyola University Archives, Chicago IL; *Loyolan* (1930): 360.

⁶⁸ D. Herbert Abel to Robert M. Kelley, S.J., (2 May 1931): 2, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 13, Folder 1, Loyola University Archives, Chicago IL; Camillo E. Volini to L.D. Moorhead (n.d.), Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 13, Folder 1, Loyola University Archives, Chicago IL.

students and insisted that “the abuse be stopped.”⁶⁹ No wonder the 1931 yearbook commented that “[t]o the non-fraternity man the fraternity is a group organized usually for the political gain of its members” and concluded that “[a]t Loyola, as at most universities, the fraternity men are in the minority while at the same time they direct the greater part of campus activities.”⁷⁰

In spite of efforts to check fraternity nepotism, it is likely that administrative control could not completely restrict the power of fraternities which, after all, included faculty and administration members as advisors and sometimes alumni members. At Loyola, prior to 1930 two out of three Arts social fraternities identified closely with Catholic administrative goals and character. Initially local endeavors, both were founded at Loyola as explicitly Catholic alternatives to the national, secular Greek system. In 1924 four St. Ignatius graduates in consultation with Rev. Charles Meehan, S.J., conceived the idea of Alpha Delta Gamma, a local fraternity founded on Jesuit ideals and restricted only to students of Catholic institutions, possibly as an outgrowth of their informal cafeteria group of “Inigoes.” Likewise, in 1925 students worked with James Mertz, S.J. to found Pi Alpha Lambda, a social fraternity devoted to modeling a “Catholic philosophy of life.”⁷¹ At Loyola, where faculty and administration routinely appointed publications editors as well as the Sodality presidency, the advantage of fraternal association with a powerful faculty member must have been considerable. While James

⁶⁹ Publication Committee Minutes (24 September 1934), Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 13, Folder 1, Loyola University Archives, Chicago IL.

⁷⁰ *Loyolan* (1931) 356.

⁷¹ *Loyolan* (1925) 189; “Fraternities,” *Loyolan* (1926) 169; “Fraternities,” *Loyola News* (1 April 1925) : 2, 4; “Pi Alpha Lambda,” *Loyolan* (1929) 338; “A Brief Sketch of Each of the Social Frats,” *Loyola News* (December 9, 1942): 4.

Mertz, S.J.—who directed fundraising for the construction of the student chapel Madonna Della Strada--advised the Loyola fraternity Pi Alpha Lambda, its membership could boast of supplying the Student Council's first president; heading the Booster Club; and establishing both Loyola's chapter of the Blue Key honor society and the publications honor society of Beta Pi.⁷² By 1935 every graduating Pi Alpha Lambda senior's yearbook entry included Blue Key (society honoring extracurricular service) membership and publications experience on the *Loyola News*, the *Quarterly*, or the yearbook staff; more often than not, it also included Sodality membership, debating experience, and debating awards.⁷³ Coached by Mertz in public speaking, a small circle of Pi Alpha Lambda members supplied public fundraising lectures for the benefit of Mertz's chapel project under the auspices of the Della Strada Lecture Club and the Joan D'Arc Club. Since chapel fundraising required student support in way of donations, ticket purchases, and publicity, nepotism and the recruitment of popular students would have ensured that the student leadership backed Mertz's cause of chapel construction. Meanwhile, the fraternity's standards and accumulated successes assured each individual Pi Alpha Lambda brother of his secure social status, even as peer pressure drove him to continue his extracurricular work.

It is possible to exaggerate the influence of the traditional Greek system in Loyola society. Fraternities were young at Loyola's Rogers Park campus, the national fraternity Phi Mu Chi having been established at Loyola in 1923 and local fraternities Alpha Delta Gamma and Pi Alpha Lambda in 1924 and 1925 respectively. As founding members

⁷² *Loyolan* (1934): 271.

⁷³ *Loyolan* (1935): 31-38.

matured and new members pledged, Loyola's Greek population naturally increased; the addition of small ethnic social fraternities in the early 1930s also would have increased the Greek presence among Loyola students. Still, the 1935 yearbook shows that members of social fraternities comprised only one third of graduating seniors in Arts and Sciences, and less than half of "involved" students, whom I define as those who reported participation in two or more extracurricular activities. Among these "involveds," five or more extracurriculars were not an uncommon workload, even for an independent. Indeed, at the Arts campus independent students held office in clubs and Student Council, won debating prizes, and edited school publications--including the *Loyola News*—only slightly less often than fraternity members.⁷⁴

Nevertheless, the Greek system dominated Loyola's chapter of Blue Key, the honorary society that selected student leaders for special recognition. According to the 1935 yearbook, out of 21 "involved" independent seniors in the Arts and Sciences college, only three had been elected to Blue Key; by contrast, out of sixteen fraternity seniors, nine had been elected to membership.⁷⁵ While independent students on Loyola's Arts campus were active participants and even leaders in extracurricular activities, it seems that by the mid-1930s the Greek system controlled access to "big man" status as represented by the Blue Key symbol.

⁷⁴ *Loyolan* (1935) 31-38.

⁷⁵ *Loyolan* (1935) 31-38.

Building Community “Spirit”

Whether organized or independent, however, leaders needed followers. In order to build positive press and offer leadership opportunities (as well as good times), De Paul and Loyola had to mobilize financial resources and student initiative to support expensive sports programs, publications, dramatic productions, and elaborate dances. Students must purchase tickets to football games, plays, and dances in order to sustain these events; students must also staff the newspaper, the football team, the drama club, and so forth. To encourage all students to feel a stake in university society and a responsibility for its success, *De Paulia* (1923) and the *Loyola News* (1924) each claimed as their mission the uniting of their institutions’ far-flung campuses into a broader community consciousness termed the “Greater De Paul” and the “Greater Loyola.” The first newspapers purporting to represent the entire student body rather than a specific campus or segment, *De Paulia* and *Loyola News* staff regarded their publications as crucial to the creation of this larger consciousness. “Those who love De Paul have always wanted to see this institution a united De Paul,” editors declared in *De Paulia*’s inaugural issue. “The paper seems the most logical way of bringing about such a union.”⁷⁶ Similarly, the *Loyola News* described itself, along with the literary magazine and the football team, as a “point of contact” among the Arts, Dental, Medical, Law, and Commerce students.⁷⁷

Aware of both the benefit and cost of “campus life,” De Paul and Loyola newspaper staff campaigned to mobilize student support of extracurricular activities, presenting participation in “campus life” as a duty to Alma Mater. “...[I]t is only when

⁷⁶ “The New Staff,” *De Paulia* (28 November 1923) 2.

⁷⁷ “School Spirit,” *Loyola News* (1 April 1925) 2.

every student of De Paul will manifest the spirit of the true De Paulite, 'De Paul for All, All for De Paul,' that the goal of a greater De Paul will ever so much as come in sight," urged *De Paulia*.⁷⁸ Each student, argued the papers, bore the responsibility of maintaining and improving the social scene so as to increase their school's prestige and attract new students. For instance, in 1924 *De Paulia* editors argued that students had an important role in improving De Paul's reputation and enrollments—work "that our faculty cannot do," but that a "united student body" could accomplish. "The hearty student support of every activity will lend to De Paul activities a 'zip' and life that cannot help but call the attention of outsiders to them. In fact, there is no more powerful means within reach of the student body for building up their Alma Mater than the enthusiastic backing of all De Paul activities," urged the newspaper.⁷⁹ Furthermore, "[i]f we develop along social and athletic lines, we will have something more to attract the new student who is anxious to matriculate at a 'peppy' school," the newspaper explained. "It means a bigger and better De Paul."⁸⁰ Likewise, the *Loyola News* directly connected student activities with Loyola's future. "Associations and activities are magnets which are annually drawing thousands to swell the Alma Mater's rolls," asserted a 1925 editorial. "...[I]t is now the extra-curricular activities which need the utmost encouragement and the hearty support of everyone, if Loyola is ever to assume her rightful place in the collegiate world."⁸¹

⁷⁸ Editorial, *De Paulia* (9 April 1924): 2.

⁷⁹ Editorial, *De Paulia* (30 January 1924): 2.

⁸⁰ "The Novelty Frolic on Friday Evening," *De Paulia* (23 January 1924): 1.

⁸¹ "College, Plus or Minus," *Loyola News* (30 September 1925): 2.

At Loyola in particular public discourse connected institutional fame with school “spirit,” as *News* staff—who included at least two, and probably more, Booster Club members--placed the responsibility for gridiron victories on the shoulders of everyday students. “Show the boys that you are behind them, and they will never lose their fighting courage which has won them such a great name,” the newspaper promised in fall of 1926. “Loyola needs your support now. Give it now, and be thankful after Thanksgiving when the season’s record will show the results of your encouragement.” In case students were uncertain of how they could show support, the editorial offered concrete suggestions. “Get out and cheer harder than ever Saturday. Go to St. Louis [an away game] if you have to shine shoes to raise the money. Send the boys a telegram when they are on their other trips. Get out and watch practice and give them a little encouragement.” In urging students to visit a hospitalized athlete, the *News* invoked guilt: “He hurt himself fighting for *you*, show him you appreciate it.”⁸² Clearly sports victories and losses were thought to reflect upon the community as a whole.

This being the case, Loyola and De Paul students frequently disgraced their communities. Football fans showed an embarrassing lack of enthusiasm and collegiate etiquette, claimed newspaper editors. “At the home games, especially those which are played at Loyola’s field, many of the spectators have acquired the puerile habit of wandering over the field and otherwise disporting themselves between halves. That is a practice which a self-respecting high school would discourage,” complained the *News*. “. . . We are justly proud of our football team, let us show it by acting like university men should and give all our surplus energy to the task of supporting that real football team as

⁸² “Now Is the Time to Root!,” *Loyola News* (27 October 1926): 2

it should be supported.”⁸³ One De Paul student preferred following a Notre Dame game on the radio to attending his own institution’s home game. “In the course of our conversation he said, ‘De Paul is not my school, for somehow I just can’t feel that it is,’ “ reported *De Paulia*. “...‘I come here for my studies only,’ he said. Instead of being loyal to his Alma Mater this student displayed emotional interest in another school. De Paul meant nothing to him in more than a scholastic way.” Horror and censure could be the only appropriate reactions to such shameless disloyalty: “We gasped,” claimed the editors.⁸⁴ At both schools, newspapers lamented that their student bodies lacked that fundamental but ineffable essence: spirit. “...[W]e feel safe in saying that its [Loyola’s] school spirit is the worst of any school of its size,” grumbled the *News*.⁸⁵ *De Paulia* editors likewise were pessimistic. “Father Coupal put it in the simplest words: ‘There is no college spirit at De Paul.’ We print these words reluctantly, for we know that they will be read by persons not connected with our university and who might receive an unfavorable impression of us.”⁸⁶

In theory such failures in “spirit” hurt the university on at least two levels. Firstly, as one disgruntled student summarized in a letter to the editor, “It is due to my lack of cheering that the team loses courage and then the game.”⁸⁷ Having lost its games, the team would lose the season—and perhaps Loyola’s chance to rise, like Notre Dame,

⁸³ “Let’s Act Like Grownups,” *Loyola News* (29 September 1926): 2.

⁸⁴ “Analyzing the Causes for the Lack of School Spirit,” *De Paulia* (5 March 1927): 2.

⁸⁵ “School Spirit,” *Loyola News* (1 April 1925): 2.

⁸⁶ “Analyzing the Causes for the Lack of School Spirit,” *De Paulia* (5 March 1927): 2.

⁸⁷ “Student Comment: Slackers??,” *Loyola News* (29 April 1925): 2.

to the forefront of Catholic academia—all because undergraduates had prioritized their desire to sleep or study over their duty to support spectator sports. Secondly, De Paul and Loyola would be unable to attract Catholic students without the entertainment and prestige associated with a real “college life.” “The high school graduate’s motto in regard to a school is ‘Ask the man who goes there,’” observed the *Loyola News* in April 1926. However, “Almost anyone will concede that conditions here are far from perfect.”

⁸⁸ Earlier, in 1925, the newspaper noted that “The freshman at Loyola University comes to a sad awakening... and replies, when asked how he likes school, that ‘there is no college life here.’” ⁸⁹

Since negative word-of-mouth, however warranted, could stunt the school’s prestige, the school newspapers urged undergraduates to regard good publicity as an obligation to the Alma Mater. Their challenge was clear: “Within a few months. . . . hundreds of boys will graduate from Catholic high schools all over the city, state and nation. There is no reason why a very large percent of those graduates should not attend Loyola University next year.” Since presumably many undergraduates could point to a number of reasons for avoiding Loyola, the *News* tried to persuade students to recall the school’s attractions and, implicitly, to use a bit of peer pressure for the common good. “The fact remains that you personally believe that Loyola surpasses all the other universities in the vicinity in many respects. If you did not you would not come here,” it argued, appealing to egoism. “If Loyola is the best and most logical school for you the

⁸⁸ “Talk It Up,” *Loyola News* (14 April 1926): 2.

⁸⁹ “College Customs,” *Loyola News* (29 April 1925): 2.

same is probably true for most of your high school friends. Explain to them the reasons that led you here and the advantages you enjoy that cannot be obtained elsewhere.”⁹⁰

News editors argued that the institution of traditional collegiate social hierarchies would improve Loyola’s status and self-esteem. Loyola, they complained, had “no class customs, no moderate form of hazing, no class rivalry.” If developed, these characteristics would lead freshmen to view the school as an exclusive social group that demanded fealty and correct behavior as conditions of membership. “It is the old principle which teaches that any show to which no admission is charged is not worth seeing,” explained the editors. “What we ought to do next year is to lose no time in impressing upon the freshmen the fact that they are at SOME school, a school whose student body decrees how the uninitiated shall act and what they shall wear on the campus; what respect they shall show to the older members and just how they shall manifest this respect.” Upperclassmen, suggested the editors, should demonstrate that they perceive membership in the student community to be an earned privilege rather than a democratic right. “If we don’t appreciate our school, we cannot expect the new men to regard it with any measure of devotion. We must determine to show them how highly we think of it, and we can do this easily by demanding a quasi-submission of the freshmen.” This “quasi-submission,” explained the editors, could involve the wearing of distinctive freshmen caps and segregating the freshmen class at football games.⁹¹

⁹⁰ “Talk It Up,” *Loyola News* (14 April 1926) 2.

⁹¹ “College Customs,” *Loyola News* (29 April 1925) 2.

Creating and enforcing class traditions, however, demanded the co-operation of more than the Booster Club. Reflecting secular collegiate rhetoric, in 1925 Loyola student leaders—some of whom would still remember the 1923 *Pageant of Youth*—began to discuss the non-participants or “slackers,” as they were sometimes termed, as immoral in their reluctance to sacrifice study, sleep, or outside interests for the good of the University community. “The [Loyola] students are either too selfish or too lazy to support any of the many activities,” the *Loyola News* complained in 1925. “...If most of the students are asked to give their time to some school enterprise they want to know what they get out of it. They can see no reason why they should give their time and energy for the benefit of the University. Asking them to attend games and back up the team is a waste of time.”⁹²

After the 1926 Eucharistic Congress a few *News* articles and editorials on the subject of “school spirit” even took on a slightly theological tone that implied connections between the university community and the spiritual unity of Christians. When in November 1926 Episcopalian John R. Mott of the International Y.M.C.A. spoke to Loyola’s Arts and Sciences college on the subject of “the universal student body and its probable influence upon the world in future years,” the *Loyola News* took the opportunity to chastise the campus slackers for prioritizing individual success over the good of society. “Dr. Mott gave us a picture of a great world-wide student body, eager and ready to attack the problems of today,” wrote the editor. “Here [at Loyola] we have a body of students eager to fulfill their personal ambitions.” In standing apart from this spiritual union, slackers neglected their obligations to improve the world, implicitly

⁹² “School Spirit,” *Loyola News* (1 April 1925), 2.

through the exercise of Christian values. “Students here do not think or act in terms of social welfare. Their first concern is their own advantage, their first question is always ‘cui bono.’ The same evil lies at the root of most of our troubles here.”⁹³ Contrast this, the editor urged, with the Thomist ideal of “a group ready to make any sacrifice for the common good, anxious to improve the world in which they live.” Loyola students were not such an ideal group. “It is hard to develop school spirit when the students ask ‘what’s in it for me?’ he concluded. “It’s hard to maintain activities when the majority think of themselves first and Loyola second.”⁹⁴ By adopting “individualism” in their approach both to world problems and to campus life, the editorial implied, students ignored the common welfare and so failed to live according to Catholic morality.

Such criticisms fell heavily on Loyola’s law, medical, and commerce students—particularly those who attended evening classes due to daytime employment. While Arts and Sciences students reportedly spent approximately three hours per week on school-sponsored extracurricular activities, the professional students—between work, class attendance, study, commuting, and family obligations--could contribute only one hour or less.⁹⁵ As a result, in spite of all-university extracurricular opportunities, “it is almost impossible to arouse the members of the Dental, Medical, Commerce, or Law departments so that they will take an interest in them,” the *Loyola News* grumbled in 1925.⁹⁶ Unfortunately the Arts students deemed professional participation necessary to

⁹³ “A Question of Attitude,” *Loyola News* (3 November 1926) 2.

⁹⁴ “A Question of Attitude,” *Loyola News* (3 November 1926) 2.

⁹⁵ “Final Student Survey Results Interesting,” *Loyola News* (29 April 1925) 1, 4.

⁹⁶ “School Spirit,” *Loyola News* (1 April 1925): 2.

support a competitive style and scale of college life. “So far the Arts and Sciences Department has borne the brunt of the task in supporting these [all-University] dances,” complained one 1926 editorial. “It is argued that they should, as their department is the home of the social spirit. But the enrolment [sic] of the college is far too small. . . . Hence they must have the support of the professional schools if Loyola is to be properly represented in the social world.”⁹⁷ At De Paul, too, professional students were sometimes singled out as unsupportive of university functions. “WHY is there so little real school-spirit amongst the Law and Commerce students?,” grumbled *De Paulia*. “Quite a few of them are found on the various Varsity teams, yet the support they give our cheer leaders is negligible.”⁹⁸ In 1929 the *De Paul Quarterly* even reflected on the moral consequences of professional isolation from social hierarchy. “The responsibilities of a student’s life, his necessary subjection to lawful superiors, his intercourse with his fellow students—these things are the builders of his moral fibre.,” the editorial mused. “A university student cannot live as a hermit.”⁹⁹

At Loyola in 1925 and 1926, however, moral condemnation of individualistic “slackers” ignited protest from professional students and, more broadly, from students who were not admitted to the elite Booster Club. Many refused to accept the moral reproaches heaped upon them by their leaders. For instance, rejecting the premise that “a student should prefer the welfare of the University to his own personal welfare,” a professional student argued that “[a] man enters a professional school for just one end,

⁹⁷ “The Last One—Make It Big,” *Loyola News* (14 April 1926): 2.

⁹⁸ “Voice of the Students,” *De Paulia* (5 March 1924): 2.

⁹⁹ Editorial, *De Paul Quarterly* (Spring 1929): 58.

the attainment of the requisite knowledge and training in that profession which he plans to embrace. And if any extra curricular activity threatens the diligent and adequate pursuance of his studies, the professional man never hesitates to refuse such activity, because his first duty is to himself. . . . ”¹⁰⁰

Similarly, “I will cite myself as an average ‘slacker,’” admitted one student in a letter to the editor. “I do not go to football games; I do not go to basketball games. I do not go to any social affairs which may be held under the auspices of the school. If the amount of school spirit which I have in me is figured on how many games and dances which I have gone to, then I am a minus quantity and as such should be cut adrift. It is due to my lack of cheering that the team loses courage and then the game.” However, the student suggested that the expectation of an stylish campus life at Loyola was unrealistic considering slackers’ very real financial limitations. “Fortunately or unfortunately, Loyola’s students are not heirs...,” he argued. “Most of us have to work for our expenses in school, and we have no time for football, or afternoon teas. Once we stop work outside, we, out of necessity, must stop school. You, who accuse us of being slackers, fail to realize what this five or ten dollars a week means to us.”¹⁰¹

Other “slackers” expressed frustration with the Booster Club’s elitist and hegemonic tendencies. “School spirit like patriotism is something that every student cherishes and to accuse him of being a slacker in it is to cut him deep,” complained one. “This you have done by holding yourselves as ‘Boosters’ and leaving the impression that everyone not a member of your organization is a slacker and by asking him to come to

¹⁰⁰ “Student Comment”, *Loyola News* (6 January 1926) 2.

¹⁰¹ “Student Comment: Slackers??,” *Loyola News* (29 April 1925) 2.

you and prove himself a 'Booster' and innocent of the charge... A "real booster club," claimed this student, would "be open to every member of the Loyola community."¹⁰²

The Booster Club used the *Loyola News* to respond to these criticisms, arguing that the "limitations on membership are not founded on any desire to set up a self appointed aristocracy, but are based on expediency and a sense of justice." Club members, declared the Boosters, were not attempting to exclude students of limited means, but only to provide Loyola teams with a solid fan base. "Indeed, if a working student indicated his willingness to do all he can for Loyola, he may feel assured that his work will not remain unnoticed or unrewarded."¹⁰³ Yet, a week later, the *Loyola News*, ever sympathetic to Booster Club objectives, could not refrain from implying that students absent from football games were failing in their obligations and placing undue stress on more dutiful Loyolans. On the previous weekend 300 Booster Club members had "yelled throughout the exciting game" between Loyola and Marquette. Before the game, they reportedly paraded throughout Rogers Park in a "snake dance" behind an "effigy of Marquette," blocking traffic along their route; and afterward they "stood up and gave a husky cheer for the team that gave Marquette the biggest scare of their football lives." In spite of its praise for this rousing "display of spirit," however, the *News* could not help but add that "these three hundred [students] as they were made up for three thousand" of the Loyola student body.¹⁰⁴ Neither the slackers' self-defense nor

¹⁰² "Student Comment: Booster or Slacker?," *Loyola News* (13 May 1925): 2.

¹⁰³ "The Booster Club: What and Why It Is," *Loyola News* (23 September 1925): 3.

¹⁰⁴ "Chicago Boosters Cheer in one Section," *Loyola News* (30 September 1925): 3; "Big Pep Meeting Held on Campus Friday Night," *Loyola News* (30 September 1925): 3.

the Booster Club's willingness to compensate, implied the paper, excused Loyola students' general lack of enthusiasm for the football team.

In Fall 1925 Booster Club attempts at solidifying a collegiate social hierarchy of upper and lowerclassmen also fell somewhat flat due to widespread disinterest—or, perhaps, widespread resistance to the “rah-rah boys,” as one student termed them.¹⁰⁵ Boosters, in an effort to impress incoming freshmen with the importance of “spirited” behavior, organized a September orientation program known as “Hello Week,” which included “an encouraging talk” by Arts dean Joseph Reiner, S.J., as well as a speech by football coach Roger Kiley that sought to persuade students of “the necessity of student support of this years’ football team, and promised a winner if that support was forthcoming.” Badges and buttons were distributed by Booster Club members. Pep rallies and a “Monster Mass Meeting” rounded out the week.¹⁰⁶

Student response, though, was underwhelming. “As one of the upper classmen I was greatly disappointed by the conduct of most of the students during Hello Week,” declared a “Sophomore” in a letter to the *Loyola News*. “It is my belief that the failure... of this innovation was due to the lack of spirit showed by the upper classmen.” Most sophomores, juniors, and seniors, noted this student, did not make an effort to speak with the freshmen, or to see that the freshmen wore their new, distinguishing badges; and “freshmen, with the example of their elders before them, did what might have been expected and refused to play.” Discouragingly, “the only conclusion that can be drawn,”

¹⁰⁵ “Student Comment: Booster or Slacker?,” *Loyola News* (13 May 1925) 2.

¹⁰⁶ “Initial ‘Hello Week’ Closes Friday Night at Campus Pep-Meeting,” *Loyola News* (23 September 1925) 1.

mused the author, “is that unless there is a great reform the efforts of the Boosters to develop a real school spirit here will fail.”¹⁰⁷

According to Horowitz, during this period a few secular institutions—notably the University of Oregon and University of Kansas—sought to force student conformity through the formation of vigilante committees which hazed fellow students who failed to participate in university traditions or rituals. Likewise, in the aftermath of September’s ‘Hello Week’ disappointment, Loyola’s Booster Club appointed a “Vigilance Committee” of four upper-classmen “as a means of enforcing the programs of the Booster Club among the students of the Arts and Science Department.” Committee member Frank Naphin (incidentally, also a member of the *Loyola News* staff) explained that “The Freshmen are not obeying the ‘Hello Week’ regulation because no duly authorized body of upper classmen are seeing to it that they do obey. If the Freshmen realize that an official body will devote their efforts to the enforcement of such rules, they will not hesitate to comply. The Vigilance Committee will do great work throughout the year.”¹⁰⁸ If its tactics resembled those of non-Catholic vigilantes, accused slackers might find themselves tried in a student “court,” paddled, or dunked in Lake Michigan.¹⁰⁹ Whatever its effect on enforcement, the Committee apparently did not inspire fear in future students: In the following Fall 1926 semester, the incoming freshmen class daringly voted to abolish the requirement of wearing their distinctive green caps.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷ “Student Comment,” *Loyola News* (30 September 1925) 2.

¹⁰⁸ “Vigilance Committee Appointed for Booster Club,” *Loyola News* (30 September 1925) 3.

¹⁰⁹ Horowitz, *Campus Life*, 132.

¹¹⁰ “Freshman Class Abolishes Caps,” *Loyola News* (24 November 1926) 1.

Perhaps to parody the “school spirit” extremism of the Booster Club—or perhaps in complete seriousness—in Fall 1926 an anonymous senior member of the Boosters (now Blue Key) wrote to the *Loyola News*, accusing Loyola faculty of failing to support the community by attending student events. “Where are the profs when we are making a public demonstration? Why do they not attend our games, our plays, our debates, our pep meetings, our dances and our student gatherings?” he questioned. “I write you, Mr. Editor, not flippantly. I write you for but one reason and it is this: To offer my humble suggestion to the teaching staff that they try, at whatever personal sacrifice, to attend our various enterprises....” To justify this veiled demand, he referred to the Jesuit principle of educating the whole person—and to the community concepts that the Jesuits had sought to instill among Loyola students and Chicago’s Catholic collegians in general: “I ask this because the whole system of our education, whether it be in class or out, has the same ideal and is inseparably one.”¹¹¹ Loyola student leaders had grasped the concept of a unified, hierarchical community, and were zealous—even over-zealous--in applying it.

While at De Paul, too, students complained that “this long-standing crusade for college and school spirit has become such an obsession that it has entered the category of fanaticism,” overall the *De Paulia* voiced a more open and critical approach to “spirit” than the *Loyola News* staff.¹¹² Dissenting opinions—which the *Loyola News* printed as letters to the editor—regularly found their way onto *De Paulia*’s editorial page. For example, in January 1924 a lead editorial by “L.P.J.” questioned De Paul promoters’

¹¹¹ Student Comment, *Loyola News* (27 October 1926) 2.

¹¹² “The Bigoted School ‘Spiritualist,’” *De Paulia* (30 January 1924) 2

preoccupation with structured activities to the neglect and even discouragement of informal social gatherings. “If certain young men find pleasure in smoking and enjoying sociability in certain sections of the campus, they are frowned upon,” L.P.J. explained. “If the young ladies prefer to dance in the corridors at noon rather than patronize the cafeteria, they become the subject of much deep condemnation by the [school-spirit] bigots. If certain lockers become the nuclei of small aggregations, the bigots burst forth with vituperation.” While organized extracurriculars were important, “they are not everything,” insisted the author: “Let’s broaden our views on school spirit” to include appreciation of the small ways in which De Paul students build community on a daily basis. The editorial implied that, far from dividing the student body or detracting from organized activities, informal social groups made important contributions to the school community.¹¹³

Offering yet another perspective, an anonymous May 1924 editorial complained that De Paul students preferred entertainment to more serious extracurriculars that in theory formed the mind and inspired co-operation. “Those who say that a college is noted for its social calendar may be correct, but is a college considered seriously by those who really want an education because of its social calendar alone?” inquired the author. He or she argued that more organized, goal-oriented activities fostered a more sincere, self-sacrificial community spirit than did dances and fraternity smokers. “There is no greater feeling of comradeship than that which comes from working alongside of others to accomplish a definite purpose,” claimed the author. “In the great task of putting over the desired effect we drop our formal manner and leave our real nature exposed, thus

¹¹³ “The Bigoted School ‘Spiritualist,’” *De Paulia* (30 January 1924) 2.

offering our fellow workers the firm foundation of friendship—our own self. We sympathize, criticize, and scold each other as real humans, dropping the veneer of the ballroom; we grow to really know each other.”¹¹⁴

De Paulia also urged students to consider the natural differences between an urban commuter campus and the ivy-covered, residential campuses that American culture idealized. Commuting, suggested editors, “lies at the bottom of the whole trouble. The native Chicagoan, with his prep school associations and connections, his local clubs and the like.... makes school his studying place and the town remains the hub of his other activities.” By contrast, mused the editor, students who moved away from the city to live on a suburban or rural campus had to invest in the school community, which formed their sole source of entertainment and social support. “It is at the school that they meet and live, and there they learn to love it because it means more to them than a place to learn things; it means the place where their social life has its beginning and its motivation.”¹¹⁵

Overall the *Loyola News* editors were far more aggressive than *De Paulia* staff in their promotion of student activities and, often, in their criticism of the so-called “slackers” who failed to show university “spirit.” In part this difference reflected De Paul and Loyola authorities’ differing approaches to the role of faculty in determining the authorship and content of student publications. Throughout the 1920s both *De Paulia* and the *Loyola News* represented a fairly informal student-faculty co-operation, in which student editors developed content in consultation with an appointed faculty “moderator,” who also approved an issue’s final layout before sending it to press. There, however, the

¹¹⁴ “Founding School Spirit on Social Activity,” *De Paulia* (21 May 1924) 2.

¹¹⁵ “Analyzing the Causes for the Lack of School Spirit,” *De Paulia* (5 March 1927) 2.

similarities ended. Loyola's administration exercised the right to appoint and fire the *Loyola News*' editorial board, which remained stable throughout each school term and sometimes across a period of years. Indeed, the *News*' five founders maintained a deadlock on editorial positions from 1924 until 1927, when the movement of three to Loyola's professional schools ended their dominance but not their presence on the newspaper staff.¹¹⁶ By contrast, De Paul students elected their editorial staff at the founding of *De Paulia*, which, while nominally retaining editorial staff throughout the school term, incorporated a more casual system of rotating editorship that offered various student groups—for example, freshmen and coeds—the opportunity to produce issues at various points in the term.

Loyola's fixed newspaper staff and centralized authority favored the creation of a coherent newspaper agenda that correlated with the administration's concerns. Well-timed editorials concerning, for example, the importance of participation in the 1926 Eucharistic Congress, suggested that faculty moderators, mediating between the newspaper staff and Loyola's administration, played a large role in shaping *News* content. At De Paul a changing editorial board permitted the expression of more varying opinions on the subject of school spirit, and indeed took a more tolerant and playful approach to the subject. The balance of men and women among *De Paulia* editors likely helped to diffuse peer pressure, which can be particularly intense within gender groups. In addition, a significant presence of professional students and potentially Jewish last names

¹¹⁶ *Loyolan* (1927), 260-262.

on *De Paulia*'s staff roster ensured that the conformist "campus life" tradition was not the only perspective represented.¹¹⁷

Indeed, as sociologist Charles S. Suchar suggests, alumni memories of De Paul campus life centered less on organized activities and entertainments than on the more casual sociabilities defended by L.P.J.. The institution's commuters character and limited meeting space pushed social life to the surrounding diners, bars, and ice cream parlors—spaces which sociologist Suchar classifies as "the extended campus." In Lincoln Park, this extended campus consisted of a strip along Webster Avenue; downtown, it focused on Pixley and Ehler's Restaurant, which rented facilities in De Paul's 64 E. Lake Street facility and functioned as the Loop campus's unofficial cafeteria.¹¹⁸ Host to lunchtime or between-class gatherings, "Pixley's" became such a tradition that, according to alumni, even students who lacked the pocket money for a restaurant meal nevertheless sat down for a Coke or coffee before returning home to eat, or else supplemented menu items with sandwiches brought from home. At Lincoln Park, the wall surrounding the athletic field became a celebrated place to walk with one's date: The 1932 yearbook described it as a "practice course" for the "formal promenade."¹¹⁹ Shared lockers, crowded corridors, and the CTA also brought students together in shared experiences which, as Suchar suggests, built an informal community consciousness.

¹¹⁷ *De Paulian* (1927) 94.

¹¹⁸ Charles S. Suchar, "The Little University Under the El," in *De Paul University: Centennial Essays and Images* (Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing) 149.

¹¹⁹ John L. Rury, "Student Life and Campus Culture at De Paul," in *De Paul University: Centennial Essays and Images*, 190.

While Loyola students also had such casual moments and points of contact, Loyola newspaper accounts suggested a greater interest in structuring and policing them so as to assure community “spirit.” After neighboring Mundelein College opened in Fall 1930, for instance, a letter to the *Loyola News* playfully requested that Mundelein sororities keep female students out of certain Rogers Park diners that the men of Loyola’s Arts and Sciences college—apparently interpreting the presence of females as a threat to their male collegiality—wished to maintain as exclusively Loyola territory.¹²⁰ Several times students used the *News* to suggest that commuting Loyola students always ride in their CTA train’s final car, thereby transforming chance social encounters into a deliberate stakeout of social space. “Fellow students who seldom meet on the campus can recognize each other as such, by the common push toward the last car...” an editor argued in 1933, relating the practice to community cohesion. “This tradition if followed will strengthen student fellowship and promote good feeling and help in continuing one of the few traditions which have survived at Loyola.”¹²¹ Also, in the 1930s a regular *Loyola News* gossip column, entitled “Beachcombing on the Beach,” attempted to elevate student nightlife at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in Rogers Park to the level of a collegiate social institution. Although Loyolans, like De Paul students, also socialized in unorganized ways, their aggressive student campaigns for “spirit” and status seemed to constantly encourage students to impose some visible form of organization upon their social interactions.

¹²⁰ “Student Comment,” *Loyola News* (7 October 1930): 2.

¹²¹ “Last Car,” *Loyola News* (17 December 1933): 4.

The Boundaries of Student Initiative

Throughout the 1920s Loyola administrators and faculty at least tacitly supported the newspaper “spirit” campaigns that urged students to merge their personal ambitions with ambitions for the school and, through it, for the Church. Father James Mertz’s chapel enterprise, for example, regularly used the *Loyola News* as a mouthpiece to appeal to Catholic students’ desire for recognition and respect on the basis of Catholic identity. “Loyola is a big university and a Catholic university,” Mertz himself argued in a 1924 *Loyola News* guest editorial. “... It must be big in its ideals, it must live true to its big ideals. These big ideals are Catholic ideals. These big ideals must be fostered and receive their direction from the Center of all Catholic activities—the Christ in the Blessed Sacrament.” A chapel building to house the Sacrament, suggested Mertz, would publicly symbolize Loyola’s prioritizing of Catholicism, thereby contributing to the university’s perceived distinctiveness and importance. “While we have buildings for science, for sports, for studies, and for research work,” he explained, “we have no buildings which we can call Our Lord’s exclusively.” Implicit in this argument was the fear that, as Loyola expanded and improved in secular areas, students and outsiders would fail to credit Catholic culture with the “big” achievement, instead attributing it to conformity with American collegiate standards.¹²²

Furthermore, implicitly addressing the charge that “Catholic university” was an oxymoronic phrase, Mertz argued that a Catholic chapel would promote rather than detract from Loyola’s educational enterprise. “Students must feel that there is one building where they can learn the biggest and most lasting lessons of life,” argued Mertz,

¹²² “Della Strada Chapel Drive Explained by Father Mertz,” *Loyola News* (15 December 1924) 1-2.

“where they can get their visions of the future and the strength to carry out what they propose during the quieter and more solemn studies before Christ and the Blessed Sacrament.” Justifying the perceived need for a chapel through reference to Classical learning, the editor declared that the chapel drive had been launched “[t]o give the student body the best opportunities to study their own hearts, to know themselves, which the Greeks of old spoke of as the most important of all sciences...” Mertz’s editorial, then, based Loyola’s need for a chapel in both Catholic and Classical values: Indeed, the Catholic chapel would represent the “most important” aspect of ancient educational tradition, demonstrating that—far from detracting from Loyola’s educational mission—Catholicism made Loyola more authentically collegiate than its secular counterparts.¹²³

As usual, to promote the status of their Church and alma mater, students were pressured to take part in a high-class extracurricular activity—in this case, a fundraising dance at the Aragon hotel. All having been arranged, “[t]he burden now rests with the students,” declared the *News*’ student editor. “The chapel is needed and this dance will get it, if it is properly backed.”¹²⁴ The event’s publicity further appealed to students’ class ambitions, promoting the dance as a rare opportunity to gain access to superior company, music, and venues. “As to the crowd, everybody in the city who belongs to the effete will sooner or later end up that evening at the Aragon,” stated the editors. “As for orchestra, the best is none too good. . . . The boys from the South Town club play real hotsy music and it’s your one chance in a lifetime to hear them, unless you belong to the exclusive club.” Moreover, “the Aragon ballroom is the most spacious and beautifully

¹²³ “Della Strada Chapel Drive Explained by Father Mertz,” *Loyola News* (15 December 1924) 1-2.

¹²⁴ “Chapel Patron Drive Growing as Dance Nears,” *Loyola News* (6 April 1927) 1, 3.

decorated dance palace in town. It has the atmosphere of an exclusive hotel and the fitting of a mansion. It is the ideal place for the affair.”¹²⁵ Support of the dance, then, was linked to exclusive access to the most stylish people, music, and spaces, appealing to Catholic students’ quest for status as well as their devotion to *alma mater*. After the event, the *News* reported that the chapel dance had “enormously increased” Loyola’s “fame in social circles,” and asserted with satisfaction that the entertainment had clearly been “the best in the land.”¹²⁶

However, as the decade drew to a close conflicts began to erupt between student initiative and administrative interests, leading the Jesuits to gradually assume greater control over the shaping the institution’s public image, including elements of its campus life. In the late 1920s the *Loyola News* gained a new international audience that worried university administrators. In 1927 Rafael Cardinal Merry del Val warned the Jesuit Father General Wladimir Ledochowski, S.J. that, in speaking with the Vatican, some unknown but influential source had described American Jesuit universities as lacking in Catholic religious character. Alarmed by this information, Ledochowski immediately initiated studies and, finally, an academic and cultural overhaul of Jesuit education that extended even to the level of student newspapers.¹²⁷ By 1937—and very possibly as

¹²⁵ “Chapel Patron Drive Growing as Dance Nears,” *Loyola News* (6 April 1927) 1, 3.

¹²⁶ “Aragon Attracts Large Crowds to Chapel Benefit,” *Loyola News* (20 April 1927) 1.

¹²⁷ William P. Leahy, S.J., *Adapting to America: Catholics, Jesuits, and Higher Education in the Twentieth Century*, (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1991), 45-49, 60.

early as 1934—Ledochowski required Loyola University to send two copies of every student publication to his office in Rome.¹²⁸

Under these conditions Loyola administrators could not trust student writers to work unsupervised. From their inception all Loyola student publications, including the *News*, had some sort of censorship arrangement to prevent the printing of articles that might hurt the University's reputation. Initially the censorship authority rested in a publication's "moderator," a faculty member who was assigned to check students' layout and writing before it went to press and to serve as the students' main point of contact with the administration. In sum, his job was to achieve "an effective compromise between student initiative and the welfare of the University," an official description that in itself suggested the conflicts involved.¹²⁹

Conflicts there were. As student campaigns to inspire, police, and reform Loyola's public image gathered strength, they occasionally threatened the smooth functioning of the Chicago Archdiocese's institutional hierarchies. For example, in 1931 the *Loyola News* published a letter from an anonymous Providence High School student who criticized the Loyola debate team's lack of skill and preparation as detracting from the university's image. The letter's disparagement of Loyola's extracurriculum prompted the prefect of Providence High, a Sister Mary Geraldine, to apologize to Loyola president Robert M. Kelley, expressing her determination to trace the author of the offending letter

¹²⁸ Daniel O'Connell, S.J. to Wilson, c. 1936, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 44, Folder 11, Loyola University Archives.

¹²⁹ Minutes, Committee on Student Publications, 12 October 1937, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 40, Folder 3, Loyola University Archives (Chicago, IL).

in order to “guard ourselves against any further annoyance from him or her.”¹³⁰ From the prefect’s perspective, maintaining an amicable relationship with other Catholic schools took priority over a student’s initiative in voicing an opinion that, if taken seriously, might even have a constructive effect.

In this incident apologies were expected, however, from more than Sister Mary Geraldine. Apparently called to account for the decision to publish the damaging Providence letter in the first place, *Loyola News* moderator Dr. D Herbert Abel defended himself and his editorial staff in a memo to Kelley. According to Abel, the newspaper’s managing editor personally knew the author of the Providence letter, who had assured the *Loyola News* that the expressed opinions represented a general consensus of the Providence student body. Furthermore, Abel refused to disclose the name of the author to Kelley, invoking journalistic standards. In the same spirit, Abel offered to publish Sister Mary Geraldine’s letter as a means of balancing the newspaper’s perspective on this issue.¹³¹

To Kelley, however, this was not an issue of truth or balance or journalistic professionalism. Rather, it was about creating and maintaining a united front among Chicago’s Catholic educational institutions, all of which had a stake in conveying positive images of Catholic student life. To control damages from this particular incident, he insisted that all parties consider the matter closed. To Sister Mary Geraldine herself Kelley offered assurances that, in his view, it was “very obvious” that the

¹³⁰ Letter to the editor, *Loyola News* (24 February 1931): 2; Sister Mary Geraldine to Robert M. Kelley, S.J., 14 March 1931, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 13, Folder 1.

¹³¹ D. Herbert Abel to Robert M. Kelley, S.J., 16 March 1931, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 13, Folder 1.

offending letter did not represent the opinion of the Providence High School student body—an assurance that flatly contradicted Abel’s opinion. Indeed, Kelley seemed to find it both diplomatic and convenient to transfer all blame to Abel, whom he pointedly described as a “lay teacher” who would naturally be less sensitive to delicate issues of institutional relationships and religious reputation. In future, Kelley assured the prefect, Abel would be “more cautious” in publishing letters that reflected poorly upon the University.¹³²

On this surface this teapot tempest concerned only a debating team. Still, the Providence and Loyola administrations’ swift, intense, and seemingly disproportionate reaction to this apparently small matter demonstrated the vigilant seriousness with which they regarded the image and interrelationships of the Catholic educational network. Innocent as it seemed, the Providence letter had threatened Loyola’s relationship with another Catholic institution and, through it, the sustained image of a unified Catholic community that the Eucharistic Congress had helped to promote. By questioning the quality of Loyola’s student activities, the letter also detracted from Alma Mater’s glory—thereby disrupting the reciprocal relationship between student and administration that *Pageant of Youth* idealized. The dispute’s resolution sought to heal these divisions and restore the disrupted hierarchies: Father Kelley’s acceptance of Sister Geraldine’s apology emphasized their unity of opinion in opposition to a subordinate layman, whom they admonished to keep better control of the still more subordinate students.

¹³² Robert M. Kelley, S.J. to Sister Mary Geraldine, 20 March 1931, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 13, Folder 1.

Only two months later the *Loyola News* also demonstrated an ability to endanger far more important financial relationships involving the Archdiocese. Citing its mission of improving the quality of the university community, the newspaper ignited a much larger “campus life” controversy by insinuating that the university’s Blue Key honorary society drew its medical-school members disproportionately from the Phi Chi medical fraternity. Not only did the accusation result in many letters of refutation and protest from students, but it also angered the Medical School Regent, Rev. Thomas H. Ahearn, S.J., who apparently blamed the Arts administrators for the incident. Since Ahearn had been appointed to his position by Archbishop Mundelein, who held the medical school’s purse-strings, the political situation was delicate.¹³³

Damage control demanded some degree of groveling. In a letter of apology, most likely prompted by Father Kelley, Abel expressed to Ahearn a sense of limited responsibility for the slip in censorship. “Earlier in the year I had asked Father Kelley to appoint someone of the Fathers with whom I could consult on doubtful questions,” explained Abel. “He conceded and appointed Father LeMay. Unfortunately for this present instance, however, Father LeMay was out of the city. . . . Accordingly it rested with me to publish or not to publish.” Ultimately Abel had decided to go ahead with the editorial, because he felt that the criticism of the Blue Key society would lead to the improvement of Loyola’s campus life and, through it, to the improvement of Loyola’s reputation. “If our zeal in publishing was mistaken the mistake was prompted by a good motive, the elimination of cliques and the advancement of solidarity,” he assured Father Ahearn. “We have tried to keep the *Loyola News* a militant campaigner for betterment in

¹³³ Goodchild, “The Mission of the Catholic University in the Midwest,” 399.

every department of the university, and our desire is to assist in unifying the school into one vast body.”¹³⁴

Father Ahearn never responded to Abel’s double-edged apology, and rumor had it that he announced his intention of never reading or even opening the letter. “Courtesy would seem to acknowledge at least the acknowledgement of its reception,” Abel complained to Father Kelley. “It seems almost as if there were a closed conspiracy against the *Loyola News* because that paper was maintaining its right to express the student opinion.”¹³⁵ Rather, in exposing divisions within the student body and questioning administrative leadership, the paper was disrupting the images of unity and hierarchy that both editor and moderator had intended to build and re-inforce.

Nevertheless, in the semester’s remaining weeks Abel did impose a stricter censorship on the *Loyola News*, only to meet with strong resistance from an editorial staff already excited by the sensation that their work had produced and, perhaps, frustrated by the administrative opposition. Hoping to avoid additional controversy, Abel demanded that the *News* refrain from further editorial comment on other student organizations. Nevertheless, three days later the editor attempted to slip an inflammatory editorial into the *Loyola News* copy. Considering it “too forceful,” Abel removed it. According to Abel, at this point the editor “stated that if he could not run the editorial he had written word for word ‘without changing even a comma’ he wouldn’t run anything in that space.” As a result that week’s issue of the *Loyola News* was printed with a blank

¹³⁴ D. Herbert Abel to T.H. Ahearn, S.J., 22 April 1931, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 13, Folder 1.

¹³⁵ D. Herbert Abel to Robert M. Kelley, S.J., 2 May 1931, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers Box 13, Folder 1.

column on its editorial page. “I suggested things which might have been put in,” Abel wrote in his own defense. “Only [the editor’s] absolute refusal to use that space for anything else is responsible for the appearance of the *News* today in its present state.”¹³⁶

In a separate letter Abel petitioned Kelley to sanction the removal of this confrontational student from his position as editor-in-chief. According to Abel, the student “has shown himself to be antagonistic at every turn. He has been tactless, definitely belligerent, and has adopted an attitude that makes it impossible to argue with him. He does not consider the authority of a faculty director as a definite curb on his activities.” Abel concluded that the student’s motivations were “definitely contrary to the best interests of the newspaper. If he be continued in office after this gesture of defiance,” warned Abel, “then the only way one will ever be able to censor his articles will be... with a gun.”¹³⁷

As the Jesuit order increased its interest in the Catholic character of student publications, in 1933 Loyola President Samuel Knox Wilson quickly took steps to tighten administrative control and accountability in the content of the *Loyola News*, no doubt hoping to prevent those embarrassing slips that had plagued the paper under Kelley’s administration. By October 1933 Wilson had established a Loyola Publications Committee, formed of the moderators of the various publications, which had the authority

¹³⁶ D. Herbert Abel to Robert M. Kelley, S.J., 19 May 1931, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 13, Folder 1.

¹³⁷ D. Herbert Abel to Robert M. Kelley, S.J., 19 May 1931, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers Box 13 Folder 1.

to resolve censorship disputes.¹³⁸ By 1937 the Publications Committee had designed a six-point policy for the *Loyola News* that called for the censorship of “questionable humor”; the elimination of offensive references to individuals or “outside institutions (especially Mundelein College)”; and the suppressing of strong opposition to the University’s administrative policies.¹³⁹ Also in 1937 the region’s Father Provincial ordered every Midwestern Jesuit college and university to create a position of “Jesuit censor of all student periodicals,” who could be “held responsible for all articles appearing in all publications even when contributed by faculty members or by those neither students nor faculty members.”¹⁴⁰ At Loyola Wilson appointed Rev. W. Eugene Shiels, S.J. to this key position, which reported directly to Wilson and wielded authority over the faculty moderators of student publications.¹⁴¹

Ever scrupulous, Shiels lost no time in drawing up his own nine-point platform of censorship and applying its strict standards to the *Loyola News*. Many of his objections to *News* content aimed to maintain the spiritual and social hierarchies appropriate to a Catholic institution. In Shiels’ opinion, for instance, the newspaper’s offenses included humor involving the name of a saint. “Catholic familiarity towards the Saints should include propriety, shouldn’t it?” he admonished the moderator. The humor columnist

¹³⁸ Wilson to William A. Finnegan, S.J., 16 October 1933, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 13, Folder 1.

¹³⁹ Minutes, Committee on Student Publications, 12 October 1937, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 40, Folder 3.

¹⁴⁰ Wilson to Guerin, 30 October 1937, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers Box 44, Folder 11; Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. to Shiels, 20 December 1937, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 40, Folder 3.

¹⁴¹ Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. to Mark Guerin, 30 October 1937, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 44, Folder 11.

also “ought to draw some rough handling” for ridiculing a student’s reputation for virtue. As for the popular gossip column detailing conversation at the Edgewater Beach Hotel, its title of “Beachcombing at the Beach” should be reconsidered “with a view to elevating our social ideal above beachcombing,” suggested Shiels. “...[M]y notion of a beachcomber is that of one with whom I should wish to avoid any but unavoidable contact.”¹⁴²

While Catholic “campus life” at Loyola and De Paul often did address both administrative and undergraduate concerns for the image of American Catholic institutions and individuals, this unity of interest could unravel in the broader contexts of Vatican and Chicago archdiocesan politics. At Loyola, Catholic students’ desire to voice criticisms, police themselves, and demonstrate participation in an irreverent American youth culture often threatened delicate hierarchical relationships, invisible to students themselves but very apparent to the university’s clerical administrators. Although the degree of slippage between the image and reality of Catholic “campus life” is impossible to pinpoint through these censored sources, the intensity of conflict surrounding relatively small infractions suggests that the collaborative effort of institutional image construction generally glossed over tensions between the religious and secular sides of student life.

In conclusion, during the 1920s status insecurities motivated Catholic educational leaders to enlist Catholic students in the promotion of their Catholic universities as a means of serving the Church. Interpreting the Church as a cosmic, hierarchically-

¹⁴² W. Eugene Shiels, S.J., to Mark Guerin, 19 November 1937, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 44, Folder 11.

organized union of persons and institutions, Loyola's presentation of *Pageant of Youth* and preparations for the International Eucharistic Congress stressed the message that students' obedient support of their educational institutions increased the status and influence of the Church, of which students formed a part. In the context of American collegiate culture, participation in extracurricular activities was an important way in which class-conscious De Paul and Loyola students, by imitating the social life of prestigious Eastern universities, could improve their Catholic institutions' reputations while also preparing themselves for social leadership. Influenced by the Jesuits' ambitions for Loyola as well as their own expectations, Loyola student leaders in particular aggressively campaigned for school spirit in ways which alienated their more studious, working peers, who aimed to succeed in the world on their own merits rather than by institutional association. By contrast, the Vincentians' lesser concern for De Paul's class status and more easygoing, democratic approach to extracurricular organization probably contributed to De Paul students' more open, less condemnatory discussions of spirit. However, as the Jesuits' political situation transformed student initiative into a liability during the late 1920s and early 30s, Loyola administrators and faculty began to assume greater control over "campus life" activities.

CHAPTER TWO

“IT OUGHT TO RAMIFY”: THE ORGANIZATION OF CISCORA, 1926-1934

“Our sodality has been too much of a touch-and-go affair,” Loyola student Robert Harnett declaimed in January 1927. “It has to assume a much larger importance in our school life. It ought to ramify through all our other activities: fraternities, debates, recreation, sports—everything, including also our social life.” Arts College Dean Joseph Reiner, S.J., applauded the word “ramify”: indeed the idea, if not the diction, had been mainly his—and that idea was even more ambitious than Harnett initially suggested to the small group of Catholic students gathered in the chemistry room.¹ They spoke of reorienting extracurricular life at Loyola University toward Catholic ideals. Reiner, however, saw the Sodality’s social and cultural ascendancy on campus as only a first step toward realizing the Catholic Action ideal of an assertive “lay apostolate” that would extend the Church’s influence throughout secular society.²

And he pushed them. Before the school term ended in 1927, Reiner, acting with and through Harnett, not only propelled Loyola’s extracurricular religious organization, a chapter of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin Mary, toward a leading role on Loyola’s Arts campus, but also expanded it into Chicago Inter Student Conference on Religious Activities (CISCORA)—later Chicago Inter-Student Catholic Action (CISCA)—an

¹ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 11.

² “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 11.

elaborate citywide federation of Catholic student organizations that included Mundelein College, De Paul University, and the four other colleges and 51 high schools that comprised Chicago's system of Catholic youth education. Co-opting the rhetoric and values of collegiate "campus life," the CISCORA federation's program stressed student leadership and initiative in an effort to form "lay apostles"—outspoken Catholic leaders who nevertheless would focus and confine their activity within boundaries set by the clergy. In the early 1930s, these boundaries would grow more explicit, tightening administrative authority over student culture at Loyola and Mundelein, and—in the late 1930s—De Paul.

At Loyola, sodality "ramification" served, not only international Catholicism's broader political and ideological interests, but also the university's immediate needs. As Chapter 1 showed, to counteract Vatican allegations of eroding Catholic character at Jesuit institutions in the United States, Jesuit international and provincial supervision of Loyola University's extracurriculum increased to the extent of scrutinizing student publications, thereby pushing Loyola administrators to organize and formalize censorship procedures that had formerly been casual and discretionary. Loyola's administration, however, did not only seek to downplay the morally questionable aspects of student life, such as irreverent language; it also sought to demonstrate that Catholicism was integral to Jesuit education—and furthermore, that Loyola students enthusiastically implemented the Vatican's "Catholic Action" agenda outside as well as inside the classroom. The revitalization and extension of the Loyola Sodality became an important part of this administrative agenda. Reflecting in 1937 on CISCORA's founding ten years earlier,

former Loyola student Robert Hartnett—by then a Jesuit priest—acknowledged the federation’s origin in Jesuit anxieties regarding the religious character of extracurricular campus life. “In 1927, it could be said with no little justice: ‘Catholic students in Catholic colleges have till now formed organizations to promote journalism, dramatics, debating, athletics, dances, just about everything *except their Catholicism,*’” he told a student audience. “Thanks to Fathers Lord and Reiner, that accusation has been blotted out. The Lord be praised!”³

Aside from the Sodality’s political value, Reiner’s interest in Catholic Action organization appears to have been sincere and genuine. Born in Chicago in 1881, Reiner, a graduate of St. Ignatius High School, formally entered the Society of Jesus in 1902 and received Holy Orders in 1913. In two of the intervening years he taught theology at St. Louis University, where perhaps he encountered—or just missed--fellow Chicagoan Daniel A. Lord, future leader of the Sodality movement in the United States. However, Reiner would vaguely credit his graduate theological studies at the University of Innsbruck (occurring between 1900 and 1902, according to one source) with forming his sense of Christianity as a sociological system embracing the range of human interactions. “When I was in Austria studying theology at Innsbruck, I became deeply impressed with the social significance of the reign of Christ,” he reportedly told a student.⁴ A 1944 CISCA history echoed this statement, claiming that “somewhere in the long course of his studies in sociology and theology, perhaps in Innsbruck, Austria, he saw in blinding light

³ Robert C. Harnett, S.J., to CISCA members (1937), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 13.

⁴ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action” (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 8-9.

how much social significance lay in the reign of Christ in the world,” stated the pamphlet, further adding the pious exclamation “If all were Christ-like!”⁵ In the freewheeling, unsupervised intellectual atmosphere of the University of Innsbruck—later celebrated as “open air” by liturgical scholar Josef A. Jungmann, S.J., who also studied there in the early twentieth century---such an epiphany would not be astonishing, or even particularly original. By 1903 at latest, Reiner’s Innsbruck studies had broadened his concept of religion to include political and social organization, as evidenced by his article series “Jones and Smith Discuss Socialism, published in *Our Sunday Visitor*.”⁶

If Innsbruck sparked Reiner’s interest in Catholicism as sociology, it was World War I that drew him into the thick of social service and civic organization. While teaching at Xavier University in Cincinnati, he crossed the Ohio River to help soldiers stationed at Fort Thomas in Newport, Kentucky, through the devastating influenza pandemic of 1918. During the war he also served on a Red Cross committee on disabled soldiers, and afterward helped to found a local committee on employment for ex-servicemen. While involvement with social welfare agencies was not unusual for volunteer and military chaplains, whose concern for the soldiers often led them beyond the standard duties of counseling and public worship, Reiner’s service seems to have been particularly valuable: in 1945 Sister Mary Roberta Bauer noted that the U.S. War Department had awarded him “special recognition for his outstanding work.”⁷

⁵ “The History of CISCA, 1926-1944,” in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 11.

⁶ Edmund J. Fortman, S.J., *A Biographical History of the Chicago Province*, (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1987), 49-51.

⁷ Edward M. Coffman, *The War to End All Wars: The American Military Experience in World War I*, (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1998), 79-80; Sister Mary Roberta Bauer, S.S.N.D.,

Reiner's experience of volunteer chaplaincy, which required him to minister to non-Catholic as well as Catholic soldiers in a time of crisis, probably increased his skill and confidence in relating to non-Catholics; also, it probably helped to stretch his perception of community identification and responsibility beyond Catholic enclaves to include the city and the nation, as well as lending a sense of urgency to his reform impulses. Simultaneous and subsequent activities situated Reiner within Protestant-dominated groups such as the American Association for Labor Legislation, the Better Housing League, the Juvenile Protective Association, and the Social Hygiene Society—even the elite, philanthropic City Club of Cincinnati—in addition to sectarian gatherings such as the Catholic Industrial Conference and Catholic Association for International Peace.⁸ Certainly Reiner reveled in organization and did not hesitate to support even non-Catholic efforts for social welfare.

After World War I, administrative assignments in Jesuit higher education allowed Reiner to integrate his views into the curriculum and the religious practices that Catholic college students encountered on campus. At Xavier University in Cincinnati, where he served as founder and regent of the School of Commerce and Sociology, he reportedly worked “to introduce his ‘new’ Catholic Action into the college sodality”; subsequently, in addition to his teaching duties, he also directed a sodality in Milwaukee from 1921 until his 1923 appointment as Dean of Arts and Sciences at Loyola.⁹ In Chicago he

“CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” (M.A. Thesis, De Paul University, 1945,) 6-7.

⁸ Bauer, “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 6-7.

⁹ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 8.

initially promoted his views in less dramatic ways, perhaps due to the existence of entrenched leadership and lack of a fully-formed organizational plan. Father Siedenburg already had founded and now presided over Loyola's School of Sociology; likewise, James Mertz, S.J., was moderator of Loyola's Sodality. Until the 1926-27 school term Reiner reportedly confined his student interactions to a course in religion ("and did he make that class work!" one student later enthused); and to coaching Loyola's debating team, to whom he reportedly stressed the importance of social issues.¹⁰

However, politics as well as personal conviction soon prompted Reiner to make Catholic Action visible on campus. As Dean of the Arts College, he must have encountered some pressure to Catholicize student life at Jesuit schools at least by January 1926, when Loyola hosted the Jesuits' Midwestern convention for curricular re-organization.¹¹ The Society of Jesus' ongoing and public scrutiny of Loyola's religious character would have maintained this pressure in the late 1920s and throughout the 1930s. Even students were made aware of the order's supervision. In 1927, for example, the student-run *Loyola News* reported that that a Jesuit official would visit Loyola for several days to "observe the educational process" at Loyola and "report upon conditions discovered" to the Missouri Province. "Whatever has been done by the professors or students in the field of intellectual achievement will not escape his notice, but will be brought to the attention of the authorities at St. Louis," explained the *News*, further

¹⁰ "Crusaders in Student Catholic Action," (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 9.

¹¹ "Arts Deans of Midwest Meet at Loyola," *Loyola News* (6 January 1926): 1.

warning that “[a]ny deficiencies will likewise be investigated....”¹² For his own part, Reiner pressured Arts professors to work religious character formation into their mentorship of students. At a 1928 faculty meeting, for example, he reportedly emphasized that “...every Jesuit professor must take a personal interest in the religious welfare of his students, particularly in encouraging them to monthly communion,” retreats, and Bible-reading; and further discussed methods of using Catholic literature, such as the Jesuit magazine *America*, in classroom activities.¹³ Certainly he was conscious of an urgent need to intensify Loyola’s Catholic commitment. Indeed, one may speculate that his nascent career in educational administration hinged on the Arts College’s religious reputation.

The International Eucharistic Congress offered a perfect opportunity to re-create that reputation. Held in Chicago in the summer of 1926, it gathered the various layers of Catholics’ religious commitment—international, national, and local—mixed them, and charged them with urgency and excitement. Parading Chicago’s Catholic high school and college students on Soldier Field in front of visiting dignitaries, it invited Catholic youth to see themselves as an integral part of a vast, triumphal Church institution, united in reverence for the Blessed Sacrament. Likewise, it offered Catholic educational administrators the opportunity to display their students’ religious fidelity and zeal on an international stage.

Importantly for Loyola, the Eucharistic Congress also connected Daniel Lord, S.J., the national director of a re-vitalized student religious movement, with Reiner, dean

¹² “Director of Studies in Visit to Loyola Campus,” *Loyola News* (23 November 1927): 1.

¹³ “Jesuit Members of Lake Shore Faculty Plan Year,” *Loyola News* (3 October 1928): 1,4.

of a college with a religious image problem. Lord had come to Chicago at the invitation of Monsignor Francis Kelley for the purpose of choreographing the Eucharistic Congress. When Kelley--who expected to serve the Congress as executive secretary--instead was appointed bishop of Oklahoma City, Lord found himself stuck for the summer at Loyola's Jesuit residence in Rogers Park with little responsibility beyond teaching a summer course at its Arts College.¹⁴ There he undoubtedly encountered Reiner, as well as James Mertz, S.J., Loyola's current Sodality moderator. Since the organization and activity of Sodality groups had become Lord's main project and expertise, no doubt the three spent some time that summer in discussing what was possible and desirable for Loyola's Sodality. In an August 1926 Loyola University hosted a Jesuit Sodality directors' convention at which Lord presented a plan for Sodality chapters that he later published as *The ABC of Sodality Organization* (1927).¹⁵

Notably, Loyola University's initiation of a citywide federation would be a pioneering effort, to date unprecedented in the Sodality movement. Lord would enthusiastically support and promote it as a model for Catholic organization in other cities, as well as credit Reiner with inspiring his Summer Schools of Spiritual Leadership.¹⁶ Very likely there was a degree of collaboration—particularly between Reiner and Lord, as Reiner's general need for visible student spirituality coincided with Lord's vision of the Sodality's ideal structure. In a sense, demand had met supply.

¹⁴ Daniel A. Lord, S.J., *Played by Ear: The Autobiography of Father Daniel A. Lord, S.J.* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1955), 260.

¹⁵ Sister Mary Florence, S.L. (Bernice Wolf), *The Sodality Movement in the United States, 1926-1936*. (St. Louis, MO: Queen's Work, 1939) 39-40.

¹⁶For example, see "Heard in Passing," *Sodalight* (6 July 1934): 1, in CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 1.

A Synthesis with “Campus Life”

Lord and Reiner’s scheme for Catholic Action as an extracurricular activity integrated pre-existing American collegiate culture with the ideology of liberal Catholicism. Reiner intended the Loyola Sodality and CISCORA, its extension, to re-interpret “campus life” values of student leadership, initiative, solidarity, and obedience in terms of the Catholic Action “lay apostolate”-- a catchphrase generally defined as “the participation of the laity in the mission of the clergy.” The international goal of the Catholic Action lay apostolate was to counter secular governments’ curtailment of clerical powers and privileges. In order for the Church to maintain an influence in modern society, laymen—the Catholic theologians theorized--would have to take the lead in shaping the values, organization, and tone of the secular society in which they moved, making that society more accordant with recent Papal statements on social justice and morality in industrial societies. For Chicago’s Catholic students, this leadership obligation could involve welcoming an African-American into their parish in defiance of popular hostility, distributing Catholic literature on buses and streetcorners, rebuking friends for lewd conversation, or visibly protesting movies with sexual content.

However, in order to become “lay apostles,” students would have to muster the courage to openly oppose prevailing social and cultural trends—to set rather than submit to secular social patterns—while at the same time remaining obedient followers of the Church hierarchy that supplied them with ideals and principles. They would have to

defy; they would have to submit; they would have to lead; and they would have to do all of these things in the appropriate contexts.

Cultivating this delicate balance of defiance, submission, and leadership in students involved careful attention to character formation. Indeed, Reiner based his 1933 “Plan for Catholic Social Action” on a central premise of Jesuit education: that “attitudes are more important than knowledge.” This value statement, which Bauer—a De Paul graduate student in Education—later described as “the fundamental idea behind Catholic training,” was a deft paraphrase of the Jesuit mission of educating “the whole person,” character as well as intellect. Reiner’s prioritization of attitudes also invoked the *Ratio Studiorum*’s goal of teaching students to reason and write in interdisciplinary ways—viewing all areas of inquiry as fundamentally interconnected—rather than forming them as specialists or experts in a specific subject area.¹⁷ According to Jesuit ideals, a Catholic college graduate would leave campus knowing how to use information; at that point he would be equipped to acquire the information itself more or less on his own.

Valuing the approach over and above the content, Reiner’s plan expressed admiration for the extracurriculum as a forum in which students already taught one another the attitudes, priorities, and leadership skills that they perceived as crucial to their aspirations. “Social habits, attitudes, and skills are generally developed more effectively through informal rather than through formal methods of instruction,” it observed, pointing to student government, debating societies, and student publications as examples

¹⁷ Bauer, “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 23.

of effective practical training for public life.¹⁸ What remained, Reiner thought, was somehow to manipulate this pre-existing peer culture toward the goal of preparing students to structure their social and economic lives according to Catholic ideals.

A fundamental step was the equation of the student body with the theology of the transcendent Mystical Body of Christ. If college students already interpreted their social lives in terms of individual submission to the “student body,” then, Reiner suggested, they were only one step away from understanding themselves as members of Christ’s Mystical Body, involving the sublimation of personal identity and desires into the collective will, which was identified with God’s will. Thus Reiner’s “Program for Catholic Social Action” explicitly aimed to “place the natural group instinct on a supernatural basis, expanding it till it includes all the children of God and all the brethren of Christ.”¹⁹

As in campus life, Reiner expected this perception or “spirit” of supernatural community to have practical consequences for the individual. In college, commitment to the “common good” of the institutional peer group theoretically shaped an individual student’s lifestyle—dictating his or her use of time and money, choice of clothing, public expression of opinions, and so forth. Similarly, Reiner presented Catholic Action theology in terms of pervasive community obligation, teaching that “[e]very Catholic, in virtue of the Sacrament of Baptism, is bound to shape both his personal and social life according to the principles of Christ in whose mystical body he is incorporated.”

¹⁸ Joseph Reiner, SJ, “A Program for Catholic Social Action,” (St. Louis: Queen’s Work, 1933), 10-11, in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 6.

¹⁹ Reiner, “A Program for Catholic Social Action,” 24.

However, just as in collegiate peer culture, Reiner's plan reconciled individual subordination with intense economic and social ambition through the concept of service. For example, Reiner felt that Catholic students should be educated to admire "men and women who share and sacrifice rather than acquire and hold, who serve the common welfare rather than.... promote their personal advantages..."²⁰ In the interest of communicating this value for community service, he—just like Booster Club members and other so-called "rah-rah boys"-- advocated the public distribution of special awards for student leaders who, through extracurricular participation, "subordinate[d] personal interests to the common welfare and put their skills and abilities at the service of the student commonwealth."²¹If ultimately such supposedly selfless public service did work to leaders' "personal advantages" by resulting in public recognition and social status—the admiration of his peers—then the Catholic student community's need to celebrate and extend its values more than justified the paradox.

Further extending this conflation of ambition and submission, Reiner's 1933 "Program for Catholic Social Action" emphasized the need for a strict principle of student initiative as a means of—paradoxically--cultivating student obedience to the Church hierarchy. People, he argued "learn by doing." For this reason it was not only "desirable" but "indispensable," Reiner argued, "that students take the promotion of the social reign of Christ into their own hands just as they take into their own hands the promotion of athletics, dramatics, debating, etc. They themselves should advise and

²⁰ Reiner, "A Program for Catholic Social Action," 6-7.

²¹ Reiner, "A Program for Catholic Social Action," 10-11.

promote definite and specific practices and activities that will enable students to apply Christian principles to social relationships and institutions while at school and prepare them to do so progressively after they have been graduated.”²² If students perceived themselves, rather than clergy or school administrators, as directing the Catholic Action movement, he elaborated, then their individual egos and status ambitions would become invested in the movement’s success, thereby attaching their “loyalties” to the Church teachings and institutions that justified their status.²³

Implementation at Loyola

Among students, however, leadership status was more likely the end, and conformity, the means—a difference that Reiner and Lord exploited in marketing Catholic Action to Loyola students in 1926. At Reiner’s invitation, Lord jumpstarted the endeavor at the Loyola Arts college’s 1926-27 annual retreat, which Reiner strategically moved from spring to October in order to capitalize on lingering enthusiasm from the summertime Eucharistic Congress. According to the *Loyola News* report, Lord challenged retreat participants with the promise that “if he could have three hundred young collegians willing to *follow* Christ in word and deed, he could make them spiritual *leaders* throughout the land” [italics mine].²⁴ Aware of students’ status preoccupations, Lord’s message focused on their goal of upward mobility (as opposed to Reiner’s focus

²² Reiner, “A Program for Catholic Social Action,” 11-12.

²³ Reiner, “A Program for Catholic Social Action,” 11-12.

²⁴ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 10.

on loyalty) representing willingness to follow and obey as a prerequisite to gaining the desired social status. Student response was overwhelmingly positive: aspiring “spiritual leaders” swelled the next month’s Sodality business meeting into “the largest and most enthusiastic in the annals of the sodality at Loyola...,” according to the *Loyola News*. “Every seat in the chapel was full and there was a standing army of about thirty.”²⁵

Applying extracurricular structure toward Catholic Action goals, in January 1927 Reiner’s plan re-organized Loyola’s Sodality into four main student committees, each representing and promoting a basic religious “attitude” or “loyalty.” Hence the Eucharistic/Our Lady Committee took as its mission the promotion of loyalty to the Persons of Christ and Mary; the Parish Loyalty Committee, co-operation with the Catholic Church hierarchy; the Social Action Committee, loyalty to the “Social Reign of Christ,” meaning the social and economic ideas outlined in the Encyclicals; the Catholic Literature Committee, loyalty to the “Cultural Reign of Christ,” or the operation of Catholic principles in the media.²⁶ Endowed with committee chairmanships (in addition to the pre-existing offices of Prefect), as well as urgent causes, Sodality students gained social visibility and importance through this organizational scheme.

Each student committee was then responsible for developing and implementing specific projects for the promotion of its assigned “loyalty.” For the Eucharistic/Our Lady Committee, these projects generally involved encouraging students to attend Mass, receive Holy Communion, and experiment with different methods of prayer. For

²⁵ “Large Attendance at First Sodality Meeting Thursday,” *Loyola News* (3 November 1926): 4.

²⁶ “CISCORA: Chicago Catholic Student Conference on Religious Activities,” [1934]., CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 8.

example, in 1927 the Eucharistic/Our Lady section of the Loyola Sodality promoted First Friday Mass attendance at Loyola and compiled statistics on the number of communicants,²⁷ which reportedly increased over the course of the school term. Students also organized a voluntary Holy Hour devotion in the Jesuit residence chapel, which histories also claim was well-attended.²⁸

Other Loyola Sodality committees, such as Social Action and Literature, developed projects that more explicitly aimed at the goal of social “ramification,” pushing the accepted boundaries of religion’s sphere on campus and in society. Notably, the Social Action Committee clashed with Student Council in 1927 over the right to organize recreational activities at a social dance.²⁹ Meanwhile, Literature Committee members worked to increase and maintain the Chicago Public Library’s holdings of “Catholic” media by playing upon Library politics and procedures. Loyola’s librarian first made a list of desirable Catholic books which Paul Plunkett, a Loyola student who also worked at the Chicago Public Library, then checked against the Library’s actual holdings, noting the discrepancies. Upon receiving Plunkett’s report, Frederic Siedenburg, S.J., who happened to be a Library Board member, pressured the Library to purchase the missing Catholic materials. Once the Library complied, the Literature Committee urged Sodalists to check the Catholic books out of the Library in order to

²⁷ Unfortunately CISCA Records did not include these statistics.

²⁸ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), 12, in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4.

²⁹ F.P.D., “Student Comment,” *Loyola News* (30 November 1927): 6.

maintain their circulation statistics, thereby preventing the Library from de-accessioning them for lack of use.³⁰

On the Loyola Arts campus, however, the goal of Sodality “ramification” soon excited hostility from other campus organizations, whose members charged that, in worldly terms, Sodalists were attempting a power grab that could upset the pre-existing balance of administrative and student authority in campus extracurricular culture. As Horowitz shows, during the 1920s American college and university students had achieved some measure of symbolic power on campus due to the organization of student government and advisory bodies.³¹ Loyola was no exception: *Loyola News* reports show that Student Councils had formed at Loyola by October 1925.³² However, from that first Sodality re-organizational meeting in 1926, Reiner and the student Sodalists implied that their mission of Catholic cultural “ramification” necessitated elevating the Sodality to a dominant position on campus. They did not believe that Loyola’s pre-existing student organizations themselves should adopt religious practice as their latest whim or project; rather, they expected Catholicism—i.e. the Sodality and Jesuit administration—to assert itself in shaping, limiting, and controlling students’ social network. Students should not depend on campus social structures for access to religion; rather, students should defer to religious authority when organizing their personal and collective social lives.

³⁰ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), 11, in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4.

³¹ Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 108.

³² “Student Council Meeting Passes New Rules,” *Loyola News* (7 October 1925): 4.

The distinction could be subtle. For example, when one sodalist—hoping to use the campus’s existing social network to popularize Catholic prayer—suggested that Loyola’s three fraternities each choose one Friday in the month on which to receive Holy Communion as a group, reportedly “[t]his motion was voted down for fear of making the reception of the Blessed Sacrament a matter of mere emulation,” subject to the “petty rivalries” of campus life.³³ While it was unacceptable for the campus social network to sponsor religious practice, however, prayer was still an acceptable way of supporting and sanctifying that social network: Loyola Sodalists agreed that Friday Masses on campus should offered for the students “as individuals and as a student body,” thereby recognizing the student community’s dependent, subordinate position in relation to God and His Church.³⁴

Moreover, Reiner and Sodality students did not hesitate to push Catholicism as a guide to individual students’ use of free hours and moments. For instance, Reiner frequently posted motivational signs on campus bulletin boards. “‘Be a Three-Minute Man,’ advised one such notice,” observing that “it took only three minutes to make a visit to the Blessed Sacrament between classes.”³⁵ In November 1927 a Sodality advertisement, invoking the school-spirit pressure to “Find a Place in Some Activity,” suggested that students join their parish’s Holy Name Society; advocate Catholic education among their peers; and represent Loyola well by example. “Make religion not

³³ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 11.

³⁴ “Sodality Holds First of Business Meetings,” *Loyola News* (24 November 1926): 3.

³⁵ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 12.

merely a matter of occasional prayers and exercises but a constant and influential factor in everything you do,” advised the ad. “Help extend the Kingdom of Christ by at least recognizing and obeying His will in your own life.”³⁶ Again—in theory--extracurricular activities should not tack on religious practices; rather, religion itself should extend to guide, motivate, and structure extracurricular life. Students did not organize the Church; rather, the Church organized the students. This ideal at least implicitly subjected the students’ society of clubs, fraternities, and athletics to the needs and powers of the Catholic Church hierarchy and its Sodality supporters.

The Sodality’s leadership aspirations provoked almost immediate resentment from at least one Loyola student. A 1927 letter to the *Loyola News* editor, for instance, chastised the new, high-profile Sodality for its perceived self-righteousness and posturing. “On page eight [of the *Loyola News*] we find a quarter page advertisement of the Sodality. Space does not permit us to do justice to this but one can not resist making a few comments,” began the student author, identified only as “F.P.D.” Invoking the sensitive issue of rivalry among Loyola’s Arts, Commerce, Law, and Medical students, the student began by rebuking the Sodality—a small group of Arts students—for presuming to use the student newspaper to preach to the entire student body. “The *News*,” he observed, “is all-university, the sodality limited to the Arts college.” Further contending that “The Catholic religion does not advertise,” he went on to ridicule the Sodality’s school-spirit rhetoric: “Shine up your sense of humor, boys, here’s the blue ribbon for fearless journalism. [Point] Number 3 of the ad is ‘Talk Loyola. Actions speak louder than words.’” In sum, the author concluded “May I make a humble appeal

³⁶ “Find A Place in Some Activity,” [advertisement], *Loyola News* (23 November 1927): 8.

for more religion and Catholicity, and less wowserism and wheelerism in the Catholic Action committee [?]"³⁷ His objections seemed to center on what he saw as the offensive self-importance of the Sodality committee, which he interpreted as intruding on the political territory of secular student organizations. Apparently surprised by these criticisms, Sodality prefect William Rafferty innocently (or perhaps disingenuously) responded that the Sodality's newspaper ads "were no different from... notices on the bulletin boards"—failing to consider that students must have found the "Three-Minute Man" notes ludicrous, too, but had refrained from saying so for fear of Dean Reiner.³⁸

Indeed, the Loyola administration's hand in the Sodality seems to have been an implicit issue in early opposition to its new program. *Loyola News* content from the 1927-28 academic term suggested a perceptual gap between Sodality insiders, who saw themselves as "Catholic leaders" in charge of the organization and acting on their own initiative; and outsiders, who viewed the Sodality as a tool of the administration, a sly intrusion of Jesuit authority into campus life.

Against the backdrop of a Jesuit Provincial inspection of Loyola in late November 1927, for instance, Sodalists became controversial figures in a "campus life" conflict between Loyola's Student Council and the Arts College administration concerning control of a social dance. According to the *Loyola News*, before the dance the Sodality's Social Action committee held a meeting—significantly, in Dean Reiner's office—to discuss methods of publicizing its activities and immediately enlarging its extracurricular influence. Apparently the upcoming dance, to be held in conjunction with the women of

³⁷ F.P.D., "Student Comment," *Loyola News* (30 November 1927): 6.

³⁸ William Rafferty, "Student Comment," *Loyola News* (11 January 1928): 2.

Rosary College, was of particular concern to the Social Action Committee (and Reiner), which regarded it as an important test of Loyola's decorum and respectability. On that afternoon in Reiner's office, "[s]trong arguments were brought forth encouraging the idea of being real Catholic gentlemen," reported the *News*. As their contribution to "establishing wholesome and delightful entertainment" at the upcoming event, Sodalists committed to proposing to Student Council that the Sodality sponsor the group activity of "old-fashioned" square or circle dancing, likely as alternatives to the sexually suggestive popular dances.³⁹

However, when Sodality prefect William Rafferty later submitted "the Sodality's" proposal at a Student Council meeting, his suggestion elicited "vociferous comment," much of it directed at perceived Sodality interference in a Council event. Ultimately, Student Council members did adopt the Sodality's proposal. Since Dean Reiner implicitly supported it, how could they not? Still, the Student Council president had to quell immediate grumbling over Sodality officiousness, asserting that "regardless of any outside help or intervention, the Student Council was the responsible, moving factor behind the dance."⁴⁰ Afterward "F.P.D." again wrote to the *Loyola News*, this time accusing aggressive Sodality leadership of threatening to usurp the powers of other campus organizations. "On the first page of the report of the Student council meeting we find that the energetic sodality committee has decided to assume direction of some of the activities of the students at the Rosary-Loyola dance. It matters not, that this is the

³⁹ "Social Action Is Active Sodality Section at Arts," *Loyola News* (23 November 1927): 2.

⁴⁰ "Many Important Matters Arise at Council Meeting," *Loyola News* (23 November 1927): 1, 8.

special privilege and duty of the Council... and that the students are liable to be antagonized by the interference of the sodalists,” contended the writer. “The Catholic Action committee is looking for action (and publicity) and will interfere with the work of any organization to attain its ends. One looks forward with interest to the time when the permission of the committee will be necessary before a fraternity can give a party, the debating team can stage a debate, the dean can give a holiday, freshmen can chew tobacco....”⁴¹

In response, Social Action Committee chair William Conley defended the Sodality by stating that it had not dictated terms, but only offered recommendations to Student Council in the capacity of fellow students—again, apparently failing to realize that plans reportedly developed in the office of Dean Reiner must have carried a certain coercive implication.⁴² While “F.P.D.’s” quip about the Sodality’s power eventually threatening the dean’s ability to give a holiday might seem to counter this interpretation, it is worth noting that the all-too-specific addition also diplomatically avoided the risk of implicating Reiner at a time of increased administrative sensitivity and censorship. The fact that “F.P.D.” mentioned the dean at all (as opposed to, say, the university president) suggested that it was important to distance Reiner in particular from criticisms of the Sodality; which in turn implied that Reiner was already far too involved with it.

A proposed insertion of Sodality materials into administrative correspondence with parents must have confirmed suspicions of a threatening alliance between Sodalists

⁴¹ F.P.D., “Student Comment,” *Loyola News* (30 November 1927): 6.

⁴² William Conley, “Student Comment,” *Loyola News* (14 December 1927): 2.

and the administration, as well as provoking resentment at an additional intrusion into students' lives. In November 1927 the *Loyola News* reported that student William Conley, chairman of the Sodality social action committee, had discussed with Reiner the possibility of sending a letter home to parents—basically, an outline of the committee's proposed program for the year--along with students' quarterly report cards.⁴³ Among student journalists, the idea inspired laughter. "Oh, My Dear! The missive hasn't arrived yet, but the odds are that the governor will receive something like this: 'Does your son play cards on Sunday? Does he read the *Sunday Visitor* before he reads the *Westbrook Pegler*?' And so on ad nauseam," a letter to the editor mocked.⁴⁴ Sodality and administrative officiousness, implied the letter, extended even to the point of recruiting parents to police the small details of students' daily lives.

What Sodality members saw as their own, legitimate student initiative, then, at least some other students appeared to resent as an indirect administrative intrusion into student organizations, social events, and even the privacy of their homes. Sodalists were seen as instruments of the Jesuit administration, the student body's natural enemy, rather than representatives of students themselves. Often the very fear of administrative authority that inspired hostility toward the Sodality might also have deterred dissenting students from clearly expressing the cause of that hostility. Still, the cause can be inferred. If Student Council members had not felt somehow pressured to comply with Rafferty's proposal, then why would they interpret a mere suggestion from a student organization as a threat to the Council's autonomy—when the Council supposedly could

⁴³ "Social Action Is Active Sodality Section at Arts," *Loyola News* (23 November 1927): 2.

⁴⁴ F.P.D., "Student Comment," *Loyola News* (30 November 1927): 6.

delegate projects as it wished? What disproportionate political pressure could the Sodality exert in Student Council without implicit administrative backing? Why make Sodality officiousness into a public issue, if its advertisements and letters (inserted with report cards issued by the administration) did not seem to carry some threatening official implication? Loyola students seemed instinctively to suspect that Reiner, rather than the student Sodality officers and committee chairs, was actually in charge of the religious organization.

However, the faculty's power to appoint officers to Loyola student publications soon quelled public opposition. In December 1927—the immediate wake of the Sodality controversy--the appointment of Sodality students J. Francis Walsh (also manager of Mertz's Della Strada Club, which raised funds for chapel construction) and William Conley (aforementioned chair of the Sodality Social Action Committee) to the *Loyola News* positions of the Editor-in-Chief and North Campus Editor, respectively, ensured Sodality dominance of the university newspaper.⁴⁵ Students noted the transition: sodalist William Rafferty, for instance, attributed the January 1928 publication of his defense of the Sodality entirely to the change in editorship.⁴⁶ Despite future changes in newspaper staff, from this point onwards, most *Loyola News* criticisms of the Sodality or Catholic Action in general would be carefully worded so as to evade objections from the appointed student editorial board as well as the faculty censors.

Notably, under Walsh and Conley's editorship, throughout the Spring 1928 semester *Loyola News* editorials worked to merge the perceived duty of "school spirit"

⁴⁵ "J. Walsh, New Editor," *Loyola News* (21 December 1927): 1.

⁴⁶ William Rafferty, "Student Comment," *Loyola News* (11 January 1928): 2.

with the ideology of Catholic Action, thereby re-interpreting the campus booster or “rah-rah boy” as a religious “lay apostle” who executed specific, concrete projects in support of Catholic institutions. For example, “Loyolans can exercise a very effectual apostolate, first, by encouraging high school seniors to continue their education; and second, by urging them to attend Loyola or some other Catholic institution,” urged one editorial. It went on to specify that “[t]he suggestion that the [Sodality] Catholic Action Section gives is very useful... They ask every student to pick out some high school senior, preferably one who is attending a public high school, and ‘work on him’ from now until next September, so that he will attend a Catholic college, such as Loyola.”⁴⁷ The editorial supported this recommendation by invoking student culture’s submersion of individual self-interest in the fortunes of the campus community: “By advising high school students in this manner, the Loyolan will be doing a distinct service to his Church, to the student concerned, and to Loyola—that means to himself.”⁴⁸ Moreover, argued the editorial, promoting college enrollment was a distinctly moral action, since “[w]ithout a college education. . . . Man’s usefulness to his fellowmen is automatically reduced”—hence, Loyola boosterism qualified as Catholic Action for the good of human society. In this way, the editors connected institutional advocacy, the core of “school spirit,” with the Sodality’s Catholic Action ideology as well as its predilection for small-scale, concrete schemes. The campus booster, they implied, of course would be the pious Sodalist.

The Sodality’s role in Loyola’s student newspaper reflected (and perhaps helped to set) official policy at the national level of Lord’s Sodality Central Office in St. Louis,

⁴⁷ “Sodality Catholic Action Group Urges New Student Drive,” *Loyola News* (2 May 1928): 1, 3; 3.

⁴⁸ “Sodality Catholic Action Group Urges New Student Drive,” *Loyola News* (2 May 1928): 1, 3; 1.

MO. By 1932 his Sodality Schools of Spiritual Leadership had codified the Sodalist takeover of campus extracurricular organizations—the sort of takeover that had occurred at the *Loyola News* in December 1927—as “The Infiltration Plan,” a recognized “technique of Catholic Action” in which Sodality members captured prominent extracurricular positions in a conscious effort to “Catholicize” the campus. Justifying this “Infiltration Plan,” the identification of status-bearing “school spirit” with public piety also continued into Lord’s Sodality Schools: the newsletter of the 1934 national convention, for example, quoted Loyola student John Bowman as stating that, since “it is the Sodalists who display real school spirit,” the Sodality merited “a pre-eminent place” in campus society.⁴⁹ Consciously or unconsciously, Sodalists appear to have used Catholic Action organization to fulfill ambitions for status on campus, even as the Sodality movement co-opted “campus life” rhetoric in the interest of expanding Catholicism’s social and cultural influence.

Organizing Inter-Student Catholic Action

Even locally, the Loyola Sodality’s influence quickly “ramified” far beyond the *Loyola News*. In May 1927 Reiner proposed extending his committee plan into a federation of student religious organizations of Chicago’s Catholic universities, colleges, and high schools for the purpose of discussing and efficiently organizing Catholic Action activity across the city.⁵⁰ According to a 1935 history composed by Mundelein students

⁴⁹ *Sodalight* (8 July 1934): 3, in CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 1.

⁵⁰ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 13; “The History of CISCA, 1926-1944,” in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 11: 3.

Virginia Woods and Catherine Heerey, Loyola Sodality officers responded to Reiner's suggestion by calling a lunch meeting with other Loyola students to discuss the likelihood of Chicago's Catholic high schools, colleges, and universities co-operating in social projects.⁵¹ Loyola Sodalists elected to pursue the suggested federation by hosting an initial conference for the exchange of ideas on student Catholic Action activity, to which Loyola would invite each Catholic school in Chicago to send two representatives from each of its student religious organizations.⁵² If the conference worked, then perhaps citywide organization was also possible.

Tellingly, Reiner himself composed the letter of invitation to the schools--but did so in the name of Loyola student Robert Harnett, the Sodality prefect, who signed the document in place of Reiner. After obtaining Harnett's signature, Reiner also looked after the mimeographing and mailing of the invitation to student religious organizations of the various schools.⁵³ Pointedly addressing the students rather than faculty or administrators, this letter contributed to the impression that the new federation would be a purely student initiative, founded through direct student-to-student communication—an important impression to maintain in the American collegiate atmosphere. However, the conditions of its composition and distribution underscored a theme that would run throughout the federation's history—an underlying tension between the image of student leadership and the actual, concealed role of administrators; and, by extension, between

⁵¹ "Crusaders in Student Catholic Action," (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 14. For the pamphlet's authorship, see "Honor CISCA Founder in Memorial Pamphlet," *Skyscraper* (8 March 1935): 2.

⁵² "Crusaders in Student Catholic Action," (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 14-15.

⁵³ "The CISCA Story," (1957), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 19: 4-5.

the image of Catholic lay leadership and the actual, concealed role of clergy and religious. As with Reiner and Hartnett's letter, it is often difficult to draw the line between the students' voices and those of clerical or religious ghostwriters with agendas of their own.

This is not to say that students were passive. On the contrary, Loyola students handled the first meeting's arrangements and promotion; and other high school and college students attended and spoke at that initial convention. According to a 1957 account, student organizations at 23 other schools contributed reportedly dynamic speakers as well as 96 student delegates.⁵⁴ A 1945 De Paul University dissertation by Education student Sister Mary Roberta Bauer, S.S.N.D provided slightly different numbers, claiming that 27 institutions—including all six Chicago-area institutions of higher education then existing (Barat College, De Paul, Loyola, St. Procopius, Rosary, and St. Xavier.), in addition to 21 high schools--sent a total of 108 delegates to that initial meeting.⁵⁵ One account estimated that as many as 40 students contributed questions, observations, and suggestions to meeting sessions that dealt specifically with attempts to integrate Catholicism into the extracurriculum. According to Robert Harnett, De Paul University students, for example, "showed how religious practices interacted on extracurricular organizations by announcing that one of the DePaul fraternities had made arrangements for a closed retreat at Mayslake this weekend."⁵⁶ Other delegates spoke of

⁵⁴ "The CISCA Story," (1957), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 19, p 5.

⁵⁵ Sister Mary Roberta Bauer, S.S.N.D., "CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists," (M.A. Thesis, De Paul University, 1945), 11.

⁵⁶ Robert C. Harnett, "A Catholic Student Conference on Religion," *America* (11 June 1927), 206-207; quoted in Bauer, "CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists," 11.

practical attempts to build frequent Communion, Holy Hours, and visits to the Blessed Sacrament into school traditions; as well as their promotion of Catholic book clubs, the Catholic press, and mission fundraising.⁵⁷ “About fifteen priests were in the audience,” noted Bauer, “but they did not enter into the discussions.”⁵⁸

From the federation’s inception, however, its student leaders situated their conversation within the framework of Reiner’s original, four-pronged committee structure as established in the Loyola Sodality. Conference topics, Reiner had promised, would “offer ample opportunities for training in and for the exercise of the lay apostolate which is one of the prime functions of Catholic education”; and, in the interests of that training and education, presentations and discussions adhered to his divisions of practice and “loyalty.”⁵⁹ For instance, in regard to the Eucharistic-Our Lady Committee’s promotion of “loyalty” to the Persons of Christ and Mary, student Genevieve Doyle of Visitation High began the first meeting with a presentation on “The Catholic Student and the Holy Eucharist.” Continuing through the other three loyalties, Mary Weimar of Rosary College spoke on “The Catholic Student and the Missions”; William Rafferty and Paul Plunkett of Loyola and Francis McMahon of DePaul, on “The Catholic Student and Catholic Literature”; Loyolans William J. Conley, J. Francis Walsh, and Maurice McCarthy, on “The Catholic Student and Catholic Action.”⁶⁰ Reiner, a particular

⁵⁷ “First Chicago Catholic Student Conference on Religious Activities,” *The Columbian*, LX (3 June 1927): 1; quoted in Bauer, “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 12.

⁵⁸ Bauer, “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 11.

⁵⁹ Bauer, “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 8.

⁶⁰ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), 19-20, in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4.

advocate of chivalrous conduct toward women, later used Maurice McCarthy and DePaul student Miss Hassett's observations on "Respect for Women" to jumpstart his nationwide "Respect for Women Crusade." In 1927 it was also Reiner who suggested the federation's official title of CISCORA, or Chicago Inter-Student Conference On Religious Activities.⁶¹ While university, college, and high school students were the group's visible representatives and workers, their initiative necessarily conformed to the shape of Reiner's vision—as was consistent with their role as Catholic Action "lay apostles," participants "in the mission of the clergy."

Bauer's account of the federation's initial meeting suggested that other Catholic educators interpreted the new organization in terms of both institutional influence and prestige, and the need for student leadership training. For instance, Bauer observed that W.I. Lonergan, S.J., the editor of *America*, lauded CISCORA's first meeting as "the inception of a movement that will set other colleges thinking, because it will give an impetus to extra-mural student body activities that are wholly religious and because it is the initial stepping out of one of our universities into local scholastic life in a way to influence the religious atmosphere...." Lonergan went on to write that CISCORA "suggests a new way, too, in which to divert the modern student body... to be leaders in their own groups."⁶²

⁶¹ "Crusaders in Student Catholic Action," (1935), 28, in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4.

⁶² W.I. Lonergan, S.J. to James Mertz, S.J. (21 May 1927), quoted in Sister Mary Roberta Bauer, S.S.N.D., "CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists," 9.

Indeed, whether due to sincerity or image construction, in 1927 praise of CISCORA expressed surprise and wonder at the straightforward, down-to-earth qualities of its student leadership. Reporting on CISCORA's founding convention, an article in the Catholic magazine *The Columbian* remarked on students' enthusiasm, wit, and ability to focus: "The unflagging interest of the delegates was maintained by the snappy, crisp, pointed, frequently very humorous remarks of the delegates themselves of whom not less than forty made contributions to the discussions..."⁶³ A retrospective noted that the 1927 convention's "Respect for Women" presentation "prompted a priest to remark that same evening that he had often heard this subject treated but never more delicately, more pointedly, or more impressively than by these students [McCarthy and Hassett]." The presentation was lauded as a "well-defined, unambiguous statement."⁶⁴ Later, the 1935 account praised high-school student Genevieve Doyle for speaking "simply and spontaneously, as though to speak on so deeply religious a subject were as natural for Catholic students as to speak on study or recreation."⁶⁵ These published remarks on the student convention reveal a value for precision, professionalism, and off-the-cuff honesty.

Privately, Reiner also expressed to Lord his pleasure at CISCORA students' businesslike, practical optimism. "I attend a great many conventions and meetings and am something of a convention-hound," he wrote. "I think I can say, in all sincerity, that

⁶³ "First Chicago Catholic Student Conference on Religious Activities," *The Columbian* (3 June 1927): 1; quoted in Sister Mary Roberta Bauer, S.S.N.D., "CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists," 12.

⁶⁴ "Crusaders in Student Catholic Action," (1935), 19-20, in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 19-20.

⁶⁵ "Crusaders in Student Catholic Action," (1935), 19-20.

this conference approached more closely to my ideal of a convention than any I have yet attended. The bombast, the ‘padding,’ the ‘stalling’ that are so characteristic of most conventions were totally absent....” However, students’ demonstrated ability to run a successful meeting did not decrease Reiner’s sense of their need for ongoing guidance. Indeed, he wrote, “[t]he sacredness of a teacher’s vocation was never brought home to me more forcibly and the thought of the privilege I have of working with such fine material made me fairly shudder as I reflected on my responsibility.”⁶⁶

Although CISCORA’s original concept had been fairly simple and informal—that the student officers and members of religious organizations would meet three times per year to exchange ideas on religious projects—necessity soon pushed Reiner to elaborate upon the original, four-committee structure in ways that would respect the autonomy and dignity of the separate institutions while also re-inforcing the hierarchy of college and high school, educator and student, clergy and laity.

Following the pattern of most Catholic extracurricular associations, the CISCORA federation had a clerical moderator who guided and policed the boundaries of student activity. Recognizing the moderator as first of six “officers” of the federation, the CISCORA constitution gave its moderator disproportionate power to veto, if he chose, “any action of the Conference, its officers, or committees” that he deemed objectionable.⁶⁷ Other officers—president, vice-president, recording secretary, corresponding secretary, and treasurer—were the purview of students; and Reiner

⁶⁶ Reiner to Lord, (3 June 1927), quoted in Bauer, “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 13.

⁶⁷ “Constitution of CISCORA,” [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 7.

specified that in CISCORA these prominent positions should go to the college and university students rather than the high-schoolers.

Election procedures, however, recognized the educational institution (and, by extension, its extracurricular moderators) over the individual student leader. Once each year, one representative of each CISCORA school cast his or her ballot, not for a person, but for an institution, the presidency going to the school receiving the highest number of votes; the vice-presidency, to the second-highest number; and so forth. Once a school had won a particular office, the president of its religious organization filled that school's elected office in CISCORA.⁶⁸ The federation's re-organization in 1934 changed the election procedures only slightly, granting the moderators of school religious organizations the power to choose which student filled that school's elected office.⁶⁹ These procedures would persist until 1942, when amendments to the federation's constitution allowed for the nomination of individual students, with only two relevant restrictions: that each nominated students be approved or "passed" by his or her institution's moderator; and that the president must always be a collegian.⁷⁰ Although subject to vote, CISCORA's executive positions remained remarkably stable: for example, Loyola would hold the presidency and Mundelein College, the secretariat, for over twenty continuous years.

⁶⁸ "Constitution of CISCORA," [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 7.

⁶⁹ "Constitution of CISCA" [1934], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 10.

⁷⁰ "Amendments to the Constitution of CISCA" [1942], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 10.

Also as in the Loyola Sodality, Reiner's four loyalties translated into four standing committees: Eucharistic-Our Lady, Apostolic, Literature, and Social Action. These four standing committees met at the discretion of their student chairmen—typically about once each month-- to discuss religious issues and recommend projects for integrating religion with daily life. According to CISCORA's 1927 constitution, the president appointed committee chairmen with the approval of the other officers; however, an undated document states that Reiner, deeming it appropriate to award committee chairmanships to college and university rather than high school students, assigned DePaul University, St. Xavier's College, Rosary College, and the Chicago Teacher's College each one standing committee, to which each school appointed a chair.⁷¹ Regardless of the exact procedure, CISCORA drew its committee chairmen as well as officers from the collegiate educational level, structuring a hierarchy of leadership within this elaborate extracurricular bureaucracy.

Beneath the committees of college men and women, Reiner organized the high school religious organizations into distinct "subcommittees," each tasked with implementing its standing committee's recommendations. Over a period of time, subcommittees tackled separate, recommended projects of their own choosing, and then reported the results to one of the monthly committee meetings: for example, in 1934 the collegiate Eucharistic-Our Lady Committee presided over thirteen high school

⁷¹ "Constitution of CISCORA,"[n.d.]; "The CISCA Organization, Pro and Con," [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 14.

subcommittees, one of which studied the liturgy while another practiced mental prayer.⁷²

On a rotating basis subcommittee students also had the opportunity to host and direct the larger committee meetings at their own high schools.⁷³ Since CISCORA identified each subcommittee with the student religious organization of a particular high school, subcommittee work in general relied on pre-existing organizational procedures and social relationships, with which CISCORA's constitution prohibited interference.

Three times each year CISCORA committees and subcommittees came together in a massive General Meeting, which rotated among the various universities, colleges, and high schools and reportedly drew together as many as 2,000 students from across Chicago.⁷⁴ Held on a Saturday, these meetings—consisting largely of various committee and subcommittee reports as well as student-run discussions--usually occupied an entire nine-to-five day. In 1931, for example, Loyola hosted a General Meeting that opened with a 9 AM Mass at nearby St. Ignatius Parish. An address by honored visitor Daniel Lord, S.J., was followed by the reports of seven CISCORA officers and committee chairmen, as well as an additional six subcommittee chairmen, for a total of thirteen separate reports in a single morning. After lunch, students from Loyola, Rosary, and St. Xavier presented a “Symposium on Catholic Social Action” consisting of another four individual talks on the topics of social action, family, recreation, and Catholic study clubs. The General Meeting closed at 5 PM with Benediction of the Blessed

⁷² “CISCORA: Chicago Catholic Student Conference on Religious Activities,” [1934]., CISCORA Records, Box 1 Folder 8.

⁷³ “CISCORA: Chicago Catholic Student Conference on Religious Activities,” [1934]., 2.

⁷⁴ Agendas, CISCORA General Meetings (1931-1932), CISCORA Records, Box 2 Folder 18.

Sacrament.⁷⁵ Similarly, a 1932 meeting held at Immaculata High School devoted the entire morning to committee and subcommittee reports, and the afternoon to a student-run “symposium,” this one on “Catholic Social Action and Bolshevism.”⁷⁶

CISCORA pamphlets and histories frequently praised the committee/subcommittee structure for connecting Catholic high school and college students in a constructive and educational way that also played to the competitive “school spirit” of the individual institutions. For example, the 1935 account claimed that the interaction between college and high school students brought out the strengths of each age group, promoting the translation of abstract theology into concrete works. “Each group has something to offer the other,” argued the writer. “Mature consideration of ideas comes usually from the college students; zeal and enthusiasm are invariably produced by the younger participants.”⁷⁷ Similarly, an anonymous historical typescript (1934) observed that, at the monthly committee meetings, collegiate chairmen could rely on hearing something “definite and practical” from the high school subcommittees, which in turn benefited from the college students’ theoretical knowledge.⁷⁸ Also, the writer argued, the subcommittee system gave each institution the opportunity to lead and to exhibit its accomplishments, so that “[e]very school feels it has a stake in CISCORA,” as

⁷⁵ Agendas, CISCORA General Meeting (28 November 1931), CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 18.

⁷⁶ Agendas, CISCORA General Meeting (5 May 1932) CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 18.

⁷⁷ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 26.

⁷⁸ “CISCORA: Chicago Catholic Student Conference on Religious Activities,” [1934], 2, in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 8.

well as an institutional reputation to uphold. Competitive school spirit assisted religious feelings in motivating students to conceive and complete projects.⁷⁹

Promoters also lauded the committee/subcommittee system for cultivating leadership skills that would benefit other student and adult organizations and, eventually, promote successful careers. CISCORA's adherence to Robert's Rules of Order, argued one pamphlet, taught students the parliamentary procedure that later would assist their entry into politics and other forms of committee work. Officers and chairmen could gain valuable experience in running large meetings: for example, in each term the CISCORA president ran three General Meetings of 1200-1800 delegates, while other officers conducted weekly or monthly meetings of as many as 175 delegates.⁸⁰ Also, since the subcommittee system offered each high school's students the chance to run one of the larger monthly committee meetings, high school students, too, could be gradually introduced to the leadership roles that they would play (or be expected to play) as collegians and professionals. "Ciscora adopted procedures and practices with a view to their educational value," Bauer explained in 1945. "Personality traits, such as poise, initiative, reliability, responsibility, courtesy, self-reliance, and tact were cultivated. The experience acquired by the students in leading discussions, making reports, or acting as chairmen of the meetings, [would] serve them in good stead in social and business

⁷⁹ "CISCORA: Chicago Catholic Student Conference on Religious Activities," [1934]., 2.

⁸⁰ "Crusaders in Student Catholic Action," 6.

contacts, whether religious or secular.”⁸¹ In 1934 CISCORA was touted as cultivating “self-reliance, initiative, resourcefulness.”⁸²

Despite the niceties of structure and procedure, Loyola students themselves often advertised CISCORA and Sodality meetings as freewheeling and democratic, offering individual students the opportunity to lead. “A unique feature of the [Sodality] convention is that no prepared speeches will be given,” the *Loyola News* assured readers in May 1930. “After a sodalist introduces a discussion, it is then thrown open to the house, any delegate so desiring having an opportunity to air his views of the subject.” This system, insisted the article “has brought out the brilliant ideas which may occur spontaneously in informal speech.”⁸³ In advertising the CISCORA General Meeting of November 1, 1930, the *Loyola News* emphasized that “[t]here will be plenty of opportunities for extemporaneous speaking and impromptu discussion, so if you have anything to say rest assured that you will be given the chance to talk at whatever length you may require. If the present conference runs true to precedent, the discussion will wax rather warm, affording a splendid opportunity to everybody to rise and speak their mind...”⁸⁴ Such accounts downplay the role of organization and moderation to present CISCORA as open, unstructured, even a little rebellious—as indeed it might have seemed in contrast to other Catholic organizations.

⁸¹ Bauer, “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 23.

⁸² “CISCORA: Chicago Catholic Student Conference on Religious Activities,” [1934]., CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 8.

⁸³ “Plan Sodality Convention for June 20, 21, 22,” *Loyola News* (30 April 1930): 3.

⁸⁴ Francis Steinbrecher, “CISCORA Notes,” *Loyola News* (28 October 1930): 2.

Apparently committed to the policy of student leadership, Reiner—frequently described as “self-effacing”—did step back and offer students the limelight in some concrete ways.⁸⁵ For example, when in 1934 high-school student John Langdon invited Reiner to advise a CISCORA Catholic writers’ circle at Loyola Academy, Reiner gently declined, replying that “...I have always gone on the principle that CISCORA projects are student projects and that it behooves the moderator to keep in the background.” Instead, he suggested, Langdon might seek a college student from Loyola, Mundelein, Rosary, or St. Xavier to moderate the high school group.⁸⁶ True to Reiner’s policy, the Depression-era CISCORA histories also emphasized students’ role in initiating and shaping the federation’s mission, presenting clerical, faculty, and administrative roles as confined to praising or assisting students’ efforts.

By contrast, later histories strongly emphasized Reiner’s constructive role in CISCORA and CISCA. While earlier interpretations gave Loyola student Robert Hartnett greater credit for initiating and organizing the federation, a 1944 typescript stated that “Having indoctrinated the prefect of the Loyola Sodality, Bob Harnett, *Father’s plan* came into being...” [italics mine]. It was Reiner, the typescript insisted, who first suggested the expansion of Loyola Sodality’s program into the other Catholic schools. This history also pointed out that, while Reiner himself did not moderate

⁸⁵ Edmund J. Fortman, S.J., *A Biographical History of the Chicago Province*, (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1987), 49-51.

⁸⁶ Reiner to John Langdon, 15 March 1934, CISCA Records Box 6 Folder 4.

CISCORA until 1932, its moderators were always Loyola Jesuits who maintained close contact with Reiner.⁸⁷

Significantly, this 1944 interpretation also depicted Reiner as indirectly shaping, perhaps even manipulating, the progress of CISCORA meetings and their “impromptu” discussions. Every Saturday he attended as many committee meetings as possible, slipping silently into the back row of seats. “Somewhere in the crowd—did you see him?—in the rear probably, was a quiet figure who stepped from one listener to another, whispering suggestions that were to kindle the spark of discussion later, slipping cards of written advice to the chairman, to speakers among the audience,” related the 1944 pamphlet. Before the meetings he would prepare committee chairmen and members with mimeographed discussion sheets; and afterward, he would follow up with phone calls.⁸⁸ The agendas, whispered hints, and unobtrusively passed notes suggested that, to some extent, students acted as Reiner’s spokesmen rather than as independent thinkers: indeed, St. Scholastica moderator Sister M. Cecilia Himebaugh (no fan of Reiner’s) once characterized CISCORA officers and chairmen as “Reiner’s stooges.”⁸⁹ In the calmer phrasing of the 1935 pamphlet, Reiner was an “obscure but ever present figure”—a subtle paradox that probably captured the ambiguity of his role as clerical, administrative moderator of an organization of lay student leaders.⁹⁰

⁸⁷ The History of CISCA, 1926-1944,” CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 11: 3.

⁸⁸ “The History of CISCA, 1926-1944,” CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 11: 3.

⁸⁹ Himebaugh to Carrabine, 9 March 1937, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 2.

⁹⁰ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 6.

The moderator's role becomes even more ambiguous in light of summertime "spiritual leadership training" that encouraged lay students to stand up to their clerical moderators with fearless alacrity. At Father Lord's 1934 Summer School of Spiritual Leadership, for instance, a CISCORA member from Mundelein College reportedly led students in opposing a priest's opinion. "In a discussion ensuing from the resolution condemning salacious literature, Father Lebuffe suggested that our young men of today and especially our young ladies have lost a certain sense of decency," began the newsletter account. "In a stirring reply to the challenge, Mary Agnes Tynan, of Mundelein College, Chicago, said that our generation is a 'rose in the slums,' emerging victorious and comparatively unstained from the particularly unwholesome environment of the post-war period. We are the victims of the generation preceding us, and have not accepted a pagan attitude. The discussion brought forth many examples of how youth does live up to a high code of decency..."⁹¹ It is unclear to what degree Tynan's opposition was scripted. Was this a formal, constructed exchange intended to provoke further discussion--or a free-flowing conversation to which Tynan spontaneously contributed? Had someone handed her a notecard? Regardless, the report—appearing in *Sodalight*, the official newsletter of the Leadership convention—presented Tynan's assertiveness in a positive light, implying that her willingness to engage and argue, even with clergy, represented the sort of student leadership that the new Sodality movement hoped to cultivate.

A tantalizing description of another conference, however, hints at the boundaries of CISCORA student leadership. At the February 1930 General Meeting held at

⁹¹ "Defense of Youth," *Sodalight* (15 July 1934): 4, in CISCA Records Box 3 Folder 1.

Providence High, Loyola student Joseph Walsh “open[ed] the discussion with a speech on the Fundamental Principles of the Sodality” before an audience of 1,200 Catholic students. Daringly, Walsh questioned CISCORA’s current program of social formation (set by Lord and Reiner) and called for a return to the Jesuit Sodality’s traditional roots. “In his speech Mr. Walsh suggested a more perfect adherence to the fundamental principle of the Sodality—Personal Holiness—and that the external features [such] as Parish Loyalty be given less emphasis....,” reported the *Loyola News*. However, the newspaper account suggests that Walsh’s proposal was swept under the rug: “On account of the extremely large attendance and the anxiety on the part of the students to speak, the discussion was necessarily cut short so that other important topics could be brought up.”⁹² Who, precisely, had cut it short—whether moderator, student chairman, or group of students—was left unstated. Still, the fact remained that a student had challenged CISCORA’s entire direction; but when the student presented the challenge for public discussion, somehow “other important topics” superseded it. A student conference reputedly eager to debate anything and everything, refused to publicly question—or possibly, was discouraged or prevented from questioning--the overarching social agenda set by Lord and Reiner. There student initiative apparently found its limit. As was consistent with its understanding of the “lay apostolate” as “the participation of the laity in the apostolate of the hierarchy,” CISCORA ultimately belonged to the Jesuits.

⁹² “Sodalists Meet, Pray, Talk, Dance at W. Side Convention,” *Loyola News* (26 February 1930): 1, 3; 1.

Co-ordinating CISCORA Activities

As international pressure upon the Church increased in the early 1930s, clergy and religious increasingly asserted their authority over CISCORA activities in an effort to maintain Church influence and efficiently combat Catholicism's enemies. From the clergy's perspective, lay subordination would have been less a matter of power-hunger or prejudice than of administering the Catholic Church's high-stakes struggle against secular culture, particularly international Communism. In Russia and Mexico, revolutions had recently destroyed Church institutions and sent clergy into hiding. By 1933, Germany's National Socialist government was dispersing Protestant groups and, in violation of a formal Concordant with the Vatican, gradually closing in on Catholic Church property. Depression-era America seemed fertile ground for atheistic socialism. Metaphorically, the "Church Militant"⁹³ was at war—and Catholic Action was the drafting of laity into military units commanded by priests, with their diocesan bishops as generals. Like military officers, clergy expected lay "soldiers" to face the enemy with courage and resourcefulness, but to rely on their clerical commanders for strategy and large-scale co-ordination.

Catholic student media encouraged Sodalists to strengthen Catholic Action's chain of command by placing CISCORA organization in the context of international struggles. In 1931, for instance, after hearing visitor Fr. Miquel Miranda speak on Catholic student organization in Mexico, *Skyscraper* editorialized that "the close contact

⁹³ The "Church Militant" is the traditional phrase for Catholics on earth, as opposed to the "Church Triumphant" (Catholics in heaven) and the Church Suffering (Catholics in purgatory). Although representing different spiritual conditions, the three factions together comprise the universal Catholic Church--the Mystical Body of Christ--to which divisions of time and space are irrelevant.

maintained between the [Mexican] student groups and the Catholic leaders” was successfully counteracting the “materialistic and atheistic teaching” that students encountered in class. “Indeed, Mexico is setting us an example in Catholic Action,” the editorial declared. “...Our country offers innumerable opportunities for progress in Catholic Action, and still we have all we can do to keep up with our southern sister. We have here numerous Catholic colleges and universities where young men and women are trained to be real intellectual leaders and promoters of Catholic Action. Must we have a persecution before young America will have the courage and spirit to lift the banner of Catholic Action and carry it high, before *all* Catholic college and university students will join forces in the great work of Catholic Action in the United States?”⁹⁴ The appeal was to national pride and the guilt of privilege, as well as Catholic unity; and the message was that “close contact” between students and Church leadership was reconstructing Catholicism in Mexico.

Similarly, in 1933 communication with European youth sodalities seemingly inspired *CISCORA News* editors (Mundelein College students) with somewhat of an inferiority complex concerning the contrast of European groups’ seemingly tighter, more centralized administration with CISCORA’s looser federation. After entertaining visitor Dr. Wilhelm Solzbacher, secretary of the World League of Catholic Youth and member of Germany’s National Council of Catholic Youth, and reviewing the newspapers of two Austrian sodalities, the editors reported that the embattled German and Austrian Catholic youth groups appeared to work together in greater co-operation and solidarity than did

⁹⁴ “Catholic Action in Mexico,” *Skyscraper* (30 April 1931): 2.

American students. Sodalists abroad wore uniforms, *CISCORA News* noted admiringly; also they had an official song—“which of course, we have too,” the newspaper was quick to add.⁹⁵ After implying envy of European sodalists’ more centralized organization, it was likely no coincidence that, thereafter, *CISCORA News* regularly reported on the progress of “sodality unions” (similar to CISCORA) in Kansas City and Detroit.⁹⁶

Although offering no observation of lay-clerical relations, this commentary on German and Austrian youth groups suggests that international examples of Catholic Action organization encouraged CISCORA student leaders to value greater focus and efficiency.

Thus far focus and efficiency were exactly what CISCORA seemed to lack. In 1930-31 CISCORA’s most comprehensive endeavor comprised 150 CISCORA high school and college students, led by sophomore William Wilkins of Loyola, who taught catechism to public-school children in populous “foreign sections” of Chicago that required more attention than clergy could provide.⁹⁷ Otherwise, the separate institutional subcommittees developed their own independent projects and reported back to their committee meetings, which functioned less as an authority structure than as a simple means of communication.

In the early 1930s CISCORA’s clerical and student leadership began to push for a greater consolidation of the federation’s activities. In March 1931, for instance, the *News* reported that students of CISCORA’s Publicity Committee, “in attempting to arrange a

⁹⁵ *CISCORA News*, v. IV no. 2 (February 1933): 1, in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 9; European Sodality Chronicle,” *CISCORA News* (May 1933) in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 9: 3.

⁹⁶ “News from the Neighbors,” *CISCORA News* (May 1933) in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 9: 3.

⁹⁷ “CISCORA Notes,” *Loyola News* (2 March 1931): 2.

publicity campaign, discovered that, with the exception of Catechetical work, no common activity for the Colleges and High Schools of the Conference exists.” In consequence, it was thought necessary to call a Directors’ meeting to define “new interests of Ciscora.”⁹⁸ As an outcome, the following *Loyola News* issue announced “two enterprises, one to be supported by the combined units of Ciscora, and the other to be developed by the Loyola U. Sodality under the direction of Father Le May.” The “combined units” enterprise would be the distribution of Catholic literature; the Loyola Sodality’s individual project would involve supporting Jesuit missions.⁹⁹ Thus, beginning in March 1931 the Loyola Sodality collected money and canceled stamps for the benefit of Jesuit missionaries in India, Honduras, Wyoming and South Dakota; and Mundelein students likewise took on sponsorship of “Little Bronze Angel” mission in Marty, South Dakota. By the end of March, Mundelein students had already collected \$28 for the mission.¹⁰⁰ Like other CISCORA schools, Loyola and Mundelein Sodality committees promoted and sold Lord’s religious pamphlets in addition to Catholic journals sponsored by clergy, such as the Jesuits’ *America* and *The Queen’s Work*.¹⁰¹ Statistics on the sale of Catholic publications at individual high schools and colleges began to appear regularly in the pages of *The New World*, Chicago’s Archdiocesan newspaper, so that the schools seemed to compete with one another for the greatest achievement in literature distribution.¹⁰²

⁹⁸ “CISCORA Notes,” *Loyola News* (17 March 1931): 4.

⁹⁹ “CISCORA,” *Loyola News* (31 March 1931): 3.

¹⁰⁰ “Mission Unit Aids Indians,” *Skyscraper* (27 March 1931): 3.

¹⁰¹ “CISCORA,” *Loyola News* (14 April 1931): 2.

¹⁰² “CISCORA,” *Loyola News* (14 April 1931): 2.

After visiting Chicago and attending CISCORA meetings in Spring 1931, *Queen's Work* director Gerald A. Fitzgibbons, S.J. also concluded that a re-organization of CISCORA would be necessary in order to bring the individual student groups into accordance with Fr. Lord's published plan *The ABC of Sodality Organization*. "The national Sodality organization plan was introduced to the Archdiocesan colleges and high schools three seasons ago. Since that time a large number of sodalists have either neglected or disregarded the Sodality plan, which almost all had enthusiastically adopted," the *Skyscraper* reported in explanation of Fitzgibbons' views. At Mundelein College, Fitzgibbons further proposed to the College's Student Activities Council that coordination among the Sodality's individual committees be increased by articulating monthly agendas which each committee would support in its own way. "For example," *Skyscraper* explained,

"...let us say that the Sodality decides upon December for 'mission month.' Then during December the Mission Committee would sponsor a tag day, perhaps, for the missions; or perhaps they would have each Sodalist pledge herself to make something for the missions. While the Mission committee is doing these things, the Literature Committee might advertise missionary magazines and periodicals, such as the *Far East*, the *Colored Harvest*, or *Jesuit Missions*. The Eucharistic Committee might ask for prayers and Holy Communion for the missions."¹⁰³

Mundelein's Sodality implemented Fitzgibbon's suggestion by devoting November 1931 to the promotion of Catholic literature; and February was conceded to be "Catholic Press Month."¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ "Sodalists Hear National Director," *Skyscraper* (29 May 1931): 3.

¹⁰⁴ "Feature Catholic Press This Month," *Skyscraper* (23 February 1932): 1.

CISCORA's most prominent co-operative endeavor, however, was public support of the Hays Code, a voluntary set of moral standards that Fr. Lord and journalist Martin Quigley (a parishioner of St. Ignatius Church in Rogers Park) composed in 1929 at the request of Hollywood regulator Will H. Hays, who in March 1930 submitted it to the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America (MPPDA).¹⁰⁵ By 1931, students—particularly at Loyola's Arts campus—would have been aware of the Hays Code and of local Catholics' potential role in its enforcement. Fresh from meetings in California, "where he [Lord] came into the closest possible contact with the motion picture industry," as soon as March 1930 Fr. Lord had presented a series of lectures at St. Ignatius Church's Loyola Community Theater "on what is going on in Hollywood, along with the talking picture."¹⁰⁶ No doubt the Hays Code had figured in the program. Reception of Lord's talks must have been enthusiastic: within weeks of his visit, Rogers Park Catholics had mobilized in protest of a controversial movie, *Party Girl*, which the local Granada Theater had scheduled for the first weeks of April 1930.

Initially banned by the Chicago censorship board for its depiction of an immoral lifestyle, *Party Girl* had been permitted within Chicago city limits by special court injunction after film agents pressed their case to Judge William J. Lindsay. Naturally, *Chicago Tribune* movie advertisements as well as theaters' "huge canvas streamers" had made the most of the controversy, promoting *Party Girl* as shown "by special injunction only." According to a June 1930 article in *Queen's Work*, when St. Ignatius pastor

¹⁰⁵ James M. Skinner, *The Cross and the Cinema: The Legion of Decency and the National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures, 1933-1970* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1993), 14.

¹⁰⁶ "'Everyman,' Fr. Lord, Are L.C.T. Features," *Loyola News* (12 March 1930): 3.

Fitzgeorge Dineen, a founding member and advisor of the city censorship board, heard that *Party Girl* would run at the Granada Theater--which had been built on the original site of St. Ignatius parish, only a few blocks from the present church building as well as Loyola University's Arts campus—he used the pulpit to propose a co-ordinated campaign of protest to St. Ignatius parishioners.¹⁰⁷

Lord's Sodality students were encouraged to view the Catholic community's response as an inspiring example of what ordinary Catholics could achieve through organization and assertiveness. *Queen's Work* reported that Catholics of St. Ignatius and seven other nearby parishes sent the theater corporation over 7,000 letters which "conveyed the information that literally thousands of families in the eight parishes of the Loyola district would no longer patronize the Granada Theater." Catholic associations, such as the Knights of Columbus, sent over twenty telegrams; and telephone calls, exulted *Queen's Work*, became so numerous that the corporation reportedly required two extra clerks to field them. Meanwhile "a representative of the combined Catholic groups of the city" met with Judge Lindsay, who soon afterward revoked his injunction permitting *Party Girl*--a move that effectively closed the Granada Theater for the remainder of the movie's scheduled run. While *Queen's Work* attributed Lindsay's action to the organized pressure of Chicago Catholics, the *Chicago Tribune* reported that Lindsay, upon viewing *Party Girl* in a downtown theater, had observed the admittance of underage patrons and chose to punish the city's theaters accordingly. Perhaps the latter was his face-saving excuse for submitting to censorship advocates. Regardless, *Queen's*

¹⁰⁷ "The Dark Marquee: Chicago Catholics Win Brilliant Fight against Showmen," *Queen's Work* (June 1930): 1, 3, 10.

Work celebrated the Granada's "dark marquee" as a Catholic cultural victory: "...[A]s an example of united and vigorous Catholic Action this story is one that might be read with profit by those whom it may concern. And the moral of it all seems to be 'Go and do likewise.'"¹⁰⁸

At the national level, however, the Hays Code soon lost credibility with Depression-hit studios that sought to lure reluctant moviegoers with increasingly racy offerings.¹⁰⁹ Rather than protest the numerous "offensive" films, however, in February 1931 CISCORA elected to promote movies that met the standards of the Hays Office, thereby channeling audiences—and hopefully, profits--toward the "decent" films. "'Morality and the Theater' was the subject of a talk by Betty Lapp, of St. Scholastica's [Academy]," *Skyscraper* reported of the February General Meeting. "The keynote of the talk was 'Clean out the movies,' with further remarks giving arguments and reasons for so doing. The movie producers and directors have adopted a moral code... This moral code will not be followed unless it proves satisfactory in regard to box office receipts." In response to Lapp's persuasions, CISCORA students resolved to appoint a committee, chaired by Lapp, to review the "clean" movies, "report on their dramatic merit, and... sell them to the public."¹¹⁰

The Movie Committee's "public" largely comprised their fellow Catholic students, as the *Loyola News* later clarified. "The Movie Committee intends to advertise

¹⁰⁸ "The Dark Marquee: Chicago Catholics Win Brilliant Fight against Showmen," *Queen's Work* (June 1930): 1, 3, 10.

¹⁰⁹ Skinner, *The Cross and the Cinema*, 15-19.

¹¹⁰ "Ciscora Meets at Providence," *Skyscraper* (27 February 1931): 4.

within the schools of the Chicago Conference pictures which are listed under the existing moral code of movie productions,” stated the *News*. “It is believed that producers’ response to increasing patronage of clean plays will in future assure the public of clean and moral shows.”¹¹¹ While the Movie Committee’s six permanent subcommittees originally arranged to preview movies at Chicago’s censorship office, the activity was subsequently moved to the Loop theaters, perhaps to avoid an appearance of collaboration between the city censorship board and the Church.¹¹² By May the committee, which included a number of Loyola students, had distributed its reviews of six “outstanding” movies throughout Chicago’s Catholic schools and also initiated a petition for the suppression of “immoral” movie advertising, which petition it asked the school sodalities to circulate among their membership.¹¹³

Informally, CISCORA students also attempted to use the power of wholesome, controlled entertainment to relate to fellow students and demonstrate their participation in their schools’ campus life. To coax unwilling children into class, Catechetical Committee members had learned “first to gain the friendship and confidence of the children by means of games and other interesting diversions, and then gradually to bring them to the point where they will be willing to join the catechetical classes”—and it seemed that this method applied to fellow college students as well.¹¹⁴ Defending

¹¹¹ “CISCORA Notes,” *Loyola News* (17 March 1931): 4.

¹¹² “CISCORA,” *Loyola News* (14 April 1931): 2.

¹¹³ “CISCORA,” *Loyola News* (31 March 1931): 3; Ciscora Conference Held at Mundelein,” *Skyscraper* (29 May 1931): 1, 4; 1.

¹¹⁴ “Ciscora Meets; Social Service Is Discussed,” *Loyola News* (25 November 1930): 3.

CISCORA against the charge of being a “narrow-minded, fanatically pious, and ‘kids’ organization,” in 1931 a Loyola columnist advertised, as evidence of CISCORA’s “youthful and modern atmosphere,” that “[d]ancing is always a prominent feature of each gathering, and other forms of most enjoyable entertainment are often provided.”¹¹⁵ Reporting on the February 1931 General Meeting at Providence High School, the *Loyola News* dwelled as much on the meeting’s opportunities for fun and humor as on CISCORA business. “Dancing in the High School Gymnasium by the students heralded the intermission for luncheon,” reported the columnist, while “[t]he afternoon session opened with a singing of parodies composed exclusively by members of the Chicago Conference.” At that same meeting, Loyola student Frank Garvey spoke on the use of visual aids, such as slides, in illustrating Sodality promotional speeches.¹¹⁶ On the university Arts campus, Loyola Sodalists organized intermural athletic teams that competed as “Sodality” against other extracurricular organizations, including fraternities. Many CISCORA activities of the early 1930s demonstrated, not only students’ willingness to organize against entertainments that the Church opposed, but also their desire to use supervised recreation to attract and relate to their less religious peers—as well as, one might guess, simply to create some inexpensive fun in an era of restricted incomes.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ “CISCORA,” *Loyola News* (24 February 1931): 3.

¹¹⁶ “Ciscora Meets in Convention at Providence,” *Loyola News* (24 February 1931): 4.

¹¹⁷ CISCORA’s openness to dancing and other popular entertainments within a chaperoned atmosphere posed a marked contrast to contemporary student religious organizations at fundamentalist Protestant institutions such as Wheaton College, Baylor University, and Calvin College, where moral concerns excluded many popular activities, especially dancing. See Lori Witt, “More Than a ‘Slaving Wife’: The

Overall, however, in the early 1930s a mild, but real, centralizing trend in CISCORA gave Jesuits increased control over the activities of individual units. While students continued to lead and influence one another, clergy shaped the organization as a whole—as was consistent with the concept of “the participation of the laity in the apostolate of the hierarchy.”

Infiltrating the campus, 1930-1934

At Loyola, however, the increasingly coercive elements of Catholic “ramification” continued to conflict with older “campus life” traditions and assumptions, a prominent example being the 1930 dispute over mandatory Mass attendance at the Lake Shore Campus. The weekly Arts Mass was new to Loyola. Inaugurated after the Eucharistic Congress of 1926, it had replaced a weekly chapel service of sermon and Benediction established only three years previous.¹¹⁸ In 1927 Loyola’s medical school established a corresponding weekly Mass at the West Side parish of St. Jarlath “as a means of fostering a spirit of militant and co-operative Catholicism among aspiring doctors.” As “the first and only Mass of its kind in the city”—meaning, the only one specifically for medical students—this medical school Mass was praised as an enhancement of Loyola’s Catholicity, as well as a means of converting non-Catholic professional students to the Catholic faith.¹¹⁹ Still, its attendance was voluntary—

Limits, Possibilities, and Meaning of Womanhood for Conservative Protestant College Women in the 1920s and 1930s,” (Dissertation, Loyola University Chicago, 2001).

¹¹⁸ “Weekly Mass at Arts Is Truly a Valuable Asset,” *Loyola News* (30 April 1930): 3.

¹¹⁹ “Weekly Mass Attended by Medical Students,” *Loyola News* (18 November 1930): 1.

encouraged, but certainly not required.¹²⁰ By contrast, at the Lake Shore (Arts) Campus, Sodality members collected Mass attendance tickets from freshmen, sophomores, and juniors, leaving only the fourth-year undergraduates to enjoy the “senior privilege” of voluntary attendance.¹²¹

Emphasis on liturgical attendance increased in 1930 and 1931 as the elimination of varsity football deprived the student community of a major rallying point.¹²² While financial hardship formed the basis of President Robert M. Kelley, S.J.’s decision to abolish Loyola’s football program after its 1930 season, a slew of student editorials quickly spun the decision as a moral choice—a noble repudiation of student athletics as “big business”—that would foster a more democratic and inclusive approach to Loyola community integration. For example, argued *Loyola News*, replacing varsity football with an expanded program of intramural athletics would allow every student to participate in university sports, thereby promoting a stronger sense of student communal unity and interdependence.¹²³ Reflecting both Catholic values and Americans’

¹²⁰ “Mass for West Side Campuses at St. Jarlath’s,” *Loyola News* (22 November 1932): 3.

¹²¹ “Seniors Lose Assembly and Mass Privilege,” *Loyola News* (23 September 1930): 1.

¹²² In 1939 De Paul University also abolished its varsity football program. Thomas G. Hitcho, “A Descriptive and Exploratory Case Study of the Evolution of Intercollegiate Athletics and Education at Loyola University Chicago, 1922-1994,” (Dissertation, Loyola University Chicago, 1996): 39-41

¹²³ Hitcho, “A Descriptive and Exploratory Case Study...,” 39-41; “Varsity Football Abolished,” *Loyola News* (9 December 1930): 1; Editorial, *Loyola News* (9 December 1930): 4.; “Roosevelt in Sports,” *Loyola News* (16 December 1930): 2; “Boxing Added to Intramural Card,” *Loyola News* (16 December 1930):4; “Coon-Skin Coats Don’t Distinguish the College Man; It’s Muscles Now,” *Loyola News* (13 January 1931): 3; “Intramural Athletics,” *Loyola News* (14 April 1931): 2.

Depression-era embrace of cooperative feeling, these arguments based institutional identity on broad-based, internal participation rather than external competition.¹²⁴

Similarly, in 1930-31 Sodalists attempted to promote the Arts students' Friday Mass at St. Ignatius Church as a new foundation of undergraduate unity and school "spirit." In May 1930 editors of CISCORA column of the *Loyola News* asserted that liturgical participation was Loyola's ideal exercise in community-building, its signature opportunity for individual Arts undergraduates to identify spiritually with the student community as a whole. "In our weekly Friday Mass, we have the most appreciated and the most satisfying way of expressing to our fellow students our sympathy in any great affliction that may befall them and giving them real aid," explained the column. "...There is no function on the campus that so unifies the entire student body as does our weekly Mass with its prayers and song and with its petitions for one another."¹²⁵ Likewise, in January 1931—the aftermath of football's abolition--another letter, signed with the pseudonym "I.M. Curious," suggested that Loyola rebuild its reputation for "spirit" upon the Catholic liturgy. "Suppose Loyola became known for the way its students attend Mass, for the way in which Mass is appreciated by students and faculty; would that distinction be worth while?," suggested the author. "Why not make Loyola 'the school where the Mass matters'?"¹²⁶

¹²⁴ Robert S. McElvaine, *The Great Depression: America, 1929-1941* (New York: Times Books, 1983), 197-223.

¹²⁵ "CISCORA Notes," *Loyola News* (21 May 1930): 3.

¹²⁶ "Student Comment," *Loyola News* (13 January 1931): 2.

Such institutional reputations were fragile. “One of the unfortunate happenings which went along with the solemn dignity of the requiem Mass last Friday was the fact that one of the visitors openly stated that she was shocked by the lack of attention the college men paid to the Sacrifice,” wrote the *Loyola News*’ CISCORA columnist in 1931. “She said she had noticed two of them who had talked throughout the entire Mass, and she was somewhat surprised at this lack of devotion.”¹²⁷ Given the Vatican pressure to reform the Catholic character of Jesuit institutions and the Jesuit Provincial’s consequent scrutiny of Loyola, the administration could ill afford even minor cracks in its religious image.

When in Fall 1930 Reiner revoked the “senior privilege” of voluntary Friday Mass attendance, he did so because previous Loyola seniors had simply chosen not to attend, thereby calling into question the image of unanimous student piety that the administration hoped to project. His decision provoked an outcry among students who viewed the dispensation from attendance, not so much as freedom from an irksome obligation, but as a symbol of class distinction—of the social hierarchy that formed the basis of their campus life. The dissatisfaction was widespread. “Some of the more radical students expressed a desire to bomb the institution, but were deterred by the conservatives, who would be content with merely bombing the Dean’s office,” quipped the *Loyola News*.¹²⁸ Letters to the editor expressed dismay at the seniors’ perceived loss of social status, and offered alternative privileges or customs that might restore the sense

¹²⁷ “CISCORA,” *Loyola News* (24 February 1931): 3.

¹²⁸ “Seniors Lose Assembly and Mass Privilege,” *Loyola News* (23 September 1930): 1.

of class distinction. "...I would suggest that a set of senior privileges be established at once," one student wrote. "It is quite likely there are a number of things that the men who have been receiving training for three years might be allowed to do which could properly be denied to underclassmen."¹²⁹ "One thing... is certain—the seniors are doing all they can to think of other privileges they can enjoy in place of the one they are about to lose," observed another student. "...What they do need... is some sort of custom, tradition, or spirit of union that might be passed down to their successors. Senior jackets," he suggested, "are commendable."¹³⁰ Also stating that "I'm in favor of having some real privileges offered the seniors, and some real customs and traditions developed," another letter suggested "having some particular spot on the campus held sacred to seniors."¹³¹ By removing class distinctions in the interest of institutional reputation, Reiner threatened the social structure that, to many students, represented "spirit" itself.

As in *Loyola News* debates of the 1920s, Reiner's defenders—most likely the Sodalists—stated their case in terms of "campus life" values, accusing the proponents of voluntary Mass attendance of demonstrating a "selfish" neglect of the institutional community's needs and standards. New, however, was students' increasing tendency to express "campus life" values in explicitly Catholic and Jesuit terms, and to apply these values to the broader society beyond campus boundaries. "Before the seniors adopt a definite stand regarding the question of privileges, let them pause and reflect that... they

¹²⁹ "Student Comment: That Senior Privilege," *Loyola News* (23 September 1930): 2.

¹³⁰ "Student Comment: A Derby, Boys!" *Loyola News* (30 September 1930): 2.

¹³¹ "Student Comment: Privilege or Traditions?" *Loyola News* (30 September 1930): 2.

logically should be clamoring, not for privileges, but for opportunities to render service, for service is the fundamental goal of Catholic education,” one letter warned, placing the student ethic of individual self-sacrifice in the context of Catholic institutional mission. Adopting the Jesuits’ chivalric metaphor, “[w]here are the men of old, the robust knights whose only thoughts were of service to their fellows; where are the heroes of yesteryear who gave with a smile and counted not the cost?,” it continued, in an allusion to the famous prayer of St. Ignatius.¹³² “...Are there no sturdy Loyolans who can stand before the Dean and announce, ‘Father, never mind our privileges; we are here to serve Loyola. What do we do first?’”¹³³

Interestingly, this letter also placed the student—and now Catholic and Jesuit--value for service in contrast to the individualism of American society, recalling Catholic Action’s struggle against secular modernism. “The great curse of modern politics is the spoils system, a system which grew out of the demand of selfish men for privileges,” the letter claimed. “... Is that the true caliber of Catholic college Seniors? Can they do no more than whine for privileges like spoiled children?”¹³⁴ In this interpretation, obedience to the Dean became, not only loyalty to *alma mater*, but also a means of expressing Catholics’ countercultural resistance to the perceived flaws of the American political and social system.

¹³² “Lord, teach me to be generous. Teach me to serve You as You deserve; to give and not to count the cost, to fight and not to heed the wounds, to toil and not to seek for rest, to labor and not to ask for reward, save that of knowing I do Your will.”

¹³³ “Student Comment,” *Loyola News* (7 October 1930): 2.

¹³⁴ “Student Comment,” *Loyola News* (7 October 1930): 2.

As implied by the widespread absence of seniors at Mass, not every Loyola student accepted the interpretation of public religious practice as a demonstration of one's institutional "spirit" and individual subordination to the student community. Responding to one such argument in 1929, a student's letter bluntly stated, "He speaks of school spirit and religion. I fail to follow him. We attend Friday Mass for two reasons: we are Catholics and it is compulsory."¹³⁵ So long as Mass attendance was obligatory, the letter argued, it could not be presented as evidence of a heartfelt, voluntary love of Loyola. This interpretation fit the broader framework of American collegiate student culture, which, as Horowitz's study suggests would work against the identification of any administratively-mandated action with institutional boosterism. In general, American college students tended to view student body "spirit" as expressed through resistance to administrative authority rather than obedience to it. One owed sacrifice, conformity, and obedience to the *student* community in support of the institution's reputation for fun and a sort of sanctified fellowship, with the administration functioning as the students' common enemy.¹³⁶

However, a surprisingly virulent reply to this 1929 letter applied peer pressure to re-inforce rather than challenge the compulsory element, presenting devout Catholicism as so integral to the identity of the Loyola student body that "...anyone who attends Friday Mass because he must, and for no other reason, could scarcely be called a

¹³⁵ "School Spirit: Student Comment," *Loyola News* (30 October 1929): 2.

¹³⁶ Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

Loyolan.”¹³⁷ To a certain segment of Loyola undergraduates, Catholicism had become the ideal public face of student body membership; and any student who objected to compulsory religious practice on the grounds of voluntarism threatened that image, undermining institutional community goals—and thereby earning an *ad hominem* attack. This position recalls the 1928 campaign of *Loyola News* editors Walsh and Conley to link campus boosterism with Catholic Action “lay apostleship.”

Coercive elements in campus religious practice increased over time. In addition to Mass attendance, in 1932 new Arts dean Thomas Egan required all Arts upperclassmen to participate in their choice of six extracurricular Catholic Action “academies” or study clubs in accordance with Pope Pius XI’s encyclical and Lord’s ABC of Sodality Organization. 1932 options included “Catholic Action,” “Catholic Literature,” “Missions,” “Catholic Dramatics,” and “Evidence” (apologetics) academies. Non-Catholics, also required to join an academy, could elect to participate in one of the explicitly Catholic groups, but in 1933 gained the alternative of a “Civics” academy specifically designated as “non-Catholic only.” While the *News* admitted that “the work of the academies will more or less parallel certain sections of the work of the Sodality,” it also insisted that “the two activities will remain separate...”¹³⁸ However, by October 1934 any boundaries dividing CISCORA and the Loyola Sodality from the compulsory Catholic Action academies (now twelve in number) were rapidly blurring, as was the boundary between curricular and extracurricular activity. Faculty moderators were

¹³⁷ E.J.D., “Student Comment,” *Loyola News* (20 November 1929): 1,3; 3.

¹³⁸ “Six Seminar Sections Study Practical Catholic Action under New System,” *Loyola News* (25 October 1932): 1.

instructed to choose academy discussion leaders from the Loyola Sodality, who would run the seminar discussions.¹³⁹ The academies in turn also sent delegates to meetings of CISCORA (now CISCA)'s four major committees.¹⁴⁰ In effect, the academy system had organized all of Loyola's Catholic Arts students into the Sodality federation, as well as placed Sodalists in positions of authority over their peers—an authority backed by the Loyola administration.

At Mundelein College, CISCORA and Sodality “ramification” appeared to proceed more smoothly in the absence of pre-existing student life traditions. Opening its doors in Fall 1930, Mundelein was new; and, as a Catholic women's college—a relatively new institutional structure—it was not as burdened with the images and expectations of collegiate popular culture. Moreover, since its foundation coincided with the growth of the CISCORA and Sodality organizations in Chicago, the Sodality could play a prominent role in the definition of Mundelein's “spirit” and campus life, rather than, as at Loyola, entering into initial conflicts with the Student Council and alternative interpretations of the ideal campus. Indeed, while—like their counterparts at Loyola and De Paul--Mundelein's newspaper editors defined their goals for the community as the realization of “A greater Mundelein,” “One hundred per cent loyalty,” and “Support in athletics and all student activities,” they explicitly stated their fourth goal as “Every Catholic student a sodalist.” To *Skyscraper's* founding editors, the construction of a viable campus life depended, not only on universal participation in campus life, but also

¹³⁹ W. Finnegan, S.J., “A Plan for the Sodality and Catholic Action Academies in the College of Arts and Letters,” CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 1.

¹⁴⁰ “Sodality Meets Today; Appoints Academy Heads,” *Loyola News* (16 October 1934): 4.

on adherence to the “religious principles that form the foundations of our college life.”¹⁴¹

While “[i]n any Catholic school, the Sodality is usually the center of religious activity,” stated editors, “here at Mundelein, it will be the basic medium and very life of it.”¹⁴²

Despite the banning of Loyola men from Mundelein campus boundaries, Mundelein students initially depended on Loyola at both an academic and a social level. During the nineteenth century Chicago Jesuits had assisted the Sisters of Charity in their initial settlement in Chicago, the drafting of their charter, and now the staffing of their college. *Skyscraper* editors thanked members of the Loyola faculty for teaching courses at Mundelein. Loyola Jesuits conducted the College’s annual retreats; and in 1932 Loyola president Robert M. Kelley, S.J., delivered the Baccalaureate address to Mundelein’s graduates.¹⁴³ Furthermore, students’ and administrators’ efforts to arrange “tea dances,” debates, and other extracurricular events with Loyola suggested that, not surprisingly, Mundelein women at first relied on their more established male neighbors for organized social and dating opportunities.

Under these conditions, the Loyola-led CISCORA organization quickly spread to Mundelein. In January 1931—only the second semester of the college’s operation—Fr. Lord himself visited Mundelein to explain the national and international structure of the Jesuits’ traditional confraternity, accompanied by Loyola Sodality prefect McCabe, who discussed more concrete features of committee organization.¹⁴⁴ Mundelein students soon

¹⁴¹ “The College Newspaper,” *Skyscraper* (30 January 1931): 2.

¹⁴² “Sodality Committees in Action,” *Skyscraper* (30 January 1931): 3.

¹⁴³ “President of Loyola University Delivers Baccalaureate Sermon,” *Skyscraper* (31 May 1932): 1.

¹⁴⁴ “Sodality Committees in Action,” *Skyscraper* (30 January 1931): 3.

organized a Sodality chapter of five committees—Braille, Missions, Liturgical, Our Lady, and Publicity—as well as a sixth unit devoted to the organization of Catholic study clubs in accordance with Fr. Lord’s guidelines. (The latter committee “is especially suitable for students with heavy courses, since it does not entail too much outside work,” *Skyscraper* advised.)¹⁴⁵ Soon afterward, the CISCORA federation elected the new Sodality to the office of Secretariat. Mundelein sodalists subsequently edited CISCORA’s page in the *New World* as well as *Sodalight*, the newsletter of the Summer Student Leadership conference.

Once having adopted the Jesuit confraternity, its local CISCORA federation, and national ties with the Sodality Central Office in St. Louis, Mundelein Sodalists quickly grew to represent a larger proportion of their student body than did their counterparts at Loyola. According to the *Loyola News*, in 1933 the Loyola Arts Sodality claimed 40 returning students and approximately 25 new pledges out of 450 students enrolled in the Arts and Sciences college; *Skyscraper*, by contrast, reported that Mundelein’s Sodality pledged 60 new members in June 1933; and, in the following December, 107 new members.¹⁴⁶ Since in Fall 1933 475 Mundelein students registered for classes, those December pledges alone accounted for nearly 25% of the total student body—and, when combined with unknown numbers of returning Sodalists, the confraternity’s dominance of campus life was practically assured.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁵ “Sodality Committees in Action,” *Skyscraper* (30 January 1931): 3.

¹⁴⁶ “Maher Elected Sodality Prefect,” *Loyola News* (3 October 1933): 7; “Sodality Receives Sixty New Members,” *Skyscraper* (8 June 1933): 1; “Receive 107 Members into College Sodality,” *Skyscraper* (21 December 1933): 1.

¹⁴⁷ “Largest Student Body Registers in Current Year,” *Skyscraper* (11 October 1933): 1.

Given these numbers, in the early 1930s the “Infiltration Plan” succeeded—perhaps effortlessly—in drawing Mundelein’s other extracurricular organizations into Sodality Catholic Action projects. For instance, in 1932 even the chemistry club collected funds for missionary work; and when Mundelein Sodality hosted the CISCORA General Meeting, the Home Economics department catered to visiting religious. Indeed, Mundelein’s Sodality identified so strongly with the student body as a whole that, when Fr. Fitzgibbons visited the College with proposals for greater co-ordination among Sodality units, he addressed—not a confraternity meeting—but a session of the Mundelein Student Council.¹⁴⁸ In the first years of Mundelein College, CISCORA and its Mundelein Sodality unit simply *were* the campus life to an extent that they would never achieve either at Loyola or De Paul.

By contrast, De Paul University’s CISCORA participants appeared to make little impact on their campus culture in the early 1930s. Lacking both a stable confraternity unit and administrative pressure to reflect an identifiably “Catholic” image, De Paul students in general would have little motivation to organize into an essentially Jesuit effort. Their public interpretation of campus “spirit,” too, tended to avoid Loyola’s Catholicizing trend unless piqued by competitive pressure. Indeed, when in October 1930 a rare *De Paulia* editorial did encourage De Paul Catholics to demonstrate their devotion in “A Religious Service” to the school, it rhetorically distanced the suggestion from De Paul’s official administrative policies; instead, the editorial’s motivation appeared to be an extended “campus life” competition with rival Loyola, whose senior class currently chafed against Dean Reiner’s decision to require Mass attendance. “De Paul University,

¹⁴⁸ “Sodalists Hear National Director,” *Skyscraper* (29 May 1931): 3.

a Catholic institution, imparts knowledge to all men, irrespective of their race or creed, and in her administration religion has no role,” the *De Paulia* editorial cautiously began, “but—she does demand from those students, who are of the same faith, a display of religious zeal and spirit, befitting such.” Recommending that De Paul’s senior class set an example by receiving Communion together on the first Friday of the month, the editorial glowingly imagined the “impressive spectacle,” of “a large group of young men and women... attending the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass for the greater honor and glory of God.”¹⁴⁹ While this editorial made no direct mention of Loyola’s current Mass attendance controversy, another, immediately above—urging De Paul to “Beat Loyola!” in its final football season of 1930—suggested that De Paul students were eager to compete with their Rogers Park neighbors in whatever areas, on whatever terms. “It is traditionally true,” the editor stated, “that Loyola brings out the best in De Paul.. . . [I]t is not *De Paulia*’s intention that it shall be forgotten by Loyolans.”¹⁵⁰ If Loyola redefined Catholicism as the new line of scrimmage, at least some De Paul students were eager for the challenge.

Despite *De Paulia*’s insistence that “in [De Paul’s] administration religion has no role,” however, a March 1934 incident suggested that Catholicism still formed an important background to student activities at De Paul. Law student Henry Rago, a Catholic, had publicly debated the value of “Catholic Action with Regard to the Movies” against non-Catholic peer Leo Shapiro, who argued against the establishment of movie censorship boards. At a subsequent roundtable discussion, Rago found it necessary to

¹⁴⁹ “A Religious Service,” *De Paulia* (30 October 1930): 2.

¹⁵⁰ “The War Dance Is On,” *De Paulia* (30 October 1930): 2.

clarify to the audience that “contrary to anything which... last week might have intimated, Shapiro was in no sense a pagan...” According to *De Paulia*, “Rago added, moreover, that although his opponent was a non-Catholic, he [Shapiro] believed as firmly as any present in a code of ethics and a movie board of censorship. ‘Shapiro,’ he said, is merely a devil’s advocate at this meeting.”¹⁵¹ While it was unclear whether Rago feared drawing administrative or popular censure upon Shapiro, or if non-Catholic students had reacted against the pejorative term “pagan” (Catholic Action slang for a secular hedonist), it might be safely concluded that the situation—even at De Paul--was sensitive enough that not even a non-Catholic student wanted to go on record as personally opposing the Church’s position, although a purely academic opposition could be acceptable.

Still, CISCORA would not have much impact at De Paul until 1935, when Bishop Bernard Sheil’s adoption of the federation as the Catholic Action unit of the Archdiocesan Catholic Youth Organization (CYO) accorded with the Vincentians’ mandate to serve their local bishop. In October 1935 De Paul students would begin to organize their own Sodality, which adopted Reiner’s four-committee structure and quickly affiliated with the citywide CISCORA, now CISCA, federation. Two months later, a CISCA Mass held at St. Vincent’s Church would be compulsory for De Paul’s Catholic undergraduates.¹⁵² Although the Catholic Action organization would not “infiltrate” De Paul until later in the decade, it eventually would become popular with a

¹⁵¹ “Deem Forum Session very Interesting,” *De Paulia* (8 March 1934): 1.

¹⁵² “First Friday Tomorrow; Compulsory Mass at 9 A.M.,” *De Paulia* (5 December 1935): 1.

subset of prominent and talented Catholic students—and with it, would come increased clerical influence over the image of student culture.

In conclusion, during the late 1920s and early 30s Lord and Reiner's plan for organized Catholic Action in Chicago's Catholic schools increased clerical control of student activities at Loyola and Mundelein, even as it elevated sodalists' status on campus and encouraged them to develop leadership skills. Indeed, by adapting to "campus life" values and rhetoric, the strategy even managed to blur clerical and lay agency to points at which they became nearly indistinguishable, matters more of perspective than of indisputable fact. On the Loyola campus, the Sodality's new assertiveness sparked conflict with pre-existing structures and assumptions of student life, even as it gained almost complete ascendancy over Mundelein newspaper editors' interpretations of student life at Mundelein College but (so far) failed to impact the De Paul campus. As Chapter 3 will show, in the late 1930s this trend in organized Catholic Action toward administrative and clerical control of campus life would only increase with the advent of war in Europe and the influence of the Catholic liturgical movement.

CHAPTER THREE

FROM “RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES” TO “CATHOLIC ACTION”: CISCA, 1934-1941

“...[I]t should be sufficiently clear that student Catholic Action is not a matter of choice,” Auxiliary Bishop Bernard J. Sheil wrote to Catholic schools in June 1934.¹ That year the CISCORA federation’s emphasis shifted from the student-led exuberance of “campus life” to the hierarchical lines of archdiocesan and academic authority.

Responding to the Vatican’s call for diocesan co-ordination of Catholic Action, in June 1934 Bishop Sheil adopted CISCORA—renamed CISCA, or Chicago Student Catholic Action-- as an official unit of Chicago’s Archdiocesan Catholic Youth Organization (CYO). In October 1934, the sudden death of CISCA moderator Joseph Reiner, S.J. enabled scholars of the Benedictine Liturgical Movement to impact the federation through the educational program of Sister M. Cecilia Himebaugh, O.S.B., moderator of the CISCA subcommittee at St. Scholastica’s Academy. In consequence of these leadership changes, administrators and students at Loyola, Mundelein, and especially De Paul pushed CISCA participation in obedience to Sheil, even as college students lost some of their individual voice in the federation’s proceedings and spirituality. By 1941, CISCA would be a federation defined more by its ideological programming than by its student leaders.

¹ Bernard J. Sheil, “Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism” (2 June 1934), Bernard J. Sheil Papers, Box 5, Folder 14, Archdiocese of Chicago Archives, Chicago, IL: 9-10.

When in September 1934 the CISCORA's Executive Committee voted to change the federation's title from Chicago Inter-Student Conference on Religious Activities (CISCORA) to Chicago Student Catholic Action (CISCA), the alteration reflected a new emphasis on the hierarchical structure implied in the phrase "Catholic Action."² By adopting the Loyola-based CISCORA federation as a unit of his Archdiocesan Catholic Youth Organization (CYO), Bishop Sheil had become its "Director General," an undefined position that nevertheless commanded real deference from members of its Executive Committee. The adoption of a new CISCA constitution further strengthened central authority within the federation, allowing CISCA itself the agency to sponsor projects and appoint special project committees in its own name, apart from the system of campus-based subcommittees.³ Drawing upon this new capability, over the period 1934-1941 Sheil would often mobilize CISCA for the co-ordination of large-scale events or demonstrations of Catholic opinion, such as the Legion of Decency Parade (1934); the public rally honoring James Roosevelt, son of the president (1937); the Catholic Youth Congress (1941); and even an annual Loyola-De Paul basketball game (inaugurated 1938) to benefit the CYO. Importantly, a more centralized structure also would allow Sheil to extend the Chicago Archdiocese's influence into the Catholic campus itself.

In asserting archdiocesan authority over the local Catholic Action federation, Sheil enacted an international Vatican policy that the recent Catholic youth crisis in Germany must have reinforced. In 1933, Article 31 of the Vatican's Concordant with the

² "Crusaders in Student Catholic Action," (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 28.

³ "Constitution of CISCA, Chicago Inter-Student Catholic Action," [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 10.

National Socialist government prompted German Catholic youth groups, hitherto independent, to re-organize under diocesan authority in the hope of escaping forced dispersal and absorption into the Hitler Youth--already the fate of their Protestant counterparts. Article 31 pledged that Hitler's government would not disrupt any religious organization formally bound to the Church hierarchy, although it would continue to treat unaffiliated, grass-roots Catholic groups as politically subversive. Responding to these this specification, German bishops swiftly incorporated Catholic youth groups into the diocesan structure in efforts to discipline and shield them from Nazi interference.⁴

While German bishops had offered their authority as a bulwark against a secular dictatorship, by 1934 that authority was under siege. Hitler's government had openly violated the terms of the Concordant, raiding the headquarters of diocesan Catholic youth organizations in Bavaria and restricting their activities in Stuttgart, Munich, Trier, Kassel, and Wiesbaden. In Chicago, *Tribune* articles regularly reported on these disruptions and the responses of German bishops and lay Catholics, interpreting the conflicts over youth organization as stories of persecution and heroic resistance.⁵ CISCORA students were aware of the situation of German Catholic youth. In July 1934 college students at Fr.

⁴Lawrence D. Walker, *Hitler Youth and Catholic Youth, 1933-1936: A Study In Totalitarian Conquest* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1970), 58-61; Mark Edward Ruff, *The Wayward Flock: Catholic Youth in Postwar West Germany* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 26-29.

⁵ Lawrence D. Walker, *Hitler Youth and Catholic Youth*, 59-105. For examples of *Chicago Tribune* coverage: "Pope Worried Over Germany's Catholic Youth," *Chicago Tribune* (29 October 1933): 4.; Sigrid Schultz, "State Will Train Youth! Bavaria Tells Catholics," *Chicago Tribune* (21 November 1933): 10; Sigrid Scultz, "All Protestant Youth Forced to Join Hitler Body; Rights of Catholic Church Groups Are Abolished," *Chicago Tribune* (22 December 1933): 14; Sigrid Schultz, "Nazis Deal Out Punishment to Foes, Tattlers; Police and Catholic Youth Clash in Stuttgart," *Chicago Tribune* (23 January 1934): 16; "Pope Refuses to Give Up Catholic Youth to Hitler," *Chicago Tribune* (25 February 1934): 3.; "Bavarian Nazis Seize Catholic Youth Property; Associations Are Ordered Dissolved," *Chicago Tribune* (4 May 1934): 18.

Lord's Spiritual Leadership Convention passed a resolution pledging prayers "for the Catholics of Germany."⁶

However, by late 1933 Vatican officials already were presenting diocesan oversight not as a localized diplomatic maneuver but as a necessary condition distinguishing genuine Catholic Action from unauthorized lay endeavors. Significantly, Sheil's June 1934 document "Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism" quoted Apostolic Delegate Amleto Giovanni Cicognani as explaining to the National Conference of Catholic Charities in October 1933 that "'Catholic activity that is not *de facto* and officially made participant in the mission of the Bishop is not Catholic Action, even through they labor under its banner. . . . It is... necessary that it [Catholic activity] be dependent upon the Pope and upon the Bishop, that it be directed by them and that it move within the limits assigned and approved by the teaching Church.'"⁷ Sheil's "Catechism" also referenced Pope Pius XI's December 1933 address to Latin American students, which stressed that lay organization should operate "'in full subjection to the ecclesiastical hierarchy,'" although still "'without hindrance to various personal initiatives.'"⁸ In effect the Vatican had mandated the diocesan supervision of Catholic youth groups worldwide, so that, in adopting CISCA as an official Chicago Archdiocesan organization, Sheil implemented the principle voiced by his superiors.

⁶ "College Convention in Retrospect," *Sodalight* (13 July 1934): 1, in CISCA Records Box 3 Folder 1.

⁷ Bernard J. Sheil, "Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism" (2 June 1934), Bernard J. Sheil Papers, Box 5, Folder 14, Archdiocese of Chicago Archives, Chicago, IL: 16.

⁸ Sheil, "Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism," 12.

According to Sheil, this principle of diocesan oversight was relevant to the United States due to the necessity of unified opposition to expanding Communist organizations that threatened to remove Christ from the process of economic and social reform. In July 1934 Sheil warned 500 college students attending Fr. Lord's Student Spiritual Leadership Convention of an estimated 37,000 "paid organizers" and another 6,000 "paid speakers" who disseminated "atheistic and communistic propaganda... among the young men and women of the country." As a result of this "systemized method of destruction," he told college students, in 1933 "the Boy Scouts alone lost 127,000 members, a great many of them entering the Young Pioneers, a radical organization."⁹ By contrast to Communist aims, his "Catechism" described Catholic Action's goal as "to Christianize society, to bring Christ as His saving doctrines into our social, political, and industrial institutions and relationships and thus to halt the process of decay that is plainly noticeable on all sides and portends complete disintegration." The stakes were high: "Without Christ and his principles Western Civilization cannot endure," Sheil declared.¹⁰

Therefore, in order to strengthen the Church, the bishop "must have the right to organize the forces in his diocese, to map out procedures, to lay out programs," argued Sheil, since "[h]e is the principle of unity of action in the diocese. No action may be undertaken without his consent, or, at least, his implicit approval. Any other action would mean a division of Christian forces..." Later in his "Catechism", Sheil quoted Pope Pius XI as declaring that "All must be effectively co-ordinated, disciplined, and

⁹ "Catholic Youth Warned Against Paid Destroyers," *Chicago Tribune* (7 July 1934): 9.

¹⁰ Sheil, "Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism," 13.

instructed,” because, as Sheil himself explained, “[i]n unity there is strength. Much of the power in the Church is dissipated because of lack of coordination.”¹¹

In the interest of unity, the bishop—traditionally accountable for catechesis in his diocese—had a duty to educate the laity in doctrine and principles consistent with Vatican teachings on Catholic Action. Emphasizing this point, Sheil’s “Catechism” cited the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*’s call for bishops to cultivate a diocesan lay apostolate “by instructing youth, by founding Christian associations, by forming study circles on Christian lines.”¹² Like Reiner, Sheil envisioned the Catholic schools as starting points for the extension of Catholic Action into parish, diocesan, national, and international areas.¹³ As educational centers, the schools were within his purview, and Sheil determined to ensure that graduates connected their learning with their future role as Catholic parishioners within the Archdiocesan network.

He did this by predicating institutional Catholicity on students’ participation in the Archdiocesan Catholic Action program. Sheil’s educational philosophy—like Reiner’s—stressed the formation of extracurricular “spirit” over course content as an indicator of genuine Catholic education. “The test of a Catholic school is not primarily the subjects that are taught but the spirit that is imparted,” he wrote in his “Catechism”. “...And the infallible criterion of a genuine Catholic school spirit is Student Catholic Action, student participation in promoting the Cause of Christ. This is its most important function and without it the school ceases to be a Catholic institution.” Catholic Action,

¹¹ Sheil, “Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism,” 16-17, 25.

¹² Sheil, “Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism,” 12.

¹³ Sheil, “Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism,” 15.

Sheil declared, was “a postulate of Catholic schools”;¹⁴ and since he had previously defined Catholic Action as “the apostolate of the faithful under the leadership of the Bishops,” it followed that a school was “Catholic” mainly insofar as its extracurricular life conformed to an Archdiocesan program. Indeed, Sheil’s strong emphasis on the campus extracurricular culture suggested a familiarity with Reiner’s 1933 “Program for Catholic Social Action,” which advised cultivating student Catholic Action by placing “the natural group instinct on a supernatural basis.”¹⁵

Joining booster/slacker rhetoric of “school spirit” to the Catholic Action military metaphor, Sheil argued that student involvement in Catholic Action should be viewed as mandatory, not discretionary. “When Christ speaks, His loyal followers ‘come to attention.’ When Christ’s representative, the Bishop, calls, they ‘rush to the colors.’ No one who glories in the title ‘Christian,’ ‘Follower of Christ,’” Sheil asserted, “can afford to be a slacker while a life-and-death-struggle for Christ’s cause is in progress.”¹⁶ The “slacker” reference was a pressure tactic familiar from “school spirit” campaigns, now deployed in support of diocesan organization. Like campus boosters, Sheil also urged students to give themselves entirely to the service of the institutional community—in this case the Church, Christ’s Mystical Body. “It behooves every member of the body to be completely at the service of the entire body, to protect it from harm, to help it towards further development, toward vigorous vitality and fruitful, beneficent activity,” he wrote,

¹⁴ Sheil, “Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism,” 1, 13.

¹⁵ Joseph Reiner, SJ, “A Program for Catholic Social Action,” CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 6: 24.

¹⁶ Sheil, “Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism,” 9-10.

echoing the campus-life ethic of selfless service to the interests of the student community.¹⁷

Furthermore, Sheil's "Catechism" stressed that student's obligation to diocesan Catholic Action should supersede any other allegiance or responsibility. "...[N]o endeavor fostered by any other group to which they [students] may belong, their family, their city, their state, their country, can mean as much to them, can claim as great a measure of loyalty and devotion, as can the cause of Christ," he wrote, urging students to bring to Catholic Action organization "a personal interest and resourcefulness similar to, but immeasurably greater than, that which they give to student activities like athletics, dramatics, etc." In doing so, students would gain "a satisfaction and a happiness beside which the pleasures of life appear tawdry, frequently nauseating," he assured them.¹⁸

Also alluding to Reiner's work in CISCA, the "Catechism" established that the number of students participating in CISCA's four-committee model would be his measure of student Catholic Action at the various schools. After specifically describing Reiner's "four loyalties" and their corresponding Eucharistic-Our Lady, Apostolic, Literature, and Social Action Committees, Sheil stipulated that the archdiocesan schools "will participate in the apostolate of the local hierarchy, will engage in Catholic Action, to the extent to which they assist the Bishop on inculcating these four loyalties in the students."¹⁹ Later in the document, he placed greater emphasis on numbers of participating students, writing that that the test of a school's effectiveness would be "the

¹⁷ Sheil, "Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism," 10.

¹⁸ Sheil, "Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism," 14.

¹⁹ Sheil, "Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism," 17.

extent to which all students, not merely a select few, grow in the four basic loyalties that constitute a well-balanced religious character and are the springs of Catholic Action.”²⁰ He also stated that the number of student delegates attending central (executive) committee meetings—the primary bond between the federation and the bishop--would influence his view of each school’s “Catholic Action spirit.”²¹ Judging from these statements, Sheil regarded statistical proof of a school’s CISCA involvement as evidence of its institutional commitment to Catholic Action and, through this, its Catholicity.

In the interests of promoting diocesan unity and proper instruction in obedience to his superiors, then, Sheil pressured Chicago Catholic schools to organize and promote CISCA clubs and increase attendance statistics at CISCA activities by interpreting high-volume Catholic Action involvement as a necessary condition of institutional Catholic character. Drawing upon the rhetoric of campus life, he also encouraged students to pursue their “God-given vocation” to Catholic Action organization over and above their studies, family life, extracurricular commitments, and any other civic or ethnic allegiance. At Loyola, Mundelein, and De Paul, the result would be such an expansion of CISCA’s role on campus that, throughout the remainder of the 1930s, no undergraduate could completely avoid the federation.

Indeed, Loyola and Mundelein students encountered CISCA mandates almost immediately in the Fall 1934 semester. As soon as they arrived on campus, Sheil mobilized students for a CYO-sponsored Legion of Decency Parade, intended “to illustrate to adults the united stand which Chicago youth has taken in defense of its

²⁰ Sheil, “Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism,” 24.

²¹ Sheil, “Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism,” 29.

morals.” Carried to the Loop by special “L” cars, the entire Loyola Arts college (roughly 500 students) marched with banners behind CISCA representatives, accompanied by the student bodies of 48 high schools and five other colleges.²² Among them were Mundelein students—presumably the entire College—who had invested considerable time in preparation for the event. “For three days preceding the parade, the students of Mundelein were drilled in military fashion by sergeants of the National Guardsmen,” reported *Skyscraper*. “They marched in platoons, each one possessing a leader and a left and right guide.”²³ At the head of parade, Sheil invited delegates from CYO organizations—including CISCA—to join him in his automobile.²⁴ Through CISCA’s presence on campus, ordinary, rank-and-file Loyola and Mundelein students found themselves visibly organized into the CYO and undergoing exertions on its behalf.

However, throughout the school term Loyola and Mundelein students encountered CISCA and the CYO most directly through the operation of mandatory study clubs, called “Catholic Action Academies,” which brought each and every Catholic undergraduate into contact with CISCA and campus Sodality members. While Daniel A. Lord’s *ABC of Sodality Organization* had inspired the foundation of Loyola’s six prototypical Catholic Action Academies in 1932, in Fall 1934 Arts Dean Rev. William A. Finnegan, S.J. reorganized the Academy system in compliance with the study-club structure outlined in Sheil’s “Chicago Student Catholic Action: A Catechism.” “These academies will be arranged along the lines outlined in Bishop Sheil’s new booklet,

²² “Arts College Joins March for Decency,” *Loyola News* (25 September 1934): 1, 3.

²³ “70,000 Students March in Parade,” *Skyscraper* (11 October 1934): 4.

²⁴ “Arts College Joins March for Decency,” *Loyola News* (25 September 1934): 1, 3.

Student Catholic Action,” the *Loyola News* explained in September, introducing Loyola’s new network of twelve study circles categorized under the four familiar headings of Eucharistic, Apostolic, Literature, and Social Action. “Each Catholic student is obliged to belong to one” of the twelve clubs, emphasized the newspaper.²⁵ Likewise citing the authority of “the Chicago Student Catholic Action catechism compiled by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Bishop Sheil, Director-general of Cisca,” the Mundelein College Sodality followed Loyola’s example in October 1934, inaugurating seven Catholic Action academies that “would enable every member every member of the student body to take part in at least one definite phase of Catholic activity...” Instead of reporting to the auditorium for the mandatory weekly assembly, twice each month the Mundelein student body divided into the academy study clubs—a structured arrangement that eliminated any excuse for negligence in Catholic Action. “Every student will have the opportunity to participate in the work,” *Skyscraper* emphasized, since “there will be nothing to interfere with her attendance” during the scheduled periods.²⁶

Reflecting Sheil’s episcopal duty to supervise instruction, the Catholic Action academies represented a direct extension of the Archdiocesan CISCA organization into the Loyola and Mundelein campus communities. At Loyola, for example, Rev. William Finnegan, S.J.’s “Plan for the Sodality and Catholic Action Academies” blurred the boundaries between CISCA and Loyola’s campus study clubs. The campus Sodality moderator ought to direct the Catholic Action academies with the assistance of the Loyola Sodality’s student members, recommended Finnegan, and the academies’

²⁵ “Catholic Action Clubs Explained at Assembly,” *Loyola News* (25 September 1934): 2.

²⁶ “Sodality Prefect Plans Academies in Catholic Action,” *Skyscraper* (11 October 1934): 1, 3.

“number and character” should depend on CISCA’s outline for the year.²⁷ Mandatory bi-weekly meetings maintained continual contact between study club members and their Sodality supervisors.²⁸ At Mundelein, too, College Sodality members chaired the College’s seven academies, effectively exercising authority over their non-Sodality peers.²⁹ Reciprocally, in October 1934 Loyola’s Catholic Action academies sent their own delegates—appointed by student counselor Rev. E.J. Colnon, S.J.—to meetings of CISCA’s four major committees.³⁰ In effect, CISCA had established a presence on Loyola’s Lake Shore Campus that no Arts undergraduate could avoid without risking his religion credits.

Predictably, some Loyola students resented this inevitable contact. Describing the mandatory academies as “seemingly the object of considerable ridicule and contempt on the part of the student body,” a 1936 *Loyola News* editorial proposed dropping the academy system in favor of a greater integration of Catholic Action topics into the Arts assemblies.³¹ Likewise, in 1937 *Loyola News* columnist and Sodality officer Warren E. Kelly daringly termed the CISCA academies “a pain in the neck.” “It is to be understood that the essentials of the program are worthy of commendation,” he qualified, “but their present form offers too many evils even to make these benefits noticeable.” Kelly identified CISCA’s evils as “irregularity of meeting, forced attendance, the general

²⁷ W. Finnegan, S.J., “A Plan for the Sodality and Catholic Action Academies in the College of Arts and Letters,” CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 1.

²⁸ “Lake Shore Academies Begin Today,” *Loyola News* (9 October 1934): 2.

²⁹ “Sodality Prefect Plans Academies in Catholic Action,” *Skyscraper* (11 October 1934): 1, 3.

³⁰ “Sodality Meets Today; Appoints Academy Heads,” *Loyola News* (16 October 1934): 4.

³¹ “A Proposal to Remedy the Academy Situation,” *Loyola News* (7 April 1936): 4.

insincerity of the program, and the unattractiveness of the presentation.” “Under the present conditions,” he ventured to predict, meetings of the various groups will continue to be irregular and uninteresting. Students will continue to attend only because they are compelled. All in all, the prime benefit for which they are ultimately striving--a Catholic interpretation of historic, economic, social, political, and moral questions--will be defeated.”³² Tellingly, at the close of the 1937 school term Kelly expressed his “sincere thanks” to Loyola moderators for permitting his column to run “without undue censorship.”³³

Further *Loyola News* editorials admonishing student indifference to Catholic Action in general also suggested that not all Loyolans participated fully or enthusiastically in Cisca programs. “Why is it that at Loyola there is so little interest shown in Catholic Action?” asked one article. “That the students have too much work or that Catholic Action is an extra-curricular activity is not a reasonable excuse. . . . Frequently one reads that at such universities as Notre Dame, St. Louis, and Marquette hundreds of young men have been enrolled in organizations of Catholic Action and later the remarkable work they have accomplished is made known.”³⁴

Discontent was not confined to students, however. Even Loyola administrators to some extent resented the Archdiocesan presence in campus life, as suggested by president Samuel Knox Wilson’s sometimes brusque letters to Carrabine. In November 1937, for

³² Warren E. Kelly, “Off the Cuff,” *Loyola News* (16 February 1937): 7.

³³ Warren E. Kelly, “Off the Cuff,” *Loyola News* (25 May 1937): 7.

³⁴ “What! No Catholic Action?” *Loyola News* (11 October 1939): 4.

example, Wilson complained that CISCA's authority and convenience too often trumped institutional schedules and administrative decisions. "Perhaps you did not know that there was considerable dissatisfaction felt with your CISCA [meeting] called for November 1, in our gymnasium," he warned Carrabine. "Such dissatisfaction will increase if you call your next meeting on November 11. After all, the teachers and principles [sic] have few enough free days, and the purpose of the organization is going to be defeated if almost every time there is a free day you call a CISCA meeting..." Furthermore, Wilson expressed annoyance at finding educators cut out of CISCA's scheduling process. "Personally I do not see much use in holding meetings as we have done the past few days and decide [sic] upon certain things only to have the plans agreed upon upset."³⁵

In response to Wilson's grievance, Carrabine argued that purpose of frequent CISCA meetings was to defend Loyola's interests against, as he hinted, over-eager female moderators. "Again, several of the faculty members of the women's colleges have been anxious to get the projects [student lecture groups]... under way soon," Carrabine explained to Wilson. However, "I judged that no important college project in CISCA should get under way without the Faculty counsel of Loyola which undertook the leadership of CISCORA more than ten years ago, and has maintained it ever since," he wrote, soothingly. Even Carrabine, however, could not smooth over all ill feeling toward CISCA: Later, in 1938, Wilson grumbled to Loyola's Catholic Action Committee

³⁵ Wilson to Carrabine, 8 November 1937, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 44, Folder 1.

moderator Rev. W. Eugene Sheils, S.J., that, in Wilson's view, campus Catholic Action had the potential to become "just another racket even though it be pious..."³⁶

However, Sheil's public mandate for student Catholic Action had the most direct and dramatic effect on De Paul University's campus life, which, over the period 1935 - 1942 would increasingly reflect his equation of school spirit and institutional Catholicity with student Catholic Action. Since CISCORA had originated as a Jesuit effort, based on the Ignatian Sodality and serving specifically Jesuit political interests and anxieties, during the early 1930s the Congregation of the Mission had had little motivation to push for CISCORA participation among De Paul students. As a result, while CISCORA/CISCA records listed De Paul as among the federation's founding schools, De Paul had sustained no Sodality or other CISCORA-affiliated club and, after the 1932 transfer of University Vice President Rev. Thomas C. Powers, C.M., to a Los Angeles parish, De Paul's involvement had declined.³⁷

Since the Congregation of the Mission emphasized obedience to local prelates, however, Vincentian administrators would have received the 1934 "Bishop's Catechism" with considerable seriousness. Perhaps it was not coincidental that, during the academic year 1934-35, the Vincentian order re-appointed Powers to the positions of De Paul University Vice President and "spiritual director," whereupon he immediately joined student in founding De Paul's CISCA chapter.³⁸ Subsequent *De Paulia* reports and

³⁶ Wilson to Shiels, 25 February 1938, *Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers*, Box 39, Folder 13.

³⁷ "Powers, Thomas Carroll," Biographical File (January 1941), DeAndreis-Rosato Memorial Archives, De Paul University, Chicago, IL.

³⁸ "Powers, Thomas Carroll," Biographical File (January 1941).

editorials reflected an aggressive campaign to promote De Paul's CISCA activities and create a demonstrably "Catholic" social image and atmosphere. Indeed, by 1941 the formerly cautious *De Paulia* had added the phrase "A Catholic Newspaper" to its masthead, effectively redefining De Paul's student life in terms of institutional Catholicism.

While little information is available concerning Fr. Powers himself, extant descriptions suggest that his influence with De Paul students probably played a large role in promoting CISCA at De Paul. In addition to his administrative duties and his courses in English and religion, Powers had always been very involved in De Paul's extracurricular organizations, especially newspaper and yearbook, drama, and debating clubs.³⁹ According to the student yearbook *De Paulian*, by 1932 he had moderated De Paul student publications for seven years, establishing a "tradition of casual guidance" in faculty oversight.⁴⁰ The 1928 *De Paulian* praised him as "a cultural bulwark" and a much-sought director of students' dramatic, literary, and social organizations.⁴¹ Like the Jesuit Daniel A. Lord, Powers was also outgoing, charismatic, and enormously popular among students. In 1928 the "announcement that the genial Father Powers was elected Vice-President of the University sent a pleasant tremor through the student body" for "none occupies a higher place in the 'hero-worship' affection of the students than their

³⁹ "Hold Rites for Vice-President of De Paul U," *New World* (1 August 1941) in "Powers, Thomas Carroll," Biographical File (January 1941).

⁴⁰ "The De Paulia," *De Paulian* (1932): 114.

⁴¹ "Reverend Thomas Carrol Powers, C.M.," *De Paulian* (1928): 20.

capable English professor,” reported the *De Paulian* yearbook.⁴² After Powers’ 1932 transfer to Los Angeles, “How much De Paul misses the ruddy face of Father Powers, his ready, uncautioned laugh, his fine mind, his great good humor, his brilliant speech, his deep loyalty and free affection....,” wrote *De Paulian* editors.⁴³ “In the class room his personality made the text book an unforgettable story, and his charm made the lecture a pleasing symphony. . . He had the faculty to impart not only learning, but also the very taste for culture, without which life is empty. He understood the problems of modern young men and women, and with this sympathy worked miracles of influence. His friendships covered all types of people.”⁴⁴ A 1941 obituary referred to Powers’ “great popularity with the students at De Paul.”⁴⁵ Even allowing for some degree of sycophantism, this repeated emphasis on Powers’ personal charisma suggests that he was, indeed, influential—perhaps enough to have inspired De Paul students’ initial involvement in CISCORA’s founding as well as their renewed interest in 1935.

De Paul’s swift re-entry into CISCA represented both a student and administrative effort. Previously, despite De Paul students’ involvement in CISCORA’s founding conferences, the University had had no Catholic club to affiliate officially with the Catholic Action federation. Now, under Powers’ moderation, in November 1934 women of the downtown Secretarial School formed the University’s first “Sodality,” while a

⁴² “Reverend Thomas Carrol Powers, C.M.,” *De Paulian* (1928): 20.

⁴³ “Administration,” *De Paulian* (1932): 19.

⁴⁴ “To You Who Know Him,” *De Paulia* (8 January 1932), in “Powers, Thomas Carroll,” Biographical File (January 1941).

⁴⁵ “Hold Rites for Vice-President of De Paul U,” *New World* (1 August 1941) in “Powers, Thomas Carroll,” Biographical File (January 1941).

separate Arts branch launched shortly afterward on the uptown campus. Intent to join CISCA was so strong that both downtown and uptown Sodalities immediately adopted Reiner's four-committee plan, electing Eucharistic-Our Lady, Apostolic, Literature, and Social Action chairmen. Indeed, as soon as February 1935--almost immediately after the Sodalities' establishment—the University hosted a CISCA General Meeting in the De Paul Auditorium, a debut which reportedly “did much to establish the prestige of De Paul in sodality personnel.”⁴⁶ As both University vice-president and Sodality moderator, no doubt Powers had helped to secure this event for his institution.

For their part, students themselves quickly secured CISCA committee positions and established a tradition of chairing the Eucharistic-Our Lady Committee, just as Loyola continuously occupied the Presidency and Mundelein, the Secretariat. As early as 1935-36 law student Henry W. Rago and uptown student Jane Charlson served respectively as chairman and secretary of CISCA's citywide Apostolic Committee.⁴⁷ Rago's CISCA career continued with the chairmanship of the citywide Eucharistic-Our Lady Committee in 1936-37, in which position De Paul Commerce student David Scanlon succeeded him in 1937-38, followed by Eugene Kennedy in 1938-39; and John McCullough in 1939-40.⁴⁸

By Fall 1935 De Paul's two Sodality groups identified so closely with the CISCA federation that De Paul publications referred to a singular “CISCA unit” comprising

⁴⁶ “Cisca,” *De Paulian* (1935): 215.

⁴⁷ “CISCA,” *De Paulian* (1936): 122; Jane Charlson, “CISCA,” *De Paulia* (30 April 1936): 2.

⁴⁸ “CISCA,” *De Paulian* (1938): 194; “CISCA,” *De Paulian* (1939): 102; “Chicago Inter-Student Catholic Action,” *De Paulian* (1940): 109.

uptown and downtown branches. A 1935-1936 yearbook photograph showed 26 members—ten male, and sixteen female—grouped evenly around two tables that presumably distinguished uptown from downtown members.⁴⁹ As their formative tradition, the CISCA unit established the habit of receiving Holy Communion as a group at the monthly First Friday Mass at St. Vincent’s Church.⁵⁰ The 1934-35 and 1935-36 yearbooks also reported that the CISCA unit organized a Guard of Honor consisting of 125 De Paul students who volunteered for fifteen-minute rotations of Eucharistic adoration every First Friday.⁵¹

In a situation recalling CISCA’s “Infiltration Plan,” De Paul members tended to accumulate leadership positions on the *De Paulia* newspaper staff, the *De Paulian* yearbook staff, and many other organizations that enabled them to influence the student body and its public image. Like CISCA leaders at Loyola and Mundelein, they were busy people: For example, Carol Crotty, Prefect of De Paul CISCA unit from 1936 to 1938, served on *De Paulia* staff from 1935-1937; edited the annual freshman edition in 1935; and was appointed co-editor in 1937-38. She also served on the yearbook staff from 1935 to 1938. As if this were not work enough, Crotty served as Secretary of the Senior Class, the Women’s League, and the Junior League; and chaired or otherwise served on three dance committees.⁵² Apostolic and Eucharistic-Our Lady chairman Henry Rago contributed a weekly *De Paulia* column from 1934 to 1937 and wrote for *De*

⁴⁹ “CISCA,” *De Paulian* (1938): 194.

⁵⁰ “CISCA,” *De Paulian* (1936): 122.

⁵¹ “Cisca,” *De Paulian* (1935): 215; “CISCA,” *De Paulian* (1936): 122.

⁵² “Carol Marguerite Crotty, Ph.B.,” *De Paulian* (1938): 64; “In Recognition—,” *De Paulia* (31 March 1938): 2.

Paulian between 1934 and 1936. His extracurricular resume further included the chairmanship of a dance committee, involvement in De Paul's Blue Key and Junior Bar Association chapters, and participation in three intramural sports.⁵³ Likewise, in addition to serving a variety of official positions in her sorority as well as a lengthy string of classes, clubs, councils, and committees, De Paul CISCA officer Leonardine Charlson contributed a 1937-38 *De Paulia* "Catholic Gleanings" column, in which she wrote of various devotions and Catholic-related events worldwide.⁵⁴ Among, rank-and-file CISCA members, law student Thomas J. Sullivan served as *De Paulia* Editor-in-Chief in 1936-37; *De Paulia* Associate Editor in 1935; *De Paulian* staff member from 1933-38; and President of Blue Key in 1937. Similarly, 1937-38 CISCA member J. Stuart Doyle was both Editor-in-Chief of the *De Paulian* yearbook and Feature Editor of *De Paulia*. Like Sullivan, Doyle also served as President of Blue Key in 1938, Junior Class Vice-President in 1937, dance committee chairman, and member of the football cheering squad.⁵⁵

Like their counterparts at Loyola and Mundelein, these and other De Paul CISCA members joined and led a range of activities, showing—perhaps significantly—a preference for literary and journalistic endeavors. For instance, of sixteen graduating seniors claiming CISCA membership in 1937, fourteen also served on the staff or editorial boards of either--or both—the *De Paulia* and the *De Paulian*.⁵⁶ Similarly, in

⁵³ "Henry Rago, L.L.B.," *De Paulian* (1937): 59.

⁵⁴ "C. Leonardine Charlson, A.B.," *De Paulian* (1938): 63.

⁵⁵ "J. Stuart Doyle, Ph.B.," *De Paulian* (1938): 65.

⁵⁶ *De Paulian* (1937): 49-62.

1938 six out of nine CISCA seniors participated in De Paul publications.⁵⁷ While the CISCA “infiltration plan” would have encouraged this interest in journalism, CISCA members’ publishing activity more likely suggests the Catholic federation’s appeal for organizational leaders, joiners, and aspiring literati energized by the Catholic cultural renaissance. Regardless, De Paul CISCA members were particularly well-positioned to shape the image of De Paul campus life as presented through its publications.

Given CISCA members’ involvement in journalism, it seems significant that CISCA’s resurgence at De Paul occurred against the backdrop of a *De Paulia* campaign to revitalize a campus life shaken by Depression-era deprivations. Having less disposable income, students were less willing to spend money on community-building entertainments. “We have tasted the joys which college has to offer. We have spat them from us. Phooey!” quipped a *De Paulia* editorial in May 1936, adding facetitiously, “How about the F.E.H.A. or N.Y.A. financing dates to the Senior Ball?”⁵⁸ In a nod to financial obstacles, in October 1936 De Paul’s Student Activities Council endeavored to encourage dance attendance by promising to cut admission prices after the sale of 400 full-price tickets. This plan, of course, assumed that 400 comparatively well-off students would be willing to step up and pay full price out of consideration for their cash-strapped peers and the glory of De Paul, an assumption soon revealed as a miscalculation. Despite *De Paulia*’s attempts to portray full-price ticketholders as an elite “400,” economizing students chose to forgo the dance, wait for the price reduction, or—as *De Paulia*

⁵⁷ *De Paulian* (1938): 62-75.

⁵⁸ “Editorial to End All Editorials,” *De Paulia* (7 May 1936): 2.

charged—angle for some committee position that carried the perk of free admissions.⁵⁹

Discouraged by decreased extracurricular participation, in 1936 De Paul student leaders added formal, structural units to their campus events in the hope of increasing peer pressure and accountability: The Blue Key Honor Society, for example, organized an athletic cheering section (which included CISCA member J. Stuart Doyle) to enliven the game atmosphere and recruit reliable attendees.⁶⁰

Amid fears of a decline in campus life, De Paul students scrambled to create CISCA-sponsored groups that also would enrich the University's extracurricular offerings. For example, the Catholic Symposium, "a new organization for the promotion of Catholic thought and Catholic Action at De Paul University," launched at the downtown (Commerce and Law) campus in October 1935.⁶¹ In that same month, CISCA's central Eucharistic-Our Lady committee commissioned De Paul students to form a De Paul branch of the Dominican Confraternity for the Angelic Warfare of St. Thomas Aquinas, a student organization originally founded in 1649 at the University of Louvain. "The movement is being started at De Paul, in accordance with Cisca, to promote membership as was the wish of Pope Leo XIII," explained *De Paulia*, interpreting the Confraternity's formation as a local and papal mandate.⁶² Also at the uptown campus, in March 1936 student George Dunne founded a CISCA-affiliated study circle that scheduled discussions ranging from Father Coughlin to the Federal Reserve

⁵⁹ "Become One of De Paul's '400,'" *De Paulia* (28 October 1936): 1.

⁶⁰ "Blue Key Organize Cheering Section; Back Homecoming," *De Paulia* (28 October 1936): 1; "J. Stuart Doyle, Ph.B.," *De Paulian* (1938): 65.

⁶¹ "Cisca Reports on St. Thomas Fraternity," *De Paulia* (24 October 1935): 1.

⁶² "Cisca Reports on St. Thomas Fraternity," *De Paulia* (24 October 1935): 1.

Board.⁶³ After attending Lord's Catholic Action seminar at Providence High School, De Paul students arranged a series of monthly lunch meetings designed "to promote the socialization of Catholic Action at De Paul" by reaching out to potential Catholic club members.⁶⁴

De Paulia editors often worked to justify CISCA and other Catholic-inflected clubs in terms of educational enrichment. For example, in March 1936—just after the establishment of Dunne's CISCA circle--guest editors advocated the establishment of general discussion clubs to extend "debate team" training to the student body as a whole, thereby promoting "clear-orderly thinking" and "intellectual advancement." In place of the informal cultural events currently held at "local food emporiums" (probably with the expectation of refreshment purchases), editors also argued for structured, Loyola-style student assemblies at which guest speakers could address De Paul students on campus.⁶⁵

Recalling Sheil's correlation of institutional Catholicity to school spirit, however, De Paul students and administrators also represented CISCA participation in terms of institutional reputation, increasingly equating community "spirit" with Catholicism and Catholic ritual. The *De Paulia* newspaper, for example, increasingly resembled the *Loyola News* in its equation of CISCA activity with campus boosterism. "...[A]n active participation in Cisca's schedule is one thing which prevents De Paul from being just another university," declared a September 1937 *De Paulia* article, implying that every De

⁶³ "CISCA," *De Paulia* (12 March 1936): 2; "Cisca Study Club Organized Uptown," *De Paulia* (19 March 1936): 1.

⁶⁴ Jane Charlson, "CISCA," *De Paulia* (7 November 1935): 3.

⁶⁵ "'Let's get Together,'" *De Paulia* (26 March 1936): 2.

Paul student had a stake in the CISCA unit's success.⁶⁶ In the following month a *De Paulia* editorial chastised students for their lack of "a spirit of militant Catholic Action," arguing that a "school with a thoroughly Catholic background... should be a leader in the promotion of Catholic Action."⁶⁷ Soon *De Paulia*'s banner included the slogan of "Promote Catholic Action," pushing CISCA with the same technique it used to support the dances and sporting events of campus life.⁶⁸ Clearly *De Paulia* editors, like those at the *Loyola News*, were attempting to co-opt students' sense of responsibility for "campus life" prestige in support of De Paul's CISCA activity.

Further uniting student life with Catholic Action, De Paul administrators also began to mandate religious practice for Catholic students in a marked departure from the University's previous policies. While Loyola Arts freshmen, sophomores, and juniors, for example, were accustomed to compulsory Mass attendance, Catholic students at De Paul had been free to attend according to their own desire or family custom. This changed in December 1935, when Powers mandated that all De Paul Catholic students join its CISCA members at their First Friday devotions. Administrators arranged a special class schedule to accommodate the liturgy; and students received attendance cards which, as *De Paulia* informed them, would be collected. "Father Powers, spiritual director of the university, looks forward to whole hearted support in this, one of the most important activities of Cisca," reported the newspaper.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ "Ciscans Choose Officers Today," *De Paulia* (30 September 1937): 4.

⁶⁷ "Let's Make De Paul Catholic Action Conscious," *De Paulia* (14 October 1937): 2.

⁶⁸ Banner, *DePaulia* (14 October 1937): 1.

⁶⁹ "First Friday Tomorrow; Compulsory Mass at 9 A.M.." *DePaulia* (5 December 1935): 1.

Thereafter the mandatory, CISCA-sponsored Mass became a regular feature of undergraduate student life at De Paul. Indeed—as at Loyola—administrators counted an absence from Mass on the First Friday of the month as a “cut” in the required religion course.⁷⁰ Also as at Loyola, members of De Paul’s CISCA unit assisted the administration in enforcing compulsory attendance, thereby exerting status and authority over their peers. “Cisca’s especial function at De Paul is to watch over the First Friday celebrations,” explained the *De Paulian* yearbook in 1938. “Members are placed in charge of attendance cards, of ushering students to seats, of controlling the crowds.”⁷¹

Adding a distinctively Vincentian flavor to Catholicism at De Paul, beginning in 1936 De Paul’s CISCA unit moderator, Rev. Thomas C. Powers, also annually enrolled all Catholic undergraduates in the Confraternity of the Miraculous Medal, a popular Marian devotion originating in the visions of Daughter of Charity Blessed Catherine Laboure (1806-1876). By contrast to the complicated admission process and lengthy prayers of the Jesuit Sodality, membership in the Vincentian Miraculous Medal confraternity involved only investing the student with a blessed medal that he or she wore every day, making it ideal for expressing a broad community bond. Again, De Paul’s CISCA unit sponsored the event. “At tomorrow’s Mass in tribute to Mary the student body will be consecrated to her and enrolled in the confraternity of the Miraculous Medal, the spiritual benefits from which are innumerable,” *De Paulia*’s “CISCA” column

⁷⁰ “Students to Attend First Friday Mass Tomorrow, Jan. 7.,” *De Paulia* (6 January 1938): 1; “Students to Attend First Friday Mass,” *De Paulia* (31 March 1938): 1.

⁷¹ “CISCA,” *De Paulian* (1938): 194.

announced in 1936.⁷² Another editorial emphasized that “the moderator of Cisca” had arranged the enrollment, and explained that “[t]here is no better guide for.. conduct in future days than Mary; there is no greater protection that the outgoing seniors can have than her loving solicitude.” Miraculous medal enrollment became an annual May tradition in which the senior class formally processed to the Marian shrine in St. Vincent’s Church, where afterward students of all classes were invested with medals. According to a 1938 *De Paulia* announcement, this procession also had been Powers’ suggestion.⁷³

As at Loyola, *De Paulia* writers also increasingly interpreted Mass attendance and campus life “spirit” as mutually re-inforcing—or even identical--concepts. Beginning in 1936, for example, the institution of CISCA-sponsored “Victory” Masses for the success of the De Paul football team depicted the liturgy as an expression of community solidarity. Asking “Have You Got True School Spirit [?!]” a September 1936 editorial urged “you, the Student Body” to “show your appreciation [for the football team] by combining your religious background and school spirit in your attendance at the special 8:30 Mass and Communion on Friday morning for the welfare of the team...”⁷⁴ Another article announced that “De Paul University is opening the football season in a truly Catholic spirit by attending Mass and Communion Friday morning,” and explained that “Cisca is sponsoring this idea of an expression in general attendance of the hopes and

⁷² Jane Charlson, “CISCA,” *De Paulia* (30 April 1936): 2.

⁷³ “May Devotion at Mass Friday,” *De Paulia* (5 May 1938): 1.

⁷⁴ “Have You Got True School Spirit! Remember Team Mass Tomorrow, 8:30 A.M.,” *De Paulia* (24 September 1936): 2.

aspirations of De Paul in athletics as well as studies.”⁷⁵ Similarly, in November 1936 the Homecoming schedule included a “Victory Mass” at which “the team, the coach, and the entire University will hear Mass and receive Holy Communion in united supplication”; while in September 1937 the Student Activities Director celebrated a mandatory Mass “for the intention of the football team.”⁷⁶ Drawing upon the campus life tradition of class hierarchy and rivalry, *De Paulia* also attempted to mobilize the ongoing friction of freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior in support of Catholic practices. The Victory Mass, for example, would “grant the freshmen their first opportunity to express their school spirit” through voluntary attendance. “Besides being a test of freshmen enthusiasm,” explained *De Paulia*, “it is a challenge to upper classmen not to be outdone in rallying ‘round the flag.’”⁷⁷ In this interpretation the Mass seemed one part prayer, one part pep rally.

Tellingly, lapses in community discipline were approached as religious lapses, lending a new intensity to accusations of “slackerism.” For example, when De Paul students failed to purchase dance tickets in October 1936, *De Paulia* labeled the economizers, not “slackers,” but “Shylocks,” an allusion with unmistakable religious connotations.⁷⁸ Similarly, in October 1937 De Paul freshmen who flouted the campus social hierarchy by refusing (or forgetting) to wear their distinctive green caps

⁷⁵ “Students; Team Attend Mass; Victory Spirit,” *De Paulia* (24 September 1936): 1.

⁷⁶ “Parade, Rally, Rush Tomorrow Night; Mass, Luncheon, Game, and Dance Climaxes Saturday,” *De Paulia* (5 November 1936): 1; “Catholic Students Required to Attend Mass Tomorrow,” *De Paulia* (30 September 1937): 1.

⁷⁷ “Students; Team Attend Mass; Victory Spirit,” *De Paulia* (24 September 1936): 1.

⁷⁸ “Become One of De Paul’s ‘400,’” *De Paulia* (28 October 1936): 1.

compensated the De Paul community by selling tickets for a CISCA benefit.⁷⁹ In turn, the De Paul CISCA unit used the raffle's proceeds to purchase Miraculous Medals for the University's basketball team members, whom Powers invested at the Miraculous Medal Shrine in St. Vincent's Church to the strains of "Ave Maria."⁸⁰ To compensate for gaps in community discipline, students supported the religious organization, which in turn conferred fresh dignity upon the athletic events that rallied De Paul as a student community. School spirit and Catholic practice thus were one and the same.

By 1937 CISCA promotions had become so ubiquitous that *De Paulia* columnist Frank Ready mocked them as knee-jerk responses to writer's block. "How about a brilliant article on Catholic philosophy in our social order, concluding with a triumphant 'Cisca-boom-bah'!" he offered the neophyte journalist stuck for an idea.⁸¹ Responding to Sheil's 1934 "Catechism", then, De Paul Vice-President Powers and a group of roughly 25 students, hailing from both uptown and downtown campuses, had managed to completely overhaul De Paul's religious image in a few short years. Re-introduced in the 1934-35 term, CISCA had gone from a campus nonentity to a dominating presence. A Vincentian school had established Jesuit confraternities. Catholic Action allegiances structured a scattering of Catholic forums and study clubs—all voluntary, but nearly all new. Under CISCA auspices, mandatory Mass attendance and the Miraculous Medal devotion had become the new expressions of school spirit and institutional loyalty. Until

⁷⁹ It is unclear whether students or administrators assigned this punishment. "Cisca Sponsors Raffle in New Drive for Funds," *De Paulia* (28 October 1937): 1.

⁸⁰ "Cisca Presents Medals to De Paul Players," *De Paulia* (9 December 1937): 1.

⁸¹ Frank Ready, "Nuances," *De Paulia* (28 October 1937): 2.

World War II mobilization disrupted De Paul's campus life in 1942, its student culture would—at least on the surface--bear a strong resemblance to Loyola's.

The Liturgical Movement

CISCA had only just entered the CYO, when, in October 1934, Reiner's sudden and fatal heart attack left a vacancy in the central moderator's position—and created space for Liturgical Movement ideologues to reshape the student extracurricular organization into an educational forum. Before re-organization under the Archdiocese, the Society of Jesus would have selected Reiner's successor; now, however, Bishop Bernard Sheil appointed the "Archdiocesan Moderator," probably in consultation with national Sodality Director Daniel A. Lord, S.J.⁸² Their choice, Martin Carrabine, S.J.--"small, genial, Irish, intense, and strong"--had helped Fr. Lord to prepare the first national Sodality convention at St. Louis in 1928.⁸³ A native of Cleveland, Ohio, Carrabine had entered the Society of Jesus in 1913 and received his ordination in 1926, the year that Reiner first reorganized the Loyola sodality. In the intervening years Carrabine taught at St. Mary's College in St. Mary's, KS, St. John's College in Belize, and in British Honduras, where like Reiner, he experienced an epidemic: In 1921 he

⁸² Significantly for CISCA, a 1957 federation history indicates that, in integrating CISCA into the Archdiocesan CYO, Sheil appropriated from the Jesuits the power to appoint CISCA's central moderator. When Reiner assumed this newly-created position in 1931, his formal title of "Province Director of the Sodality" had reflected CISCORA's identity as an extension of the Jesuit Sodality movement. After the transition, noted a 1957 history, Sheil "kept Reiner on" under the title of "Archdiocesan Moderator"; and later, in 1950, Sheil would "appoint" a non-Jesuit, Fr. Francis X. Lawlor, O.S.A., to the moderator's position. See "The CISCA Story" (1957), CISCA Records Box 1 Folder 19: 8, 12.

⁸³ Edmund J. Fortman, S.J., *A Biographical History of the Chicago Province*, (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1987), 115-116; "CISCAns Honors Father Carrabine at Farewell Meet," *New World*, (March 3, 1950).

contracted yellow fever, but recovered while others around him died. Returning to the United States in somewhat delicate health, Carrabine served as associate editor of *Jesuit Missions* magazine in New York before his transfer to Chicago.⁸⁴ He would moderate CISCA from 1934 until his retirement in 1950, working first from CISCA offices at Loyola Academy; then from Loyola's downtown Lewis Towers complex (1940-43); at De Paul University (1943-46); and finally, from the basement of Holy Family parish.

Alumni reminisces on the occasion of his jubilee in 1963 and death in 1965 suggest that Carrabine was a charismatic moderator who exerted great personal influence over CISCA students. "What I remember most about him was that he radiated," Helen Gannon wrote in 1965. "There is no other way to express it. He seemed to glow with an inner flame and he seemed to take each one of us into his heart."⁸⁵ Similarly, Sister M. Thomas, S.S.C. (Delphine Wedmore) recalled that Carrabine's "capacity for empathy, his ability to identify himself with others without detriment to himself was simply amazing," and offered several instances of his no-nonsense advice to her as a student and young novice. "He really cared about us!" she enthused. "Cared in a strong, virile, practical way that made up his brand of Christlikeness."⁸⁶ Mary Ann McMillan praised him for saving her personal faith: "I [was]...a convert and a rather wobbly one when Father entered my life via a retreat. He put everything straight...."⁸⁷ On a broader, community level, John and Margaret Langdon credited him with changing the face of

⁸⁴Fortman, *A Biographical History of the Chicago Province*, 115-116.

⁸⁵ Helen E. Gannon to Mr. and Mrs. Langdon (1965), CISCA Records, Box 9 Folder 5.

⁸⁶ Sister M. Thomas, S.S.C., to Mr. and Mrs. Langdon, 10 November 1965, CISCA Records, Box 9 Folder 5.

⁸⁷ Mary Ann McMillan to Mr. and Mrs. Fleming (1963), CISCA Records, Box 9 Folder 5.

Chicago Catholicism. “So great was Father Carrabine’s impact on the Catholic vision in Chicago that the story will someday be told—when and by whom we do not know,” they wrote to CISCA alumni in 1965.⁸⁸ More than twenty years later, Loyola University archivist Brother Michael Grace even attempted to initiate a petition for Carrabine’s canonization, a move that reflected the enthusiasm surrounding his memory.⁸⁹

However, despite Carrabine’s appeal to individuals (and possible sainthood), intellectually he shaped the CISCA organization less than a fervent Benedictine nun who, in the leadership transition following Reiner’s death, scrambled to prepare a Catholic Action program that would reflect her own commitment to the emerging American Liturgical Movement. While CISCA’s priestly moderators generally tried to avoid the limelight, Sister M. Cecilia Himebaugh—the federation’s unofficial co-moderator throughout Carrabine’s tenure--actually succeeded in receiving no public recognition: Even Bauer’s dissertation, the work of a fellow nun, failed to acknowledge Himebaugh, although organizational records suggest that from about 1935 onwards Himebaugh’s enthusiasm for liturgical renewal, guided by her correspondence with prominent theologian Virgil Michel, dominated CISCA’s agenda to the point of clashing with student leadership. Reflecting in 1965 on CISCA’s history, Himebaugh described her almost complete invisibility as necessary to the organization. Indeed, she recalled it as her own choice. “For I... had insisted on functioning only as a ghost writer,” she wrote. “Since ‘Togetherness’ among Catholic schools was then almost unknown...., one nun’s special prominence as an unelected executive would have been objectionable.” To keep

⁸⁸ John and Margaret Langdon to CISCA alumni, (27 September 1965), CISCA Records Box 9 Folder 4.

⁸⁹ Grace to Marciniak, (4 August 1986), CISCA Records Box 9 Folder 7.

the peace and further the greater good, she insisted, "...Father Carrabine manned the battlements alone..."⁹⁰

Emerging from retrospectives and personal correspondence, Himebaugh's personality appears highly-strung, sensitive to criticism, yet forceful—often barely restrained by diplomatic deference to (male) clergy. A convert to Catholicism, Himebaugh had learned to function without the emotional support of her Lutheran father, since childhood her only remaining parent, who had disowned her when she professed religious vows in 1911 and thereafter refused all communication with her. Repeated letters to her father, all unanswered, attested to how much his rejection continued to hurt her. Indeed, biographer Mary Benet McKinney, O.S.B., interprets Himebaugh's public self-effacement as an expression of pain at her exclusion from the family, noting that Himebaugh routinely omitted her surname from published works until a cousin finally renewed contact with her in 1955, whereupon she resumed the use of her family name.⁹¹ In 1977 fellow Benedictine nuns poetically eulogized Himebaugh as a "woman often not understood/ by her own sisters/ often viewed as/ different/ apart/ eccentric," while suggesting that her "alone-ness" had served her as both an inspiration and a personal challenge. She was also, they insisted, a woman ahead of her time: Himebaugh "saw... the almost untouched issues of justice/ and race/ and equality/ the popular issues of the '60s/ but saw them/ felt them/ touched them/ in the '40s..."⁹² Perhaps in part because of

⁹⁰ Sister Cecilia Himebaugh, "Cisca in Retrospect," CISCA Records, Box 1, Folder 20.

⁹¹ Mary Benet McKinney, OSB, Himebaugh, Sister M. Cecilia," in Rima Lunin Schultz and Adele Hast, eds, *Women Building Chicago: A Biographical Dictionary* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 393-394.

⁹² Wilson, Miriam and Mary Benet McKinney, Eulogy, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 1.

her own experiences of rejection and marginalization, this introverted and “eccentric” nun, who reportedly thrived on “alone-ness,” was strongly attracted by the communal implications of the Mystical Body of Christ and the gathering movement for active lay participation in the Mass as a means of healing social rifts.

To Himebaugh, liturgical structure was more than a reflection or distillation of theological truth; like her mentors Virgil Michel, O.S.B., Gerald Ellard, S.J., and William Busch, S.J., she regarded it as socially prescriptive, a blueprint for community behavior. Along with these prominent liturgical innovators, Himebaugh believed that the current approach to liturgy encouraged the formation of a complacent, self-absorbed spirituality that blunted laymen’s sense of mutual responsibility and leadership potential. Liturgical norms dating from the Council of Trent established that at the altar the priest, acting *in persona Christae*, recited the consecratory Mass prayers quietly to himself within a private space sectioned off by his back, while, behind him, the individual laymen united their intentions with his in whatever manner they deemed effective, offering the Eucharistic Sacrifice in an indirect, vicarious way. While by the 1930s many of the younger generation read the liturgical text from a Missal—a publication first made available to laity at the turn of the century—many older Catholics, likely including the majority of immigrant and ethnic parishioners, still said the rosary, read from prayerbooks, or meditated privately during Mass. This layer of separation from the liturgical text and activity, Himebaugh believed, taught individual Catholics to view spirituality in an isolated rather than a social sense—in terms of emotional response and personal perfection rather than interaction and mutual responsibility. Moreover,

Himebaugh felt that weekly experience of ritual separation between priest and people taught laity that they had no active role in the Church; that they were passive recipients of grace through the priest, rather than active conduits of grace to one another.⁹³

Following the lead of her progressive mentors, Himebaugh hoped to promote lay activism in economic, racial, and gender reforms by encouraging young Catholics to read and recite the liturgical text along with the priest, an action which (progressives theorized) would enable laity to identify with both Christ and the clerical class in the sacrificial action of the Mass. This “lay priesthood” concept invoked both the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ and a related philosophy of personalism, which taught that each individual Catholic was called to act as Christ—indeed, to “be Christ”—every day within his or her social sphere.⁹⁴ To re-inforce this identification, reformers encouraged laity to work toward “full, active participation” first through use of the Missal; and later, when available, through participation in the *Missa Recitata* or Dialogue Mass, a form in which laity recited Mass prayers alternately with a leader.⁹⁵ Again, reformers viewed liturgy as the ritual bridge between theological concepts and daily life. As went the Mass, so also would go society.

Indeed, in the interest of social justice, proponents of the Liturgical Movement hoped that high-school and collegiate experiences of the *Missa Recitata*, or Dialogue

⁹³ Keith F. Pecklers, *The Unread Vision: The Liturgical Movement in the United States of America, 1926-1955* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 40-43, 47-52, 101-103; 136.

⁹⁴ Paul B. Marx, O.S.B., *Virgil Michel and the Liturgical Movement* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1957), 55; Joseph P. Chinnici, O.F.M., “The Catholic Community at Prayer, 1926-1976,” in James O’Toole, ed., *Habits of Devotion: Catholic Religious Practice in Twentieth-Century America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 9-87; 39-40.

⁹⁵ Keith F. Pecklers, *The Unread Vision*, 40-43, 47-52, 101-103; 136.

Mass, would lay the groundwork for its widespread implementation in Catholic parishes. “[...]the work of widest value that students can do is to discuss the Liturgy, its meaning, and its place in Catholic life, so that when the various dioceses to which they belong go forward in liturgical observance, they, as parishioners, will be ready and anxious to cooperate,” Gerald Ellard, S.J. would tell Mundelein students in 1937. “When every parish Mass is a *Missa Recitata*, when every Catholic realizes that he is a vital member of a Living Body, the Church, then the ideal of scholars in the liturgical field will be realized.”⁹⁶

However, encouraging social values through active liturgical participation first involved persuading students that the Mass text was relevant and appropriate to them. As principal of St. Scholastica’s Academy from 1927 to 1932, Himebaugh organized that high school’s religious organization as a “liturgical” subcommittee of CISCORA’s Eucharistic/OurLady committee and led her students in study of the Missal and promotion of the *Missa Recitata* (a Mass in which the laity joined in the altar servers’ responses as well as such sung prayers as the *Gloria*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnus Dei*). In 1934 her enthusiasm for these projects led her to initiate correspondence with the famous liturgical scholar Virgil Michel, a fellow Benedictine and editor of the liturgical journal *Orate Fratres*; as well as Jesuit scholar William Busch, S.J. In addition, a 1935 letter suggested an ongoing personal acquaintance with Rev. Albert Hammenstede, the liturgical innovator from Maria Laach monastery in Belgium.⁹⁷ Cultivating these innovators as mentors, she confided her hopes of enlarging St. Scholastica’s project in

⁹⁶ “Father Ellard Discusses Social Aspect of Liturgy,” *Skyscraper* (19 March 1937): 3.

⁹⁷ Himebaugh to Virgil Michel (6 August 1935) CISCORA Records Box 7 Folder 4.

liturgical education to encompass all of CISCORA, as well as her personal anxieties regarding the challenge of teaching the new liturgical theology in an accurate and accessible manner.

To some extent Reiner shared Himebaugh's desire to foster active lay participation in the liturgy as a route to social action, although, as with all aspects of CISCORA, his policy was to encourage good habits and trust the students themselves to seek knowledge as they desired it. As early as 1928, he and Mertz took the step of introducing Loyola Arts students to a version of the *Missa Recitata*, wherein students joined in selected prayers and choral songs—presumably using a draft of Reiner's own "Mass Prayers and Hymns for Congregational Use," which Queen's Work published in 1930. In preface to this pamphlet, Reiner expressed its goals as "... [t]hrough congregational praying and singing to make the Mass, as it should be, a corporate, public act of homage to the Divine Majesty; to "bring out in relief the structure of the Mass... especially of Communion as a sacrificial banquet..."; and to "enable the faithful to join the priest, to follow him, if not with the precise words that he uses, at least with the same general idea and sentiments." Overall, Reiner hoped "to make attendance at Mass more intelligent, more devotional, more attractive, more fruitful"--aims that reflected Liturgical Movement influences.⁹⁸

However, rather than aggressively re-educate students in liturgical theology, Reiner gently urged students to sing the Mass with the help of his book, which he hoped would ease them gradually into engagement with the full text of the Mass and its underlying theology. "As a further result [of this Mass book]," he explained, "it is hoped

⁹⁸ "Fr. Reiner Arranges Method of Assisting at Holy Mass," *Loyola News* (11 November 1930): 3.

that many of those using this method will be led to use the method most desired by the Church, the Missal.”⁹⁹ At Loyola, he personally requested that students “have their Mass books so as to participate fully in the offering up of the sacrifice”; and, when Arts students routinely neglected to bring their books on retreat, he provided them institutional copies, to be distributed before Mass and afterward collected.¹⁰⁰ As with student leadership in general, Reiner offered students the semblance of personal choice and initiative in matters of liturgy, trusting habit and peer pressure to imperceptibly provoke their intellectual curiosity and guide their ideological formation.

Reiner’s hands-off approach proved an early source of frustration to Himebaugh, who hoped to aggressively expand liturgical education beyond her own institutional subcommittee at St. Scholastica’s into the broader CISCORA organization. “[I]t seems to me that merely teaching persons to use the Missal, without instructing them in the real meaning of the Sacrifice, is not getting very far along the road of the liturgy,” she wrote to Michel.¹⁰¹ Himebaugh’s correspondence with theologians Michel and William Busch, S.J. indicated that Reiner—reportedly nicknamed “Bucky” for his “tenacity in clinging to his decisions”—was unwilling to compromise with Himebaugh concerning the group’s broader direction.¹⁰² “I hope that Father Reiner will come to agree with you that the doctrine of the Mystical Body must be taught, judiciously of course, to our young people,” Busch wrote to Himebaugh in 1934. “It should not be a sort of specialty of one

⁹⁹ “Fr. Reiner Arranges Method of Assisting at Holy Mass,” *Loyola News* (11 November 1930): 3.

¹⁰⁰ “Friday Chapel Periods Begin for Students,” *Loyola News* (26 September 1928): 1.

¹⁰¹ Himebaugh to Michel, 26 January 1935, CISCORA Records, CISCORA Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

¹⁰² Bauer, “CISCORA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 28.

institution.”¹⁰³ In 1936, reflecting on some limited success in introducing students to “the doctrine of the mystical body and its applications to daily life,” Himebaugh triumphantly observed to Michel that “Two years ago Father Reiner told me that I could never get Ciscans to under[stand] that much.”¹⁰⁴

Perhaps encouraged by Sheil’s June 1934 emphasis on instructing the laity, that Fall Himebaugh found her opportunity. Immediately after Reiner’s death—even before Carrabine’s appointment could be announced—she began to prepare a proposal for Cisca programming that she intended to present to the new moderator appointed by Sheil. Once Carrabine took office, Himebaugh sounded him out on the subject and received ample encouragement to continue developing her schema. “Father Carrabine is proving himself not only open-minded but even vitally interested in liturgy,” she reported to Busch in December 1934.¹⁰⁵

With Carrabine’s permission, by way of experiment in March 1935 Himebaugh’s liturgical subcommittee presented a short dramatic skit that used the text of the Mass to interpret Catholicism’s Mystical Body concept as a Godly alternative to Communist ideology¹⁰⁶—introducing “startling ideas,” as Himebaugh phrased it. “[W]e ‘did’ liturgy in a new way at the last Cisca meeting,” she wrote to Michel. “It was very necessary to startle the Ciscans out of their somnolent indifference to all things liturgical...” Rattled indeed, the students responded strongly. “The discussion that

¹⁰³ Rev. William Busch, S.J., to Himebaugh, 29 October 1934, Cisca Records Box 7 Folder 5.

¹⁰⁴ Himebaugh to Virgil Michel, 11 November 1936, Cisca Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

¹⁰⁵ Cecilia Himebaugh to William Busch, 31 December 1934, Cisca Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

¹⁰⁶ For an analysis of this 1935 skit, see pp. 209-211 of this chapter.

followed lasted almost an hour, instead of the eight minutes usually allowed,” she reported. “In fact, it was prolonged by vote twice. I know that we went pretty far, and I should love to know what you think of anything so radical.”¹⁰⁷ Michel must have approved: In April 1935 the liturgical journal *Orate Fratres*, which he edited, published the text of the untitled CISCA skit as an example of “how some of the abstract ideas underlying the program of the Liturgical Movement can be popularized.”¹⁰⁸

Carrabine, too, considered the experiment a “success,” and also remarked on the lively conflicts of the ensuing student discussion. “[A]fter last Saturday’s meeting, I don’t think that you can complain of the lack of discontent among Ciscans with things liturgical as they are now,” he wrote to Himebaugh. “If anything, the opposition—principally McGrathian—went too far. Veronica scored with mighty effect when she broke in on that warm discussion after Miss Egan and Mr. McGrath had leaned heavily and long on the bellows of communistic and anti-individualistic oratory.” Still, he warned Himebaugh that repetition would be necessary before the liturgical movement would “effectively ‘register’” in the minds of regular CISCA members. “But that is not a reflection on the skit itself or its presentation,” he reassured Himebaugh. “It is merely a comment on the crassness of us Ciscans in matters liturgical.”¹⁰⁹

Encouraged, Himebaugh worked on her CISCA program proposal throughout the semester, slowly elaborating a committee arrangement centered on the concept of liturgy. “...I have been working every spare moment—and such moments are rare—on that

¹⁰⁷ Himebaugh to Michel, 23 March 1935, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

¹⁰⁸ “CISCA,” *Orate Fratres* v. IX no. 6 (20 April 1935), 278-281.

¹⁰⁹ Carrabine to Himebaugh, 19 March 1935, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

organization plan for Cisca, some of the committee plans for which I am enclosing...” she wrote to Michel in May 1935. Hoping for his input, she briefly summarized her approach to the re-organization: “...You see, Father, I am trying to outline very briefly the possibilities of applying the dogma [of the Mystical Body of Christ] to each of the committees... I followed the outline that you will readily recognize: aim of the committee in terms of the Mystical Body, the theory (or knowledge) of the doctrine as applied to that particular subject, then the attitude to be engendered in the students, and finally the activities proper to the committee in light of the dogma...” Liturgy would be central to this scheme, as “[w]ithout my realizing it, I found that all the committees culminate in the Sacrifice of the Mass, which is how it should be.” While Himebaugh worried that the plan was “too visionary” to be entirely practical, “...I hoped that I could at least give Father Carrabine an inkling of the immense possibilities of basing everything on such solid and unsentimental spirituality...” she wrote. So far “I have not shown anything of it to him, as he is too busy getting ready for the big meeting... After that he wants to see it, if you think there is anything worth your while to see.”¹¹⁰

Writing throughout the summer months, Himebaugh finally finished her schema in August 1935. “It was a long and difficult task for me—in fact, the hardest work I ever did, not excepting my thesis,” she confided to Michel. Moreover, she reported that Carrabine, likely recalling the Communist-missal skit in March, anticipated strong student resistance: “... [H]e sees even more clearly than I the innumerable obstacles in our path. The idea is going to be a difficult thing to sell to hard-shelled Ciscans, to many of whom the doctrine of the Mystical Body is like a heresy that we are trying to

¹¹⁰ Himebaugh to Michel, 25 May 1935, Cisca Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

promulgate in opposition to the good old-fashioned teachings of their pastor and teachers.” Still, “I believe Father Carrabine is really very much interested in the project,” she wrote, and prayed that while in retreat “...God will let him know His will about what is to be done this coming year.”¹¹¹

She presented her proposals—and Carrabine pronounced them “splendid,” though he was also “relieved” that Virgil Michel attested to their orthodoxy. Himebaugh happily repeated the complements to Michel in October.¹¹² Having personally approved Himebaugh’s plan, Carrabine next presented it to Bishop Sheil, who reportedly felt such confidence in Michel’s *nihil obstat* that he waived the usual requirement of running the documents by the official Archdiocesan censor at Mundelein Seminary. As a result, “I don’t think you need worry over Father Virgil’s name appearing on the... copies,” Carrabine reassured Himebaugh. “That circumstance, I believe, will help rather than hinder” the plan’s acceptance throughout the Archdiocese. While visiting the Sodality Central Office in St. Louis later that same month, Carrabine also gave to Fr. Lord a copy of Himebaugh’s schema, “the summary with the a copy of the detailed development of each of the committees—that big, loose-leaf notebook you gave me.” Interestingly, Carrabine’s letter expressed no anxiety regarding Lord’s reaction, an absence attributable either to prior knowledge of Lord’s opinions, or to Lord’s lesser authority in comparison with Sheil.¹¹³

¹¹¹ Himebaugh to Michel, 6 August 1935, CISCA Records, , Box 7 Folder 4.

¹¹² Himebaugh to Michel, 10 October 1935, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

¹¹³ Carrabine to Himebaugh, 17 October 1935, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 3; Himebaugh to Michel, 10 October 1935, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

After this approval process, Carrabine seemed to allow Himebaugh a great deal of latitude in planning subsequent CISCA meetings and events in coordination with Archdiocesan and Sodality goals, accepting for himself the more executive tasks of operating and publicizing the organization, counseling students, and occasionally applying the brakes to Himebaugh's enthusiasm. Unlike Reiner, however, he was open to persuasion: When in summer 1936 Carrabine hesitated to intrude further on the curricular provenance of schools by scheduling an intensive, theological study of the Mass text, Himebaugh appeared to overcome him by sheer force of conviction. "To Father's objection that liturgy should come from the schools themselves having studied it, I countered that it would never come then—at least not until he and I were laid away," she wrote. There, apparently, ended Carrabine's resistance.¹¹⁴ In November 1936 she informed Michel that "Father Carrabine is as loyal and enthusiastic for the Cause as ever," much as if she were reporting on his cooperation to a co-conspirator.¹¹⁵

Even as Himebaugh continually challenged Carrabine to take risks with CISCA content, Michel in turn pressured her to incorporate the Liturgical Movement more explicitly than she herself considered politically expedient. For instance, when Michel, reviewing Himebaugh's completed CISCA schema, suggested that the "Eucharistic-Our Lady" committee be retitled "Liturgical" in order to clarify its purpose, Himebaugh found herself—like Carrabine—applying the brakes. "To suggest a change in title... would mean rousing such a storm of opposition that would be not only futile but suicidal to the Cause for which we are working," she explained to Michel. "Therefore, although Father

¹¹⁴ Himebaugh to Michel, 25 July 1936, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

¹¹⁵ Himebaugh to Virgil Michel, 11 November 1936, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

Lord has never agreed to the title and Father Carrabine also sees its discrepancy, we think that it had better stand unchallenged. . . . You may remember I told you that in regard to the outlines I had avoided the use of the word *liturgical* whenever possible, on account of the preconceived prejudice to the idea of liturgy on the part of most people.”¹¹⁶ If Himebaugh had to manage the more cautious Carrabine to some extent, she also occasionally had to stand up to Michel, the stridently progressive academic, while maintaining a certain deference in her attitude toward both men.

Despite this gendered balancing act, Himebaugh nevertheless succeeded in using her moment to maneuver into a significant intellectual role in citywide Catholic youth leadership. Her overarching plan would re-orient CISCA away from freewheeling student committees and toward a structured program of spiritual and theological indoctrination in the interest of social change. Moreover, she would consistently push the envelope, promoting progressive Benedictine liturgical scholarship in a student organization dominated by more cautious, diplomatic Jesuits. For a female religious, Himebaugh’s inclusion in the leadership sphere of male clergy was out of the ordinary, a privilege that could threaten extant relationships among the Catholic schools—which was why, according to Himebaugh, it had to remain hidden.

The new CISCA program reflected the federation’s titular change from an organization centered on campus “Religious Activities” to one focused on co-ordinated, ideological “Catholic Action” in unity with the Church hierarchy. Perhaps with Sheil’s “Catechism” in mind, Carrabine and Himebaugh disapproved of Reiner’s focus on the

¹¹⁶ Himebaugh to Michel, 22 October 1935, CISCA Records Box 7 Folder 4.

defined projects of student-led committees and subcommittees, which they deplored as scattered, secular “Catholic activity,” lacking any sense of unified purpose or theological justification.¹¹⁷ What Reiner had viewed as active, practical exercises in organization for social justice and Catholic cultural ascendancy, Carrabine criticized as distractingly “material,” obsessed with “concrete results,” and fueled only by “the natural means of enthusiasm and ballyhoo.” Student leaders aspired to visible success in their committee projects, and to this end promoted and concentrated on one organized effort to the exclusion of other areas of spirituality. For this reason, leaders’ formation lacked integrity and interior motivation.¹¹⁸ Rather, it was, in Hartnett’s subsequent words, “too conformed to this world.”¹¹⁹

By contrast to Reiner’s decentralized, project-based approach to organized Catholic Action, Carrabine and Himebaugh favored a stronger central organization that engaged individual students through the concept of personalism—the idea that each individual had the obligation of representing Christ to others, as well as finding Christ in others. According to Bauer, Carrabine repeatedly told students that “[i]t is vastly more important to *be* than to *do*,” meaning that efforts to “be one with Christ” would inevitably spill over into the intangible, one-on-one social interactions that shaped society and culture.¹²⁰ Similarly, Himebaugh insisted that “Catholic Action consists not in *doing*

¹¹⁷ “The History of CISCA, 1926-1944,” in CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 11: 6.

¹¹⁸ Bauer, “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 122-123.

¹¹⁹ Robert C. Harnett, S.J., to CISCA members (1937), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 13.

¹²⁰ Bauer, “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 167-168; Martin Carrabine, S.J. and Sister M. Cecilia, O.S.B., *The Parish Turns Red* (St. Louis, MO: The Queen’s Work, 1943) 39.

things but in being Christ...”¹²¹ This personalist critique struck at the heart of CISCA’s former construction as an extracurricular activity in which students, acting in committees and subcommittees, planned, executed, and reported upon specific projects with all the “enthusiasm and ballyhoo” associated with “school spirit.”¹²²

Furthermore, according to CISCA histories Carrabine found that Reiner’s co-option of institutional “campus life” procedures, based on secular standards of popularity and success, often failed to meet CISCA’s need for informed, theologically-motivated student leadership. For instance, while the federation’s constitution gave De Paul, Xavier, Rosary, and the Chicago Teacher’s College the privilege of appointing CISCA’s four main committee chairmen according to their own institutional custom, the outcome might be leaders who were popular, clever, and perhaps even religious, but not necessarily in agreement with CISCA’s progressive ideology. The arrangement “often resulted in naming for the post a student who had never attended a Cisca meeting, and who was even prejudiced against the whole idea,” explained an undated narrative, probably penned by Himebaugh. While “[t]o the credit of Father Carrabine’s sincere salesmanship many of the best chairmen were fashioned of such unpromising raw material, young men and women who had come to scoff but became ardent apostles for the cause,” from Carrabine’s perspective CISCA needed leadership rooted in religious conviction, rather than in the campus peer culture with its secular factors and influences.

123

¹²¹ Sister Cecilia Himebaugh, O.S.B., “CISCA in Retrospect,” [1965], CISCA Records Box 1 Folder 20.

¹²² Sister Cecilia Himebaugh, “CISCA in Retrospect” [1965], CISCA Records Box 1 Folder 20.

¹²³ “The CISCA Organization, Pro and Con,” [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 14: 5.

To address these motivational issues, Himebaugh's plan re-invented CISCA explicitly as a "school for lay leaders"—a centralized religion curriculum controlled by moderators, as opposed to a federated extracurriculum that re-directed pre-existing campus leadership ideals, procedures, and social pressures toward a religious purpose.¹²⁴ Formal education now took priority over practical experience. "Ciscans needed to learn more in order to do more," explained the 1944 CISCA history, which Himebaugh probably ghostwrote. To meet the perceived educational need, "CISCA would develop a new training technique, a lecture room, a method of study and discussion to unify, motivate, guide the laboratory."¹²⁵ A 1957 history referred to CISCA's new educational focus as Carrabine's "motivation through knowledge" program.¹²⁶ In 1939 Carrabine articulated CISCA's purpose in terms of the organization's Archdiocesan allegiance, defining CISCA's goal as "to provide lay leaders... to establish a nucleus of lay leaders thoroughly instructed in Catholic dogmas, but also familiar with the Catholic viewpoint on social questions, literature, education, international relations and similar subjects, in each parish of the diocese."¹²⁷

To promote this educational mission, Himebaugh's plan reworded Reiner's flow chart of CISCA structure, restating the committees' defining "loyalties" as "loyalties motivated by knowledge," in which the theology of "The Mystical Body of Christ" formed "the unifying and motivating subject." This explicitly theological connection in

¹²⁴ "The History of CISCA, 1926-1944," CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 11: 6.

¹²⁵ "The History of CISCA, 1926-1944," CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 11: 5.

¹²⁶ "The CISCA Story," (1957), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 19: 10.

¹²⁷ CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 15: 1.

turn impacted individual committee mission statements. For example, the Social Action Committee's adjusted goal was "knowing how to live out co-membership in Christ's Mystical Body."¹²⁸ Interestingly, CISCA histories and promotional materials often adopted a scientific rhetoric in order to explain the relationship between overarching intellectual concepts and student-led activity. CISCA was described as a "laboratory of Catholic Action" in which federated committees conducted co-ordinated "experimentation" on the common theological theme of the Mystical Body.¹²⁹

Re-organized according to Himebaugh and Carrabine's preferences, CISCA general and committee meetings now resembled the seminar classroom more closely than the Student Council. Beginning in the 1935-36 academic year, Himebaugh constructed an annual "syllabus" outlining a broad educational theme—such as "Making the World Safe for Christianity" [1941]—to which all meetings and projects related. Both General and Saturday committee gatherings now became "planned meetings" at which students discussed, not the details of their own committee and subcommittee projects, but mimeographed programs of ideas, questions, and reading assignments that had been sent to institutional moderators for circulation among the students. For instance, in 1941 a General Meeting agenda referred to assigned readings from *America*, *New World*, *Catholic Mind*, and *Reader's Digest*.¹³⁰ Carrabine urged students to prepare for a

¹²⁸ "The History of CISCA, 1926-1944," CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 11: 6.

¹²⁹ "Crusaders in Student Catholic Action," (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 6; "The History of CISCA, 1926-1944," CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 11: 5.

¹³⁰ Agendas, General Meeting (22 February 1941), CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 18.

meeting's discussions by organizing informal "bull sessions" on the pre-circulated questions and readings.¹³¹

Student officers and chairmen consequently lost some control of the General Meetings, which under Reiner had devoted the entire morning to the federated committee and institutional subcommittee reports—in effect, to students' account of their own activities. Under Carrabine and Himebaugh's new program, however, the General Meeting limited committee reports to one hour or less in order to accommodate a tightly-scheduled series of educational talks, discussions, and prescriptive dramalogues. For example, in February 1937 the General Meeting's morning program began with *Missa Recitata* and mental prayer and proceeded through a keynote talk on "Christ and Culture" by De Paul student Henry Rago, which was followed by an economics "Symposium on Co-operatives," involving open discussion. After lunch, the CISCA Players presented Fr. Lord's one-act play "The Flame Leaps Up." Bishop Sheil then addressed the assembly, and the meeting closed with Benediction.¹³² While it is true that students still gave the talks, participated (often eagerly) in the discussions, and enacted the plays, the power of committee and subcommittee chairs to take the floor and introduce their own topics, concerns, and achievements for general discussion was curtailed.

Increasingly, CISCA meetings also "scripted" student interactions in ways that went well beyond Reiner's notecard prompts, prefacing open discussion with skits or dialogues in which student actors spoke of "right" and "wrong" ways of integrating

¹³¹ "The History of CISCA, 1926-1944," CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 11; 6; "The CISCA Story" (1957), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 19: 10.

¹³² Agendas, General Meeting (22 February 1937), CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 18.

religion with daily life. Himebaugh intended this innovation, first introduced at the March 1935 meeting, to entertain the students while also normalizing theological concepts. "...CISCA's membership consisted of students to whom the Saturday meeting must not be 'just another class in religion,'" she recalled in 1965. "To them 'new' truths must be presented in a manner untrammelled by classroom formality and brought down from the rarified realm of pure theory, into the most human of terms. Hence it was decided that the play might be the thing wherein to catch the interest of youth, emancipate its self-consciousness, and dispel its suspicion that the spiritual has no relation to authority." Likely Himebaugh herself penned the anonymous skits,¹³³ in which fictional students—usually high-schoolers--presented religious concepts in the guise of supposedly ordinary hallway, cafeteria, and courtship conversations. "Thus was found a way of concentrating ideas in a normal group of young people, who 'talked religion' in modern terminology and made it a perfectly natural topic for dates and dinners," claimed Himebaugh.¹³⁴

Co-opting the strategy of Progressive-era community pageants, these CISCA skits made students actors and audience complicit in a liturgical construction of the Catholic community, its political context, and its outsiders. For example, the inaugural skit,

¹³³ Authorship of the skits is difficult to confirm due to Himebaugh's deliberate concealment of her role in CISCA. Although in 1935 an anonymous editorial in *Orate Fratres* publicly attributed authorship of the March 1935 Missal skit, for example, to "two students of St. Scholastica's Academy," curiously enough Himebaugh's private correspondence neither named these students nor alluded to their role—which was unusual, as typically she played up evidence that her students could "talk liturgy" with intelligence. Indeed, after the performance Carrabine congratulated Himebaugh for "the excellent job you made of the liturgical skit"; and in May 1935 Michel wrote to her "I was very to hear that Peter Maurin likes your skits so well... By all means continue working on them because it is a real medium for you of propaganda." While these remarks do leave plenty of room for doubt, they create a general impression that Himebaugh was the author. See *Orate Fratres* v. ix no. 6 (April 20, 1935): 278; Carrabine to Himebaugh (19 March 1935) CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 3; Michel to Himebaugh (22 May 1935) CISCA Records Box 7 Folder 4.

¹³⁴ Sister Cecilia Himebaugh, "CISCA in Retrospect" [1965], CISCA Records Box 1 Folder 20.

enacted by St. Scholastica high school students before the March 1935 General Meeting, explicitly linked the use of a Missal at Mass with the construction of community as Mystical Body and, through it, with Catholic Action's political function as a Godly alternative to Communism. In this dialogue, a fictional Catholic student (Pat) announces that she is "turning Communist" and that "it's the Missal that's making me one." When a second student (Jean) reacts with shock and disbelief, Pat replies that "...you don't understand the Mass fully unless you know about the brotherhood of man... If you really think when you use the Missal, you've got to get the feeling of this brotherhood." Pat goes on to explain that the text of the liturgy makes it clear that Catholic laity offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in unity with the priest, forming a brotherhood under the parentage of God. Communists, she argues, differ only from Catholics in that Communists represent a "brotherhood of orphans" without a common Father.

The character Jean reacts to Pat's explanation by placing the comparison between Catholicism and Communism in competitive terms: "If all this is on the up and up, why in the world don't we get out and tell the Communists that we already have exactly what they're working for?" At this point the skit's emphasis shifts from the ideological construct to the need for social action, for Catholics' active response to the Mystical Body aspects of the liturgy. Pat contends that Catholics in general are too "selfish or indifferent—or both," too "smug and self-satisfied," to recognize their duty to their fellow man—and that this self-absorption is "at the root of all our social troubles today and that makes the Communists frenzied about class exploitation..." Eventually, she asserts, either "Communism or a realization of genuine Catholicity" will correct social

injustices, a prediction that carries an implicit threat: if ordinary Catholics fail to understand and respond to the liturgy's appeal for universal brotherhood and mutual sacrifice, then Communism will prevail in the United States. "...I'm just trying to show you that the Church wants us to do something," Pat says in conclusion. "Don't you see that the Mass ought to be the generating station for all kinds of Catholic Action? Let's have action, and plenty of it—as the effect of our Mass."¹³⁵ In sum, the dialogue taught that liturgical text, as encountered in the Missal, should form the basis of a social ideology that affected individual decisions in the broader context of human society.

Although on a much smaller scale, this example of CISCA skits bore a remarkable resemblance to the community pageants that were so popular during the 1910s and 20s—including Daniel A. Lord, S.J.'s *Pageant of Youth*, which interpreted university "campus life" rituals in terms of allegiance to the Blessed Virgin. First, the skit's prescriptive purpose is unmistakable: It attempts to define the Church as a non-geographic community—a spiritual "brotherhood" in the "Mystical Body of Christ"—and identify the Mass as that community's unifying ritual, similar to the games and exercises of "campus life." As in *Pageant of Youth*, the community encounters large-scale external opposition in the form of Communism, as well as internal dissidents—"indifferent or selfish," or "smug and self-satisfied" Catholics who refuse to submit to the community rituals and the values that those rituals convey. Unlike the large-scale *Pageant of Youth*, this little CISCA skit enacts no conflict resolution, as the "smug and self-satisfied" Catholics are not dramatically punished and re-integrated into the religious

¹³⁵ Sister Cecilia Himebaugh, "Communism and the Missal," quoted in Sister Mary Roberta Bauer, S.S.N.D., "CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists," (M.A. Thesis, De Paul University, 1945), 36-39.

community. However, the skit does refer to a possible future resolution, suggesting that a popularization of active liturgical participation would be a means of social healing.

Secondly, as in *Pageant of Youth* and other community pageants, community members—in this case, students—act the various roles according to Himebaugh’s script, with other students as their audience. The action, then, is completely internal, as the community is representing a communal image or construction to itself in an effort to strengthen and replicate internal bonds. In theory, both actors and audience are carrying away certain messages about the Catholic Church community—in this case, that community is realized through ritual engagement with the text of the Mass, which produces a “feeling of brotherhood”; that community membership involves social obligation; and that, in order to be effective, the community must re-integrate dissidents who, it is implied, neither understand the liturgical text nor recognize the bonds of community. Himebaugh’s skits could refer to these Catholics, who approached the Mass without much textual awareness, in a scornful tone intended to shape students’ opinions: for instance, one 1940 skit referred disparagingly to “a rosary-at-Mass Catholic, who never dreamed that what went on at the altar had anything to do with her.”¹³⁶

Interestingly, the CISCA skit, which itself functioned as a miniature community pageant, often interpreted the Mass, too, as a form of theater. For instance, in 1940 a skit entitled “The Holy Week Apostles Hold a Bull Session” compared Mass to an opera in foreign language, which is unintelligible without prior knowledge of the script. “...[I]f you want to be intelligent, you’ve got to know the play beforehand,” said one character to another—in other words, participatory engagement with the Mass necessarily involved

¹³⁶ “The Holy Week Apostles Hold a Bull Session,” [1940], CISCA Records, Box 4 Folder 5: 1.

study of the text.¹³⁷ Another short, untitled skit also depicted young Chicago-area Catholics discussing the Mass after seeing a performance of a play, “Abe Lincoln in Illinois,” which was, essentially, a civic celebration. This skit also directly compared the liturgy to a community-building play.¹³⁸ Indeed, one might argue that the Mass itself was increasingly understood less as spiritual access to a “real” event (Christ’s sacrificial crucifixion) than as the dramatic enactment of a community pageant in which community members—parishioners and priest—presented a common script to one another for the purpose of creating or maintaining unity and teaching social justice values.

More explicitly, in 1939 Himebaugh and Carrabine related the Liturgical Movement to the realization of a political ideal that they termed “Christocracy”—a vaguely-described construct centered on the primacy of the Mystical Body of Christ. An October meeting of CISCA’s Eucharistic-Our Lady Committee explained “Christocracy” as referring, not to a theocracy or an explicitly monarchical form of government, but to an American government of committed Catholic Christians, who, through their conscious bond in the Mystical Body of Christ, “determine their policies, laws, and actions as a unified body subject to the guidance of Christ as Head.” According to the meeting’s agenda, thus a “Christocracy” would be—paradoxically—both democratic, in that it derived its legitimacy from a united body of citizens; and monarchical, in that the people acted in reverent awareness of their role as Christ’s subjects and instruments.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ “The Holy Week Apostles Hold a Bull Session, “ [1940], CISCA Records, Box 4 Folder 5: 1.

¹³⁸ Untitled skit, CISCA Records, Box 4 Folder 5.

¹³⁹ “Eucharistic-Our Lady Committee (College), October 7, 1939,” CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 8.

Carrabine and Himebaugh taught that an improved understanding of Catholic liturgy would advance Christocracy's political and social ends. Indeed, Himebaugh had arguably connected the Christocratic concept with the liturgy as early as 1935, when her initial skit interpreted the Missal as teaching a revolutionary Christian concept of the "brotherhood of man" that could compete, politically and socially, with Communist ideology.¹⁴⁰ Similarly, the 1939 Eucharistic-Our Lady agenda suggested that Catholic sacraments had political significance due to their expression of popular union in the Mystical Body. "Could you... compare Baptism with the process of naturalization, by which men become citizens of a Christocracy?" it queried, linking the sacrament to civic identity. Moreover, "Can you explain to another student how every Mass is a renewal of Baptism?"¹⁴¹ In 1941-42 CISCA's annual agenda further related the political interpretation of the Mass with the individual practice of personalism. "LITURGY: What is it?," the agenda asked, and replied, "It is the life activity of the Mystic Christ on earth. What is the Mystic Christ doing today? Trying to build up a redeemed world into a New Christian World Order." Having established liturgy as a political catalyst, the agenda went on to question, "Out of what is He trying to build this?" The reply alluded to the personalist emphasis on Christ's presence in the individual as demonstrated in his or her relationship to the community: "Out of people made alive with supernatural life," it went; "out of materials used for God."¹⁴² Announcing this theme to students, in 1941 the

¹⁴⁰ Sister Cecilia Himebaugh, "Communism and the Missal," quoted in Bauer, "CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists," 36-39.

¹⁴¹ "Eucharistic-Our Lady Committee (College), October 7, 1939," CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 8.

¹⁴² "CISCA and Its Plan for the Year 1941-42," CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 16.

new CISCA president, Loyola student Charles O'Reilly, defined the "CISCA bull's eye for the year" as "To permeate the whole of student life—personal, social, cultural, with the genuine Christian spirit." *CISCA News* linked this expressed goal with the liturgy, declaiming "The battle cry is 'Ite, Missa est!' or 'The Mass is over, now go out and live it!'"¹⁴³ Similarly, the newsletter announced the theme of the next Apostolic Committee meeting as "Putting the Liturgy into Action."¹⁴⁴ In an era of Depression at home and war clouds in Europe, liturgical participation was more than an individual route to heaven; it was a political statement here on earth.

In to addition to promoting liturgy as catalyst for political and social reform, the new CISCA meeting programs also worked to move non-liturgical prayer away from the adorations, novenas, and rosaries of 19th-century ultramontanist and toward public prayers and guided meditations that attempted to awaken the subject's social consciousness. In general, Michel and other Liturgical Movement theologians believed that traditional private devotions tended to impede the social application of Catholic principles, since (they argued) these devotions aimed to evoke an individual, emotional response which, if approached as an end in itself, could lead the subject into spiritual complacency. By contrast, Michel hoped that a new approach to prayer would discourage students from dwelling on individual religious feelings and prompt them to translate Catholic principles into social action. For this reason the official CISCA vocal prayer, composed by John Henry Newman and adopted by CISCA in 1936, prescribed personalism--the goal of representing Christ in one's social activities—rather than

¹⁴³ *CISCA News* (4 October 1941), CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 22: 2.

¹⁴⁴ *CISCA News* (4 October 1941), CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 22: 4.

feelings of love of God or sorrow for personal sins. “Dear Jesus, help me to spread Thy fragrance everywhere,” it began. “Flood my soul with Thy spirit and life. Penetrate and possess my whole being so utterly that all my life may be only a radiance of Thine. Shine through me and be so in me that every soul I come in contact with may feel Thy presence in my soul. Let them look up and see no longer me but only Jesus.”¹⁴⁵

CISCA meetings also worked to ground the practice of meditation or “mental prayer” in community aims, experiences, and shared texts, rather than in the individual imagination and the goal of personal salvation. “Mental prayer,” a traditional but sophisticated prayer technique that St. Ignatius Loyola and St. Francis De Sales had taught and modeled, was usually understood as a private devotion involving intense personal reflection on theological concepts (such as heaven, hell, and purgatory) or the events of Christ’s life (as in the mysteries of the Rosary or Stations of the Cross) with the goals of cultivating personal virtue and conforming the individual mind to God’s will. According to De Sales, advanced practitioners of mental prayer progressively internalized the object of meditation to such an extent that they could, for example, picture the crucifixion event taking place “in their hearts”; and eventually, advancing through mental prayer to pure contemplation, they achieved such individual union with God that words and images were no longer necessary to excite and express worship. Traditional mental prayer could have public aspects: For example, a Catholic could conduct such meditative devotions such as the Rosary or the Stations of the Cross either alone or as part of a formal group exercise. Still, as with the nineteenth-century understanding of the Mass, the goal of the shared text and ritual was the development of

¹⁴⁵ Prayer card [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 10.

an intensely individual, interior connection with God. Although seated side-by-side in the pew, meditating Catholics nevertheless aimed to surround themselves with a closetlike privacy, forgetful of social and environmental “distractions.”¹⁴⁶

Initially CISCA students studied a traditional approach to mental prayer. A resolution proposed at the May 1935 General Meeting, for example, defined mental prayer’s aim as “personal holiness” and described it as an individual, free-form conversation—“a brief heart-to-heart talk to Christ or His Mother” in which CISCA members presented “their problems, joys or sorrows, just as they do to their most trusted friends.”¹⁴⁷ As the 1930s progressed, however, CISCA meetings increasingly added public and social elements to the individual experience. First of all, the aim of the prayer was readjusted. Social action, not contemplation or personal perfection, became the desired outcome. By 1945, Bauer understood mental prayer as essentially related to community formation and the cultivation of social leadership. In addition to “peace of mind and calmness of heart,” she wrote, as a result of mental prayer a CISCA student “becomes more tolerant of others and is encouraged to help them on toward their common goal—heaven; he becomes enkindled with a longing to be a leader in Christ’s army.”¹⁴⁸ In this interpretation, mental prayer was less a means of personal salvation than a wellspring of corporate direction, cohesion, and social virtue. While prayer still

¹⁴⁶ See St. Francis De Sales, *Introduction to the Devout Life*, John K. Ryan, trans., (New York: Doubleday, 2003): 70-81.

¹⁴⁷ Bauer, “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 124.

¹⁴⁸ Sister Mary Roberta Bauer, S.S.N.D., “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 50-51.

engaged the individual heart and mind, its intent was to appropriately connect that heart and mind with the surrounding community.

Secondly, CISCA meetings at general and committee level began to approach mental prayer less as an intense personal experience than as a public, scripted introduction to the discussion of some social issue. Meeting programs show that mental prayer opened gatherings as large as 75-100 (committee meetings) or even as large as 2,000 (General meetings). There, students listened to a common reading of Scripture, poetry, or a passage from a Papal Encyclical, usually selected for its relationship to the meeting's topic; reflected on it quietly for a few minutes; and then used their reflections as a segue into the day's program. Occasionally a set of questions accompanied the reading in order to clarify the meeting's thematic principle and prompt students to relate it to American or world society.¹⁴⁹ Creatively expanding upon this format, in 1937 Mundelein Sodalists went so far as to "present" their mental prayer "in the form of a tableau.... [of] the Annunciation picture" in which students portrayed the roles of Mary and the Angel Gabriel.¹⁵⁰ In the context of meetings, individual mental prayer became a practical exercise, initiated through some form of public presentation, and designed to support the intended direction of the planned meeting.

In adapting the practice of mental prayer to the public life of laity, CISCA members also embraced the sounds and images of secular urban life as aids rather than eschewing them as "distractions." In 1945 Bauer's dissertation explained a CISCA subcommittee's recommendations on everyday mental prayer as linked to environmental

¹⁴⁹ Agendas (1937-38), CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 6.

¹⁵⁰ "Sodality Presents Program; Puts Tapers on Cisca Cake," *Skyscraper* (30 April 1937): 3.

stimuli. “Various devices have been suggested to form psychological associations that will serve to call to mind the presence of God,” she wrote, “for instance: one can train oneself to pray mentally every time the clock strikes; every time a whistle blows; every time a door is closed; every time he sees a crucifix, a picture, or a church.”¹⁵¹ In 1936-37 the *De Paulia* columns of Eucharistic-Our Lady Committee chairman Henry Rago similarly mined the spiritual significance of ordinary experiences: To Rago, eating a hamburger was nothing less than an “expression of faith in the greater destiny of our souls,” while a barber’s small talk could lead into a consideration of the modern platitudes that obscure God’s absolute Truth.¹⁵² Attempting to adapt the monastic ideal of mental prayer to the situation of laity, CISCA had re-interpreted the experience as integrated into the patterns and rhythms of a hectic, noisy day and, to some degree, dependent on those patterns and rhythms. While more individualized than group mental prayer, this technique nevertheless tied prayer to routine public stimuli—to public life, to small events, cues, and irritants that many people shared.

On campus, annual student retreats reflected this shift from private interior prayer to shared public meditations directed toward some social goal. In 1926, for example, Loyola’s student retreat emphasized privacy and individuality, juxtaposing meditative devotions such as Benediction and the Way of the Cross with long periods of silence for prayer and spiritual reading of individually-chosen texts. “All are expected to observe

¹⁵¹ Sister Mary Roberta Bauer, S.S.N.D., “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” 51.

¹⁵² Henry W. Rago, “In Defense of Hamburgers,” *De Paulia* (16 January 1936): 2; Henry Rago, “Our Barbers, Resolutions, and Several Other Matters,” *De Paulia* (7 January 1937): 2.

silence, as far as circumstances permit, especially during the intermission,” the *Loyola News* instructed.¹⁵³ By contrast, in 1938 De Paul’s obligatory student retreat, conducted by the youthful Rev. John Francis Brown of St. Jerome’s Parish, consisted of three seminars on social problems as well as periods of communal “spiritual reading” in which “faculty priests will read and explain elevating literature to the students.”¹⁵⁴ Unlike the meditative, silent retreats of the 1920s, this was a group experience resembling the classroom. “Father Brown did not insist on silence and seclusion for the retreat; he did not suggest hours of meditation and folded hands”; rather, *De Paulia* reported, “he appealed to the intelligence of his audience...”¹⁵⁵ As in CISCA, campus programs increasingly interpreted prayer as a directed social experience that contextualized the individual within Christ’s Mystical Body.

Not all CISCA students welcomed the new approach to organization and spirituality. Reminiscing in 1965, Himebaugh explained that “...the doctrine itself of the Mystical Body and of lay participation in the Mass was hitherto unheard of in most Catholic parishes. Needless to say, youth with Yankee canniness had at first developed a sales resistance on the grounds of orthodoxy and practicality.”¹⁵⁶ In October 1935 Himebaugh perceived students’ “sales resistance” as so strong that she hesitated to rename the “Eucharistic-Our Lady” committee the “Liturgical” committee, fearing that

¹⁵³ “Fr. Lord Leads Arts Students in Retreat,” *Loyola News* (20 October 1926): 1.

¹⁵⁴ “Rev. John F. Brown to Conduct Annual Three Day Retreat,” *De Paulia* (20 January 1938): 1.

¹⁵⁵ “Retreat Master urges Students to Higher Life,” *De Paulia* (10 February 1938): 1.

¹⁵⁶ Sister Cecilia Himebaugh, “CISCA in Retrospect” [1965], CISCA Records Box 1 Folder 20.

that the change would alienate students and alumni who had a “preconceived prejudice” against the movement.¹⁵⁷ Students also objected to the downplaying of student leadership and projects in favor of pre-arranged programs of theological education. “Quite a bit of opposition developed toward this change of emphasis, but the need for a long period of indoctrination was there...” Himebaugh wrote in 1957.¹⁵⁸ In 1965 she reflected that “Opposition... is a mark of any true apostolate; therefore we should have been duly concerned if good, well-meaning persons had not begun setting up roadblocks. So the old guard soon attacked our ‘planned meetings,’ whose origin they could not trace.”¹⁵⁹

Students’ rancor was understandable: After all, one may speculate that those who had bothered to join their campus religious organizations probably had done so because they were already attracted by Catholic worship as presented in their home parishes, together with the devotionality and interior, emotional, individual emphasis that Michel, Himebaugh, and Carrabine deplored. Parents (often ethnic), parish priests, and parish-run Catholic grade schools all had re-inforced this nineteenth-century devotional style. Many students took their pious practices seriously. Moreover, senior student members would have remembered CISCORA’s previous program, which they had—at least nominally—helped to create. Who, they likely wondered, were Himebaugh and Carrabine to invalidate their prior spiritual experiences, as well as the authority of their parents, pastors, and student leaders?

¹⁵⁷ Himebaugh to Michel, 22 October 1935, Cisca Records Box 7 Folder 4.

¹⁵⁸ “The Cisca Story,” (1957), Cisca Records Box 1 Folder 19: 10.

¹⁵⁹ Sister Cecilia Himebaugh, “Cisca in Retrospect” [1965], Cisca Records Box 1 Folder 20.

Unfortunately Himebaugh's correspondence provides the only account of students' motives and modes of resistance, and all too often she expressed a general sense of frustration with student recalcitrance rather than offering specific examples of it. When describing particular incidents, however, her 1935-1936 letters give the impression that much of the resistance was passive—a less a matter of overt attack, than of what Himebaugh perceived as a stubbornly devotional mindset. “In October we considered that Catholic Action is the attempt to bring back Christ into present-day society...,” she wrote to Michel in 1936. “Since this work of Christ cannot be done unless we become more and more Christ ourselves, we considered various ways by which we can gain this Christ-life. At the end of the meeting the Character committee... printed a card with the resolution in the form of a rule of life, or the ‘the daily half-dozen,’ which was adopted enthusiastically. This emphasises [sic] the need for daily Mass and Communion, mental prayer, aspirations, and self-denial. You will rightfully think,” she grumbled, “that liturgy is woefully lacking.”¹⁶⁰ Either students had listened to Himebaugh but, from long habit or misunderstanding of her expectations, defaulted to their usual concern with personal habits of prayer, self-discipline, and frequent Communion; or else they had listened to Himebaugh from politeness but, in the end, made the deliberate decision to use the individual style of worship with which they felt most comfortable. If it was conscious resistance, it was passive. Nevertheless, Himebaugh appeared to perceive it as real and daunting—so much so that, in a moment of uncertainty, she even asked Michel, “Do you

¹⁶⁰ Himebaugh to Michel, 11 November 1936, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

think we have gone too far in trying to popularize the idea [of the Mystical Body of Christ]?”¹⁶¹

When resistance was open, however, peer pressure ultimately worked to Himebaugh’s advantage, as the Liturgical Movement shared with institutional school “spirit” a communal, anti-individualistic ethic that disparaged non-conformity as an expression of self-interest and “slackerism.” In February 1936 Himebaugh observed that “[w]e have met with a little opposition, but the peculiar trait of it is that all who have openly opposed have capitulated, giving as their reason for opposition the motive of selfishness”—an interpretation that could have been lifted from school spirit rhetoric. Moreover, students could create and enforce community boundaries with remarkable aggression. “At the last...meeting there was a rather vocal minority that objected to the planned meeting because it did not give them enough opportunity to air their own opinions,” Himebaugh wrote to Michel. “Father [Carrabine] just told me this morning that the leader of this faction has since been almost repudiated by his own school—in fact, it was the intervention of the moderator that saved him from being ousted from office altogether. I think the poor boy has learned a rather expensive lesson without any instigation from those in authority.”¹⁶²

Attrition also helped to resolve intra-group conflict and ensure the success of the new, educational program. Difficult students “graduated”; troublesome moderators were “transferred,” as Himebaugh delicately phrased it, perhaps with Reiner in her thoughts.

¹⁶¹ Cecilia Himebaugh, OSB, to Virgil Michel, OSB, (4 March 1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 7.

¹⁶² Himebaugh to Michel, 12 February 1936, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

By November 1936 Himebaugh could observe to Michel that “[o]ne thing that seems providential is that those persons who were rather dangerous opponents of the whole project have been removed from Cisca...”¹⁶³ Due to this confluence of peer pressure and natural community turnover, subsequent students who disagreed with CISCA’s new approach probably did not join the group. Credit is probably due, also, to Carrabine’s tact, patience, and interpersonal skills, which Himebaugh praised in 1965. “The war was finally won by the weapons of his unfailing humility and love,” she wrote, “which made him return the slings and arrows of outraged upstarts by the complete giving of time and personal endowments to their service.”¹⁶⁴

Nevertheless, a March 1937 letter from Himebaugh to Carrabine indicated that some graduated members of CISCA continued to challenge the planned meetings as a departure from Reiner’s original vision of student leadership. After a visit in which Carrabine urgently communicated the complaints of the “old and devoted Ciscoran,” Himebaugh responded vehemently to charges that she had wrested control of a student organization away from the students themselves, converting it from a genuine extracurricular activity into a “propaganda machine.” “...I began examining our—or in justice to you say *my* policy—to see if it is in any sense true that I have attempted ‘to change a rabbit into a deer,’” she wrote to Carrabine. “What is the nature of Cisca? I suppose, Inter-Student Catholic Action. But is it any less ‘inter-student’ than formerly? Not to any one who knows how carefully—thought privately—Father Reiner coached his chairmen and planted his stooges. We haven’t had to use a stooge for a year now.”

¹⁶³ Himebaugh to Virgil Michel, 11 November 1936, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

¹⁶⁴ M. Cecilia Himebaugh, O.S.B., “Cisca in Retrospect,” [1965], CISCA Records Box 1 Folder 20.

Reiner, she evidently felt, had been no less controlling; he only had been more subtle in his methods. Moreover, Himebaugh professed to consider the creation of a “propaganda machine” perfectly justified, “provided the means is Christ’s means and the end is God’s honor and glory,” as she asserted. “Can you say ‘yes’ to that test?” she challenged Carrabine. “If not, then I may as well fold up.” Her response not only revealed frustration at the ongoing attacks, but hinted at a perception of Carrabine as, in private, less than heroically supportive of her program.¹⁶⁵

Still, Himebaugh also found cause for satisfaction in student and institutional response to CISCA programming. “Viewing in retrospect my endeavors with Cisca last year, I am really not discouraged, because we did succeed at least in making most Ciscans Mystical-Body conscious, as was proved at the recent Sodality convention in St. Louis, when our delegation brought up the topic again and again in discussions and even embodied it in a resolution,” she wrote to Michel in July 1936.¹⁶⁶ Moreover, her effort had influenced religious education on campus. “I do know for certain that that the Cisca move was instrumental in making several of the schools here study the doctrine [of the Mystical Body of Christ] either in study clubs or in religions [sic] classes,” she reported. “Having accomplished that much, my next aim is to work on towards liturgy itself, though I doubt we can go at it very hard before January... I do think, from last year’s experience that we can get the schools to take up liturgy too if we can ‘sell’ it at the Saturday meetings. For this purpose I hope that we can organize an all-Cisca study club

¹⁶⁵ Himebaugh to Carrabine, 9 March 1937, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 2.

¹⁶⁶ Himebaugh to Michel, 25 July 1936, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

after the football season closes... and can make the devotees of this branch introduce their enthusiasm into the mass of the students.”¹⁶⁷

CISCA’s lines of authority—proceeding from Bishop to moderators to Sodality members to on-campus organizations—enabled the federation’s promotion of liturgical knowledge and participation to spread quickly onto Loyola, Mundelein, and De Paul campuses. At Loyola, for example, newspaper accounts suggested that the influence of the Jesuit Sodality had led Loyola members to experiment with the *Missa Recitata* as early as 1930, under Reiner’s administration. CISCA’s new program renewed this effort mid-decade, so that by 1936 the spoken responses were familiar to Loyola Sodalists, who further aimed to sing the High Mass from beginning to end.¹⁶⁸ By way of study, in Fall 1934 Loyola’s Sodality-administered Academy system included not one, but two liturgical clubs: the Liturgical Academy, which studied the Mass text and trained altar servers; and the Liturgical Music Academy, whose members learned Gregorian chant and traditional hymns, sang them at the Friday student Masses, and aimed to teach them to the entire student body. In November 1934 the *Loyola News* happily observed that, although the Liturgical Music Academy was among the most demanding or “difficult” in the compulsory study club system, 45 out of approximately 500 Arts students elected it in preference to the eleven other options—which, though not a high proportion, apparently satisfied Sodalists that their effort was succeeding.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁷ Himebaugh to Michel, 25 July 1936, CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 4.

¹⁶⁸ “Sodality Group to Sing Solemn Mass, : *Loyola News* (9 March 1937): 8.

¹⁶⁹ “Academies Reorganize, Begin Oct. 9,” *Loyola News* (2 October 1934): 7; “What the Academies Are Doing,” *Loyola News* (23 November 1934): 3; “What the Academies Are Doing,” *Loyola News* (7 December 1934):.8.

To encourage campuswide liturgical participation through engagement with the text of the Mass, in October 1937 Loyola Sodality members and their moderator, William Finnegan, S.J., decided to purchase and distribute Daily Missals for Arts students' personal use. Indeed, CISCA president George Fleming went so far as to represent Missal use as a new mandate for Loyola's (also mandatory) Arts student Mass, describing as one of "the changes announced in the conduct of the weekly Mass" the declaration that "... hereafter the students are to assist at the Friday Mass by use of the Daily Missal." To promote Loyola's new standard of liturgical participation, "[d]irection in the use of the missal will be given in religion classes and in the Friday instructions after Mass," which, reported the *Loyola News*, would continue until every student could follow the liturgy in this manner.¹⁷⁰ By the end of 1937, then, Loyola administrators—with the support of the Sodality--not only required all Arts students to attend the weekly Mass, but also dictated the manner in which they were to pray at Mass.

Referring to its Sodality students as liturgical "pioneers," in May 1936 Mundelein College replaced its morning daily Mass with a *Missa Recitata*, explicitly noting the change as "[i]n accordance with the liturgical movement, which is designed to bring about a greater participation of the laity in the ceremonies of the Church..."¹⁷¹ In the following year liturgical scholar Gerald Ellard, S.J. (St. Mary's College, Kansas) presented a lecture entitled "Youth Leads on the Liturgical Front" to a mandatory student

¹⁷⁰ "Sodalists Sponsor Use of Daily Missal," *Loyola News* (19 October 1937): 3; George Fleming, "Wisdom They Foster," *Loyola News* (19 October 1937): 4; "Sodality Supplies Missals for Weekly Student Mass," *Loyola News* (26 October 1937): 8.

¹⁷¹ "Residents Introduce the *Missa Recitata*," *Skyscraper* (15 May 1936): 3.

assembly.¹⁷² By 1937 Mundelein students also encountered Ellard's textbook *Christian Life and Worship* in their religion courses.¹⁷³

The Liturgical Movement's emphasis on study and active participation also trickled into De Paul University's First Friday Masses. As early as February 1936 a *De Paulia* editorial introduced the subject of liturgical education, explaining that "The Catholic Church in which, as the Church of Christ, we profess our faith, is not merely a body of doctrine but also one of common prayer and worship," i.e. the Mass, the sacraments, and the Liturgy of the Hours. "It is part of the duty of every Catholic to understand these divinely instituted forms," continued the editorial, "and the more firmly rooted, the more intelligent this understanding, the greater is the grace which can be derived from them. The purpose of the so-called Liturgical movement is the dissemination of the knowledge necessary to engender this deeper appreciation."¹⁷⁴ One year later, in February 1937, *De Paulia* specified that the entire student body should bring Missals to the First Friday Mass, as there would be a "public reading of the prayers."¹⁷⁵ Evidently Powers felt that students lacked confidence in their Latin, since, when De Paul officially inaugurated the *Missa Recitata* in Fall 1937, he used his religion course to drill students in their responses.¹⁷⁶ By Spring 1938 a newly-formed Glee Club guided and beautified the students' role.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷² "Father Ellard Will Talk Here Tuesday," *Skyscraper* (5 March 1937): 1.

¹⁷³ "Father Ellard Discusses Social Aspect of Liturgy," *Skyscraper* (19 March 1937): 3.

¹⁷⁴ "An Opportunity for Catholics," *De Paulia* (13 February 1936): 2.

¹⁷⁵ "Northside Students to Attend Mass Friday," *De Paulia* (4 February 1937): 1.

¹⁷⁶ "Students to Attend First Friday Mass Tomorrow Morning," *De Paulia* (4 November 1937): 1; "Students to Attend First Friday Mass Tomorrow, Dec. 3," *De Paulia* (2 December 1937): 1.

Enacting the “Infiltration Plan,” during the 1936-37 term Eucharistic-Our Lady committee chairman Henry Rago used his regular *De Paulia* column to argue that liturgical participation affirmed the essential unity of mankind across accidental divisions of class and race. For example, Rago’s 1936 composition “Below Zero” found evidence of the Mystical Body of Christ in a streetcar during a cold snap. “Poor laborers are shoved against more patrician passengers, and a poking elbow or a misplaced foot brings only a smile and a simple jest about the weather...,” Rago marveled. “...Underneath their complaints and their shivering they enjoy the zero weather. It gives them something to be excited about, something to talk about to each other, something to share with all Middle Western humanity. It is something I share and talk about, with the conductor, with the stranger in the elevator, with the waiter...” Sporting events, continued Rago, created the same community feeling. In particular, “I remember what a thrill I got the night Louis beat Levinsky, when I was the first to tell a colored boy who was watching cars below Wacker Drive,” he wrote. “That boy smiled a smile full of wild white teeth and tossed his cap madly into the air; and [in] that moment I felt the jubilation of a whole race singing.”

The spontaneous friendliness of a shared experience, concluded Rago, pointed to mankind’s ultimate unity in God, a unity that transcended the artifice of social categories such as class and race. “There must be an ultimate truth connected with the matter somewhere, when things like zero weather, the World Series, or a simple folk song will bring men together,” he mused. “It may possibly mean that men belong together. It may

¹⁷⁷ “Students to Attend First Friday Mass Tomorrow Morning,” *De Paulia* (3 March 1938) 1.

even mean that as they sing together, so should they pray together—perhaps they should even observe a Liturgy, so that they pray together as one great Mystical Body of Christ, praying (Saint Paul says) not *to* Christ, but *with* Christ.”¹⁷⁸

Looking to the city environment for inspiration, Rago later found this same “ultimate truth” in an aerial view of Chicago’s skyscrapers, which to him symbolized humanity’s concerted spiritual reach toward heaven—a reach compromised by the material competition at street level. “It is difficult to believe that that these buildings are used to house plans whereby one man might beat his fellow down,” he reflected. “They are fighting, each one, to possess this scene which tonight is peace and beauty.” Liturgical participation, suggested Rago, could counteract commercialism and actualize the skyscraper’s spiritual ideal. “...[T]here will be no unity among men until their souls are united, until their souls are going in the same direction [as the skyscrapers],” he wrote. “There will be no unity among men until their voices are united in one prayer; and that prayer, the Mass.”¹⁷⁹

Rago’s spirituality was far more than Liturgical Movement propaganda, however, as even he could warn against an over-reliance on the textual aspects of active participation with a depth and sophistication that bespoke real sincerity. An Apostolic Committee meeting of Feb 18, 1939 opened with mental prayer upon a Rago sonnet, entitled “To a Blind Man at Mass,” which voiced the self-doubt of an educated Catholic who, Missal in hand, had just knelt, either for the beginning of Mass, or perhaps for the Sanctus—a chant, introduced by a bell, that traditionally preceded a long, quiet Latin

¹⁷⁸ Henry W. Rago, “Below Zero,” *De Paulia* (13 February 1936): 2.

¹⁷⁹ Henry W. Rago, “Canticle of Steel,” *De Paulia* (24 September 1936): 2.

prayer in which the priest consecrated the Body and Blood of Christ and elevated it for adoration.

Hearing the bell, I falter to my knees
 And fumble with my Book until I find
 The place; and then read in listless fashion, ease
 Over the passion-pounded Latin; blind

To the spilled Blood in every rubric cross,
 My eyes desert the pages, go their own
 Way.....¹⁸⁰

According to the liturgical movement's practical standards, the speaker was participating in the liturgy: he attempted to use his Missal to follow the text of the Mass, and he was at least intellectually aware of meaning and symbolism—that the words were “passion-pounded,” that there was “spilled Blood” in the prescribed gestures. However, the speaker found that following the liturgy's text and ritual did not guarantee the presence of mind necessary to appreciate the significance that he intellectually realized. Although watching and reading from an obviously educated perspective, the speaker was—in a word—“blind.”

As his mind began to wander, however, he observed someone who did appear to be truly praying: a physically blind man, cut off from the prayer's Latin translation and the liturgical actions which, during the Consecration's quiet murmur, were so dependent on the ability to read and observe. In terms of the liturgical movement's textual approach to “active participation,” a blind man should receive little or nothing from the Mass. Nevertheless, at the moment of Consecration this blind man appeared aware of Christ's

¹⁸⁰ Agendas, Apostolic Committee (18 February, 1939), CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 18.

sacramental Presence in the elevated Host in a way that eluded those who could read their Missal: "...[S]uddenly," wrote Rago, "[my eyes] are at a loss/ To leave the sight of you, kneeling alone,

The radiance of your soul upon your face,
 Joy in you, round you, like a luminous thing
 You, blessed stranger, patient in your place,
 Hearing a friend approach and listening:
 And now your face uplifted eagerly:
 Pity the blinded: *tell us what you see.*¹⁸¹

Using concepts of sight and blindness on metaphorical as well as literal levels, Rago's poem suggested that—ironically--the blind man, cut off from the public experience of the Mass, entered into it more deeply than those who could participate according to liturgical movement guidelines. Unable to observe the rituals at the altar and probably without access to a Braille Missal (the poem made no mention of one), the blind man relied on "hearing" and "listening" to alert him to God's presence—yet, tellingly, there would have been little to hear but bells and, depending on the tone of the priest, perhaps some murmured Latin! The English translation of the text would be inaccessible. Still, Rago described the blind man as "hearing a friend approach and listening," a reference to his inner disposition, his individual receptivity to Christ's presence in the newly-consecrated Body and Blood, which the physically blind man appeared to experience in a warm, real, and personal way. Ironically, then, it was the blind man who spiritually "saw," spiritually perceived God, while the person with access to the words and action was spiritually "blinded." Overall, Rago's poem seemed to imply that, in

¹⁸¹ Agendas, Apostolic Committee (18 February, 1939), CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 18.

constructing “active participation” as a busy engagement with public text and ritual, the liturgical movement risked losing what was positive in the much-maligned “kneeling alone” of devotional Catholicism: a humble openness to God’s presence and agency.

This interpretation can be overstated. Liturgical reformers as well as traditionalists sometimes expressed a certain “missalitis,” although in the case of reformers the book’s difficulties and distractions seemed an argument for oral participation in a *Missa Recitata*.¹⁸² Moreover, far from taking Rago’s sonnet as a threat to the Liturgical Movement, CISCA moderators used it to illuminate the theme of the “Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God” within a structured “Preparation for the Dialogue Mass.”¹⁸³ However, if “To a Blind Man at Mass” did not exactly constitute resistance, still it offered a balanced, even critical approach to the day’s Catholic cultural tensions—in itself, a form of student initiative. Despite the demands of his committee chairmanship, Rago could approach Liturgical Movement teachings in a thoughtful and sophisticated manner, warning others of the spiritual danger in too much attachment to the written word.

During the late 1930s, then, leadership changes centralized authority in CISCORA—now CISCA—and strengthened the federation’s influence on the college campus. Adopting CISCA as the Catholic Action unit of his Archdiocesan Catholic Youth Organization, Sheil enforced the Vatican’s principle of bishop-centered Catholic Action organization and challenged Chicago’s Catholic schools to demonstrate their

¹⁸² Joseph P. Chinnici, O.F.M., “The Catholic Community at Prayer, 1926-1976,” in James O’Toole, ed., *Habits of Devotion: Catholic Religious Practice in Twentieth-Century America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), .9-87; 34.

¹⁸³ “CISCA Meetings for February, 1939,” CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 18.

Catholic character through mass participation in the Archdiocesan Cisca program. In response, Mundelein students adopted the study club system already established at Loyola, while De Paul University students and administrators founded a Cisca unit that swiftly Catholicized the formerly non-sectarian image of De Paul student life. Meanwhile, Reiner's sudden demise in October 1934 enabled Sister M. Cecilia Himebaugh, O.S.B., to implement a new Cisca program--centered on the Benedictine Liturgical Movement--that curtailed student initiative in favor of theological education. Thus the decrees of bishops and theories of liturgical scholars touched ground on the Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein campuses, where they shaped students' approaches to social status, ethnicity, and gender, as subsequent chapters will show.

CHAPTER FOUR

INCLUSION AND ELITISM

Reviewing the *Loyola News* with an eye toward institutional status aspirations, in 1937 Loyola publications censor W. Eugene Shiels, S.J. recommended revising the title of the “Beachcombing at the Beach” gossip column “with a view to elevating our social ideal above beachcombing.” “[M]y notion of a beachcomber is that of one with whom I should wish to avoid any but unavoidable contact,” he explained.¹ Even as Shiels wrote, however, community expansion and CISCA’s increasingly pro-labor, personalist ideology were influencing a subset of committed Catholic students to question the spiritual costs of individual social mobility and even the moral value of class hierarchies. Indeed, by the late 1930s these ardent Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein student Catholic Actionists would view Shiels’ hypothetical beachcomber as an embodiment of Christ Himself, so that social contact with him—far from degrading or undesirable—became a source of spiritual status and grace. As this subset of Catholic students learned to question and transgress social boundaries, however, ironically their religious commitment to inclusiveness distinguished them as a new spiritual elite in conflict with fellow parishioners, on-campus peers, and even other CISCA members.

¹ W. Eugene Shiels, S.J., to Mark Guerin, 19 November 1937, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 44, Folder 11.

During the Depression pressures tended toward a more egalitarian social model as the 1929 economic collapse destabilized the educational and economic markers of social class, rendering Catholic students' class identification troublingly ambiguous. By Fall 1930 *De Paulia* deemed it "indisputable fact" that many De Paul graduates would soon join the ranks of what it termed the "white-collar unemployed": middle-class by education and culture, yet forced to compete with experienced blue-collar laborers for work on proposed federal road and construction projects. In an ironic inversion of socio-economic hierarchies, here the college graduate would represent the dregs of the labor pool, speculated the editorial, since "his development has been mental instead of physical," resulting in an "excusable lack of [physical] efficiency" in construction work.² Suddenly the young college graduate represented, not the person best fitted for success, but—argued the De Paul editor—the person least prepared to enter the workforce. By contrast, less-educated persons with practical skill appeared more employable and more likely to access material goods. Challenging students' basic assumptions concerning class status, this perception would have predisposed Depression-era students to consider class structure somewhat less useful and meaningful in terms of social identification.

Economic hardship also deemphasized social divisions by reinforcing the bonds of community interdependence promulgated in both "campus life" and Catholic Action's Mystical Body ideology. Pinning self-interest of needy students on the power of the campus community, for example, during the Depression Loyola and De Paul University administrators mediated government-subsidized employment programs that assisted students in financial difficulty with their tuition and other expenses. In February 1934

² "The White-Collar Unemployed," *De Paulia* (30 October 1930): 2.

the U.S. government granted Loyola University \$1515 in Federal Emergency Relief funding for the creation of on-campus clerical, research, and maintenance positions for cash-strapped students over a period of four months. In order to qualify for FERC employment, a student had to demonstrate, not only academic ability and “a good moral character,” but also financial need “such as to make impossible his further attendance at school without this aid.” These judgments rested with the University: *Loyola News* specified that University President Rev. Samuel Knox Wilson personally vouched “for the validity of the need of the [Loyola] applicants” to the Illinois Emergency Relief board.³ Throughout Spring 1934 Loyola University administrators collected and approved program applications; created the on-campus jobs according to National Recovery Act specifications; and distributed FERC paychecks to 101 eligible Loyola students, who earned an average of \$15 for their first month.⁴ In February 1937 the Students Aid Program of the National Youth Administration (NYA) likewise funded 331 “socially desirable” research, clerical, and teaching assistantship positions on the Loyola campus.⁵ As with the FERC program, Loyola administrators and government NYA directors cooperated in administering this work-study program, so that Loyola students depended on the Catholic educational institution as well as upon the government bureaucracy for their work-study grants.⁶

³ “Seek Funds for Student Work Loans,” *Loyola News* (13 February 1934): 1.

⁴ “FERC Funds for Loyola Total \$1515,” *Loyola News* (20 February 1934): 2.; “Average FERC Check Amounts to About \$15,” *Loyola News* (1 May 1934): 5.

⁵ “331 Loyolans Get NYA Aid,” *Loyola News* (2 February 1937): 1.

⁶ “256 Loyolans get NYA Jobs,” *Loyola News* (26 October 1937): 1.

Beginning in 1934, De Paul students also benefited from NYA and Works Progress Administration (WPA) subsidies, although—unlike Loyola, which placed a majority of its student workers in on-campus positions—De Paul appeared to locate the majority of its opportunities off campus.⁷ By 1938 175 De Paul students were working NYA-funded positions at the Illinois State Employment Service, Hull House, the American Library Association, Immigration Service, Placement Bureau of the Veterans' League, and Army Headquarters for the 6th Corps Area. An additional twelve students taught courses for the WPA. Despite the off-campus nature of the work, however, students relied on De Paul University administrators to negotiate the underlying NYA employment subsidies. In 1936 the University petitioned the NYA to increase De Paul's allotment of employment funding; and as late as 1938 De Paul University applied to Washington for an increase of as many as 100 additional NYA jobs.⁸ Alarmed by Senate attacks on WPA and NYA relief programs, in 1937 Bishop Bernard Sheil also urged CISCA federation members to write in support of continued government funding for student employment.⁹ The Catholic campus and to some extent even the archdiocesan CISCA community, then, acted as intermediaries between the individual student and the government bureaucracy, encouraging students to identify with and rely upon these religious community structures. Indeed, individual students found that their

⁷ "Over 300 Students Assigned to Work Projects in NYA," *Loyola News* (27 September 1935): 2.

⁸ "N.Y.A. Unit Enters Fifth Year; Plan Increase in Quota," *De Paulia* (10 March 1938): 1; "De Paul Allotments Increased by NYA," *De Paulia* (12 March 1936): 1.

⁹ "Instructions from Bishop Sheil," (25 May 1937), CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 2.

employment needs were met, not through direct contact with the secular government, but through the sponsorship of the Catholic university community.

Preparing for life after graduation, students also responded to precarious individual career prospects by turning to the campus community for networking opportunities, job placement, financial aid, and overall status association, thereby affirming the practical value of collegiate “school spirit.” Student organizations stressed the economic aspects of social ties: For example, in 1931 a Loyola Student Council survey indicated that employed Loyola graduates of the classes of ’29 and ’30 identified “influence” as the most important factor in securing their jobs. Furthermore, “[t]hose who received positions through influence find it much easier to get on than those who did not,” reported the *Loyola News*. “Scholastic average, the survey shows, had very little influence after graduation. Employers are not interested in one’s average but in actual experience and capabilities for work.”¹⁰ To exert university influence in favor of students’ professional development, in 1930 Loyola Arts administrators Fr. Joseph Reiner and Fr. Schulte inaugurated a career networking program designed to supply undergraduate seniors with friendly contacts among Chicago’s business and professional elite.¹¹ Further developing career networks, in 1934 Loyola established a free legal clinic that would combine charitable assistance toward the poor with Law students’ need

¹⁰ “Class Averages Prove No Help in Landing Job,” *Loyola News* (19 May 1931): 3.

¹¹ “New Administrative Council to Assist Graduates: Vocational Aid Promised Arts Seniors,” *Loyola News* (5 March 1930): 1.

for practical experience “under the supervision of a practicing attorney” who, presumably, could later supply job-seeking students with a respectable reference.¹²

Students’ increased dependence on institutional community influence further stressed the unifying ideology of “campus life,” even as disposable income for parties, clothes, and tickets appreciably declined. During the 1930s advocates of “campus life” ideology promoted student activities and “spirit” by pointing out the potential economic advantages of collegiate socializing. Urging Loyola’s Arts and professional students to interact in all-University events, in 1933 a *Loyola News* editorial argued that “...if you get to know students from other departments you will be making contacts that may prove valuable business assets.” For example, “Medical students will need clients. . . The same is true of the Dental students, the Law students, the Commerce and Arts men.”¹³

Reflecting these pressures toward the organization and mobilization of strong and unified “all-University” communities, at Loyola professional students—formerly aloof from campus life—took steps to enter it. Newly-formed professional, departmental, and ethnic associations organized smokers, lectures, and dances, many open to students of all departments. Intramural and debate teams drew professional students further into an extracurricular realm previously dominated by Arts undergraduates. Alumni associations also gained importance as students and graduates increasingly sought to extend the campus social network into the city.¹⁴ At Loyola, Mundelein, and, beginning in the mid-

¹² “Proposes to Establish Legal Clinic,” *Loyola News* (17 April 1934): 1.

¹³ “Get Friendly,” *Loyola News* (10 October 1933): 4.

¹⁴ “Faculty Greets New Students at Med. Smoker,” *Loyola News* (17 October 1933): 2; “Commerce I-M Handball Gets Under Way Soon,” *Loyola News* (17 October 1933): 7.; “Meds Stage First Stude-Prof Party,” *Loyola News* (13 March 1934): 1; “Arts, Commerce Open Intramural Debates Today,” *Loyola News*

1930s, De Paul, compulsory Masses, assemblies, and religious practices such as Miraculous Medal enrollment sought to sacralize and ritualize these campus community bonds.¹⁵

Overall, the ideological construction of overarching Catholic educational communities became more prominent as financially vulnerable Catholic students grew increasingly conscious of their economic interdependence. This strengthening of religious bonds among Depression-era Catholic college students in Chicago formed a striking contrast to the ethnic and religious institutional alienation of the urban working class that historian Lizabeth Cohen describes in *Making a New Deal*.¹⁶ By emphasizing broad community identification, it also worked against the maintenance of hard and fast social boundaries.

In the late 1930s CISCA expansion challenged social hierarchy as Bishop Sheil's mission to catechize every Catholic student stressed the seams of the federation's original, exclusive structure. As originally conceived in the late 1920s, CISCA elaborated upon a traditional, elitist approach to lay organization: The majority of CISCA's federated student and alumni groups were--at least in theory--societies exclusive in spiritual privileges, standards, and practices. Comprising 90% of CISCA units, Jesuit Sodality chapters, for example, constructed membership as an "intimate union" of Catholic elite--"including a vast number of the hierarchy, clergy, and religious,

(1 May 1934): 1; "Academic Council Amends Ruling on Dancing, Decorum," *Loyola News* (16 February 1936): 1. See also Chapter 5.

¹⁵ See Chapters 2 and 3.

¹⁶ Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), especially 218-238.

and the best among the laity”—that shared a list of moral and spiritual privileges. These included “a purer life,” a lesser propensity to sin, “more tranquil rest,” “more grace and more of the favor of heaven” and, ultimately, “a more glorious crown in heaven.” Such benefits proceeded from the Sodality’s special indulgences; prayers of fellow Sodalists in heaven and on earth; special protection of the Blessed Virgin Mary; guidance of a spiritual director; and the wholesome society of fellow Sodalists.¹⁷

To maintain this standard of “the best among the laity,” student Sodalists ideally met strict membership criteria and committed to a structured program of prayer and religious formation. When applying to join a Sodality chapter, candidates had to show evidence of good moral character; afterward, they underwent a probationary period of at least two months, during which—in theory—the chapter’s moderator and officers evaluated their fitness for full membership. Finally, candidates were admitted to membership in a solemn ceremony, at which they consecrated their lives to service of the Blessed Virgin Mary and, in turn, received a formal certificate of participation in the indulgences granted to the international Sodality organization.¹⁸ As Sodalists, thereafter they met regularly for common spiritual exercises, including weekly recitation of the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary and an annual retreat.¹⁹ Ongoing constructions of CISCA programs as training for lay leadership on campus and in American society supported Sodality self-consciousness as a group set above rank-and-file Catholic

¹⁷“The CISCA Story” [1957], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 19: 11; “Be a Sodalist! And Gain These Advantages,” [holy card], CISCA Records, Box 6 Folder 2; Edward F. Garesche, S.J., *The Sodality Manual* (St. Louis: Queen’s Work Press, 1926), 16-18.

¹⁸ Garesche, *The Sodality Manual*, 40-44

¹⁹ Garesche, *The Sodality Manual*, 34-35.

students, who occasionally charged Sodality members with self-righteous airs and collaboration with campus administrative authority (see Chapter 1).

However, as Catholic schools sought to demonstrate broad-based CISCA participation in compliance with Sheil's 1934 directive, application of Sodality membership standards accordingly slipped--rendering the CISCA federation more inclusive and broadly influential, but also less self-motivated. According to a 1957 CISCA history, by 1948 many Chicago-area Sodality chapters comprised nearly an entire student body. Enforcement of membership standards became an increasingly problematic issue for the national Sodality organization as it sought to balance the demands of broad cultural influence with rigorous spirituality.²⁰

In the late 1930s CISCA membership also expanded beyond its original concept as a strictly "student" organization to include young, college-educated Catholic adults with their own ideas and connections. In 1937 graduates formed a "CISCA Alumni" circle on their own initiative—to the misgivings of Sr. Himebaugh, who saw the this step off campus as inconsistent with CISCA's "real nature" and, one might speculate, a threat to the authority of the federation's institutional moderators.²¹ By July 1941 the CISCA Alumni organization comprised thirteen separate committees, including a Book Club; writer's group; Speakers' Bureau; Liturgical Advisory Board; and a Contemplative Committee that practiced and taught mental prayer techniques.²² An undated Alumni

²⁰ "The CISCA Story" [1957], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 19: 11.

²¹ Himebaugh to Carrabine [1937], CISCA Records, Box 7 Folder 2. Although Himebaugh had doubts about the CISCA Alumni organization, she nevertheless voted to approve its membership in the federation.

²² Jean Hart, "Outline of CISCA Alumni Committees," (July 1941), CISCA Records Box 3 Folder 14.

mailing list listed as many as 155 recipients of the group's news and announcements.²³ 244

The group's constitution document affirmed many of CISCA's central concepts and structures, such as Reiner's "four loyalties"; obedience to the local bishop; the personalist idea of "becoming Christlike" as both a spiritual goal and a spur to social action; and the "infiltration" of the Catholic faith into surrounding society.²⁴

Prompted by Sheil, the CISCA Alumni circle increasingly linked the federation to other Chicago Archdiocesan groups in concerted opposition to Communist organizers. In October 1939 Sheil approached CISCA Alumni president John Langdon with a proposal to organize Chicago's parish, collegiate, and ethnic youth societies into a Catholic Youth Senate that would "present a united front" on social issues throughout the Archdiocese and assist one another in definite projects. Within two months Langdon and other Catholic youth leaders had initiated the CYS, which included—in addition to CISCA, CISCA Alumni, and other groups-- the University of Chicago's Calvert Club; Northwestern University's Sheil Club; the Chicago Catholic Women's and Men's Clubs; the Chicago Parish Sodality Union; the Notre Dame Club of Chicago; and Chicago Catholic Labor Theater.

Even before finalizing the CYS constitution in February 1940, the Catholic Youth Senate immediately began to implement another of Sheil's suggestions: a national Catholic Youth Congress, to be organized in Chicago that summer as in response to the Communist-leaning American Youth Congress of 1937. Themed "Catholic Youth Speaks on the Reconstruction of the Social Order," the Catholic Youth Congress aimed to

²³ "Mailing List—CISCA Alumni," [n.d.], CISCA Records Box 3 Folder 11.

²⁴ Constitution of CISCA Alumni, [n.d.], CISCA Records Box 3 Folder 10.

articulate resolutions that would place Catholic Action political, economic, and social views in a national spotlight as the united voice of American Catholic youth.²⁵ Staging this event demanded a large-scale co-ordination of youth volunteers to plan the two-day program, register delegates and observers, arrange for venue and staff, and promote the Congress via print, radio script, and parish meeting.²⁶ By World War II, Chicago Catholic student organization had overflowed campus boundaries to incorporate, not only Catholic organizations and movements across the city, but—briefly—across the nation.

As campus, CISCA, and archdiocese situated Depression-era Catholic college students in increasingly inclusive spiritualized communities, Catholic students expressed increasing ambivalence toward the individualism and materialism of American middle-class culture. Economic conditions reinforced a critique of middle-class values: In Fall 1930, for example, a *De Paulia* editorial argued that middle-class cultural associations of success with individual material sufficiency would result in greater psychological suffering for the unemployed college graduate than the unemployed blue-collar laborer. "...[I]t would be extremely difficult for him [to adapt himself to the vastly different standard of living]," fretted *De Paulia*. "...Poverty is a much greater burden to the educated than to the unschooled, due to our modern civilization which tends to place a stigma of failure on those who are unable to provide for themselves." Moreover, middle-

²⁵ "Report of the Catholic Youth Senate of the Archdiocese of Chicago," (1940), CISCA Records, Box 5 Folder 12; Minutes, Catholic Youth Senate (22 May 1940), CISCA Records, Box 5 Folder 6.

²⁶ Minutes, Catholic Youth Senate (22 May 1940), CISCA Records, Box 5 Folder 6.

class values stressed personal independence, so that “...it goes against the grain to ask aid from others,” *De Paulia* observed.²⁷

Newspaper reports seemed to confirm the inadequacy of middle-class individualism and materialism as, burdened with expectations of financial independence and agency, young professional alumni suffered psychologically when confronted with an inability to provide for themselves and others. His income depleted by torrent of charity patients, in August 1932 Loyola medical alumnus Dr. A.J. Karilius took his own life, reportedly for shame over his failure to meet financial obligations.²⁸ Three months later, 34-year-old Dr. James E. Coleman—an outstanding physician who was one of Loyola’s first African-American graduates—also committed suicide due to “severe mental anguish... because he did not have money to support destitute relatives.”²⁹ Census records showed that in 1930 his household included a half-brother and two lodgers from Mississippi, all currently unemployed.³⁰ While these examples represent extreme reactions to extreme cases, they also hint at the level of stress that financial problems could inflict on middle-class alumni, accustomed to interpret material gain and loss in terms of personal competence.

Catholic Action ideology supported this indictment of middle-class values, as Catholic educators denounced familiar ideological enemies—individualism and materialism—and called for a prioritization of social values above material self-interest.

²⁷ “The White-Collar Unemployed,” *De Paulia* (30 October 1930): 2.

²⁸ “Physician Ends Life to Escape Alimony Cell,” *Chicago Tribune* (25 August 1932): 1.

²⁹ “Dr. James E. Coleman Dies after Taking Poison,” *Chicago Defender* (26 November 1932): 1.; “Coroner’s Jury Finds Dr. Coleman a Suicide,” *Chicago Defender* (10 December 1932): 2.

³⁰ *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, District 72, Roll 418, 11A.

For example, addressing Mundelein College students in November 1935, national Sodality director Daniel A. Lord, S.J. implicated laissez-faire capitalism as well as Marxist materialism in the economic collapse. "...Father Lord declared that the theories of rugged individualism [American capitalism] and of materialistic evolution [Marxism] which supplanted Christianity... brought about the present chaos," reported *Skyscraper*. By contrast to both systems, the Depression's "only remedy" was "the re-adoption of Christian principles" throughout the world, Lord concluded.³¹

Re-adopting Christian principles involved a rethinking of the middle class's association with self-interested, laissez-faire capitalism. At Loyola and Mundelein, anti-materialist and pro-Catholic rhetoric made its way into business courses, encouraging future entrepreneurs, corporate managers, accountants, and secretaries to consider economic decisions from a social and ethical standpoint. In December 1935, Loyola commerce students listened to a lecture representing the Papal encyclical *Quadregesimo Anno* as "the charter of the social principles that we must know and understand in order to solve corporate problems," among them the "inordinate concentration of wealth and power." As an assignment, each student had to read and report on the text of the encyclical.³² Similarly, in 1938 Loyola philosophy professor Joseph A. McLaughlin, S.J., warned Mundelein commerce and economics students against "the materialistic philosophy prevalent in the business world today," stressing "the necessity for a strict adherence to Christian principles in all business dealings." According to *Skyscraper*,

³¹ "Christianity Is Only Real World Culture, Father Lord States," *Skyscraper* (14 November 1935): 1.

³² "'Quadregesimo Anno' of Pius XI 'Business Text'? Prof Thinks So!," *Loyola News* (20 December 1935): 1.

“...success, Father McLaughlin insists, should be measured in terms of eternity, and not according to the false and pagan standards of gain.”³³

Endeavoring to promote Catholicism as a Godly alternative to Communism, in the mid-1930s CISCA’s Catholic Action programming encouraged Catholic students to identify with the discourse and initiatives of blue-collar labor organization, including collective bargaining, the minimum wage, and child labor laws. Co-opting Communist rhetoric, at the Sodality’s Summer 1934 convention—the same at which Bishop Sheil asserted Archdiocesan authority over local Catholic Action organizations--CISCA students sang a Daniel Lord composition entitled “Comrades Together” and referred to their officers’ manual as the “Red book”; later, Fr. Carrabine and Sr. Himebaugh would likewise promote the Mystical Body’s social integration in a pamphlet entitled “The Parish Turns Red.”³⁴ In May 1931 Loyola students conducted a symposium on Leo XIII’s pro-labor encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, addressing such topics as “A Just Price,” “The Right to a Living Wage and Employment,” and “The Right to Strike.”³⁵ In October 1936 CISCA’s General Meeting likewise explored a theme of “Communism, Minimum Wage, and Christian Citizenship.”³⁶

As CISCA continued to expand, college students and young alumni expressed their commitment to Catholic social reforms through concurrent involvement in other,

³³ “Lectures on Ethics to Commerce Club,” *Skyscraper* (18 May 1938): 3.

³⁴ *Sodalight* (8 July 1934): 3, in CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 1; “This is for the Prefect and Other Officers,” CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 5.

³⁵ “Six Students Discuss Labor in Symposium,” *Loyola News* (19 May 1931): 3; *Loyolans Discuss Ethics of Labor*, *Skyscraper* (29 May 1931): 4.

³⁶ “Cisca Discusses Communism, Wages at Mercy, Oct. 31,” *Skyscraper* (23 October 1936): 3.

more controversial lay movements--such as Peter Maurin and Dorothy Day's Catholic Worker (CW) and Cardijn's Jocism—that intensified the tone of working-class radicalism within the CISCA federation. Founded in 1933 in New York City by Maurin, an itinerant philosopher, and Day, a former Communist and associate of Greenwich Village literati, the Catholic Worker movement espoused a radical identification with the lower classes that permitted no condescension, no attitudes of superiority. By contrast to the earlier generation of Protestant settlement workers, Maurin and Day did not frame their mission as the cultural uplift of the poor; rather they voluntarily became poor, sharing their home, food, and possessions with the destitute who, according to personalist interpretation, were living embodiments of Christ Himself. To this end Catholic Workers organized Houses of Hospitality in which lay volunteers shared meals, living space, and dialogue liturgy with homeless and other unemployed persons, often directed to their door by local clergy. (Day herself took this mission so much to heart that her daughter, Tamar, learned to accept the theft and destruction of toys and other personal items as a matter of routine.³⁷) Presenting Catholicism as a God-centered and anti-materialistic alternative to Communism, Catholic Workers also furthered labor movement efforts at collective bargaining for improved compensation and working conditions. Their newspaper, the *Catholic Worker*, advocated the cause of labor as well as interracialism and ecumenicism.³⁸

³⁷ Dorothy Day, *The Long Loneliness* (New York: Harper & Row, 1952. Reprint, 1997): 237-238.

³⁸ Gleason, *Contending with Modernity*, 154-155; Mel Piehl, *Breaking Bread: The Catholic Worker and the Origin of Modern Catholic Radicalism in America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982).

According to *De Paulia*, Chicago's Catholic Worker group dated from May 1936, when Maurin traveled to Chicago to conduct a series of round tables on Catholic social action.³⁹ However, student exposure to the movement began as early as May 1935, when Day, introduced by Fr. Carrabine, lectured on "capitalist excesses" to a mandatory Loyola Arts student assembly. Representatives from Mundelein College and Immaculata, St. Scholastica's, and Marywood high schools also attended.⁴⁰ Soon individual students such as De Paulian Catherine Ready, Loyolans John Cogley, John Bowers, and Ed Marciniak, and Mundeleinite Helen Farrell moved beyond CISCA into Chicago's organized Catholic Worker group, where, according to Himebaugh, college students comprised a majority of CW volunteers. "I suppose you know that the Catholic Worker has started something like a branch here in Chicago at last," wrote Himebaugh to Michel in July 1936. "One of the boys in Cisca told me of it. He has been attending the meetings at Old St. Patrick's Church down town and likes them very much."⁴¹ Himebaugh's subsequent letters continued to report on CISCA members' involvement in the local CW group, often from the perspective of an outsider working from hearsay. "...[Father Carrabine] did not seem to know much about the state of affairs except that the old-timers...were dropping off and [Loyola student and CISCA president] John Bowers, who by the way was caustic in his criticism of D. Day last spring, appears to be assuming the lead," Himebaugh wrote. "This is apparently because he has a strong influence as head of the Maritain Study Club and also because of the financial support he

³⁹ "Catholic Glimpses," *De Paulia* (7 January 1937): 2.

⁴⁰ "Dorothy Day Speaks at Arts College," *Loyola News* (17 May 1935): 8.

⁴¹ Himebaugh to Michel, 25 July 1936, CISCA Records Box 7 Folder 4.

furnishes. He also seems to be very much in the confidence of Father John Hayes,” a clerical Catholic Actionist. Himebaugh went on to observe that college students “seem to make up the bulk of C.W. personelle [sic] now. . .”⁴²

The Chicago group’s newly-founded newspaper the *Chicago Catholic Worker* likewise reflected collegiate and college alumni leadership. In 1938-39 CISCA students Cogley, Marciniak, and Ready were among its editors, while Bowers contributed a regular column on the group’s Taylor Street activities. Mundelein student Helen Farrell, “an enthusiastic member” of Chicago’s Catholic Worker group, contributed an editorial in 1937; while fellow Mundelein student Frances Butt authored an opinion piece in 1939.⁴³ By 1938 Himebaugh, now completely won over to the movement, was also contributing articles on liturgy and the unity of Christ’s Mystical Body.⁴⁴

Chicago’s Catholic Worker group engaged in the sort of counterculturally rebellious work that drew zealous students beyond their normal experience. Some voluntarily crossed class lines to join the poor in messy and degrading tasks. “They go around to certain restaurants every morning and collect left-over vegetables... with the sportive air of a St. Francis modernized,” Himebaugh marveled to Michel. “They themselves had to go out on the bread line one day last August...”⁴⁵ Resident and visiting volunteers at the CW House of Hospitality nursed pneumonia and frostbite

⁴² Himebaugh to Michel, January 1937, CISCA Records Box 7 Folder 4.

⁴³ “Student Writers Receive Publicity,” *Skyscraper* (3 December 1937): 3; Frances Butt, “Youth, Enthusiasm—1939,” *Chicago Catholic Worker* (April 1939): 4.

⁴⁴ Cecilia Himebaugh, O.S.B., “A Drama of Social Significance,” *Chicago Catholic Worker* (September 1938): 4; Himebaugh, “There Are Breadlines in Heaven,” *Chicago Catholic Worker* (March 1939): 3.

⁴⁵ Himebaugh to Michel, 24 October 1938, CISCA Records Box 7 Folder 4.

victims; experienced the threat of fire to substandard housing; and discussed delousing indigent guests in compliance with Health Department standards.⁴⁶ Bowers joined Catholic Worker personnel in a Taylor Street slum, where he organized a credit union and—with the help of students from Quigley seminary and Providence and St. Mary’s high schools—a summer school for children.⁴⁷ Students also volunteered their time to clean the CW house and cook meals for the residents.⁴⁸ “Students have been regular visitors and they have made themselves ‘at home’ with delightful ease,” reported the *Chicago Catholic Worker* in 1939, celebrating the mixed environment in which “[c]ollege graduates and professional men have passed salt to laborer and factory hand. Hunger and want have a way of leveling off all barriers,” it added.⁴⁹

Consistent with their commitment to personalist and Mystical Body ideology, Catholic Workers also pushed liturgical reform further than Himebaugh and Carrabine had dared to go in CISCA or its member campuses. In October 1938 Himebaugh alluded to an “apostolate of the liturgy in the vernacular” that two Catholic Workers had “exercised for some time at the C.W. farm in Easton last summer.”⁵⁰ This extremity of liturgical innovation reflected the Catholic Worker movement’s likewise extreme interpretation of human unity in the Mystical Body of Christ.

⁴⁶ “Health Department Bears Down,” *Chicago Catholic Worker* (July 1938): 1, 3; John B. Bowers, “Along Taylor Street,” *Chicago Catholic Worker* (December 1938): 2.

⁴⁷ John B. Bowers, “Along Taylor Street,” *Chicago Catholic Worker* (June 1938): 2; John B. Bowers, “Along Taylor Street,” *Chicago Catholic Worker* (July 1938): 3.

⁴⁸ “Life Goes on at the House,” *Chicago Catholic Worker* (October 1938): 3.

⁴⁹ “Hunger, Want Break Down Old Barriers,” *Chicago Catholic Worker* (April 1939): 1,4.

⁵⁰ Himebaugh to Michel, 24 October 1938, CISCA Records Box 7 Folder 4.

By 1937 the CISCA federation actively cooperated with the local Catholic Worker effort, organizing distribution of *The Catholic Worker* at the Communists' annual May Day parade and promoting CW involvement through CISCA's page in the Archdiocesan paper *The New World*.⁵¹ At Loyola Community Theater the CISCA Players—including seven Loyolans--advocated the CW group through Fr. Daniel Lord's drama *Storm-Tossed*, which told of an industrialist's Catholic daughter who, against her father's opposition, joined a thinly disguised version of the Catholic Worker Movement during a labor dispute at her father's factory. While distributing the Catholic organization's newspaper to her father's striking laborers, the daughter was mistakenly shot—and the shock of her death led owner and workers to resolve their differences, in addition to clinching the religious conversion of a young Communist organizer. “The moral of the play,” *Loyola News* explained, “is to substitute love for our fellowman in place of hate for the solution of world problems”—a message that invoked the themes of Mystical Body unity and cooperation pervading the Catholic Worker, CISCA, and the ideology of Catholic campus life.⁵² In an organized campaign to promote this “social order drama,” CISCA committees distributed tickets to member schools; arranged a publicity poster contest; and urged students to “Push *Storm-Tossed*” to peers and family members.⁵³

⁵¹ “Preliminary Discussion for CISCA for 1937-38,” CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 6: 2; “Catholic Worker Group Urges Ciscan May Day Action,” *The New World* (10 April 1937): 10; “Jim Cisca Replies!!” *The New World* (5 February 1937): 14; “Heard at the Meeting,” *The New World* (12 February 1937): 10.

⁵² “Cisca Play of Father Lord This Week,” *Loyola News* (16 March 1937): 3.

⁵³ “Highlights of the General Meeting,” *The New World* (27 February 1937): 10; “Storm-Tossed Committees Plan Campaign,” *The New World* (27 February 1937): 10; “Push ‘Storm-Tossed,’” *New World* (5 March 1937): 10.

In 1937 CISCA advocacy of Catholic Worker “radicalism” spilled over onto the Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein campuses, encouraging Catholic students to empathize with the laboring classes. Dorothy Day returned to address Mundelein College’s Sodality, philosophy, and sociology clubs in May, stressing the Church’s strategy of appealing to American laborers in competition with the Communist Party.⁵⁴ At Loyola, Ed Marciniak spoke on “The Catholic Worker in Chicago” before a November 1937 meeting of the Catholic Social Order academy—a unit in Loyola’s system of mandatory Catholic study circles—thereby exposing students on the margins of Catholic Action to the Catholic Worker’s labor advocacy.⁵⁵ Meanwhile, at De Paul CISCA students distributed copies of *The Catholic Worker* (New York City) which *De Paulia* editors—reflecting their characteristic business slant—recommended to “potential members of the business or professional worlds” as a publication “edited in the interest of the working man” that explained “the positions of employee and employer in terms of the Catholic ethical philosophy of life.”⁵⁶ Throughout the month *De Paulia* continued to endorse Day’s newspaper as addressing questions of “How can the Catholic proletariat assist in the social reconstruction?”, “What is the Church’s attitude toward labor strife?”, and “What is the alternative to Communism?”⁵⁷ These promotions encouraged De Paul’s future professionals to view the laboring classes and their collective bargaining efforts with sympathy rather than hostility.

⁵⁴ “Dorothy Day Urges Brotherhood of Man,” *Skyscraper* (14 May 1937): 4.

⁵⁵ “Social Action Groups Meet to Map Plans,” *Loyola News* (16 November 1937): 3.

⁵⁶ “Read It!,” *De Paulia* (29 April 1937): 1.

⁵⁷ *De Paulia* (20 May 1937): 1.

Elaborating upon the personalist ideology familiar from CISCA, issues of the newly-founded *Chicago Catholic Worker* further exposed interested Loyola, Mundelein, and De Paul students to arguments against the moral stigmatization of poverty. “We have the poor who are ashamed to go to Mass in seedy clothing... not because they are not welcomed by the Pastor, but because they feel a sense of shame before their fellow parishioners,” explained a 1938 editorial. On the contrary, “[t]o the poor belong the seats of honor in our parishes,” since Christ Himself had been poor: “Who of us would scorn the poverty of Bethlehem or Nazareth?”⁵⁸ Reinforcing this argument, the *Chicago Catholic Worker* exposed students to images of Jesus as “Christ the Worker” and “A People’s Christ” Who “talks on the street corner with the proletariat of today...”⁵⁹ In a 1939 piece entitled “There Are Breadlines in Heaven,” CISCA moderator Himebaugh further stressed that, in the eyes of God, all of humanity was dependent—a condition contrary to middle-class values. “For who of us has never asked God for a ‘hand out,’ has never said ‘Give us this day our daily bread?’” Himebaugh queried. “Aren’t we all, then, beggars in God’s sight?” Himebaugh went on to envision God as looking upon humanity as “a teeming mass of proletariat, who are utterly dependent upon His charity for the crops that feed us, for the life that energizes us, for the very air we breathe.”⁶⁰ All of these arguments and images challenged middle-class claims to superior virtue and independence, leading students to identify morally with struggling and unemployed laborers.

⁵⁸ “To the Poor... To Christ!,” *Chicago Catholic Worker* (November 1938): 2.

⁵⁹ Stanley B. James, “A People’s Christ,” *Chicago Catholic Worker* (February 1939): 1.

⁶⁰ Himebaugh, “There Are Breadlines in Heaven,” *Chicago Catholic Worker* (March 1939): 3.

Meanwhile, as the 1930s drew to a close, “specialized Catholic Action” or “Jocism” appealed to some ardent CISCA members as a corrective to the perceived intellectual isolation of the study-club method employed by CISCA’s campus academies. Founded in France by Canon Joseph Cardijn, Jocism derived its popular title from JOC, the initials of Cardijn’s *Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne* or Young Catholic Worker organization. His distinctive techniques--“specialization” and the “inquiry method”—focused on applying theoretical conclusions to practical situations. Positing that only participants in a specific institution or state of life could adequately address its difficulties, “specialization” referred to the formation of separate Catholic Action groups, termed “cells” or “equipes,” for specific professions or vocations. Catholic Actionists, believed Cardijn, should operate to solve the problems of their own community or “milieu,” whether it be a parish, a workplace, or an educational institution. For instance, students should address campus issues; steelworkers should address the problems of their plant; and so forth. To this end, Jocist leaders—specially trained in this methodology—initiated the formation of small groups or “cells” of people of like background, who identified community needs, carried out individual Catholic Action assignments, and applied Cardijn’s inquiry method to any difficulties. This inquiry method consisted of three steps—observe, judge, and act—designed to compel the application of intellectual convictions to specific, practical problems. This intense focus on concrete action distinguished Jocism from the preceding “study club” movement, which Jocists criticized for failing to translate theory into practical solutions. Claims to represent the one

“authentic” form of Catholic Action rendered Jocism controversial among Catholic Action groups that primarily stressed education and socialization.⁶¹

Developed in France and Belgium in the mid-1920s, Jocism spread throughout the United States from what historian Philip Gleason describes as a “Chicago-Notre Dame base.” In 1937 a Paris conference of Cardijn’s *Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne* attracted attendees from 24 nations, signaling Jocism’s arrival on the international stage. Exposed to the movement while a student at Louvain, Fr. Donald Kanaly introduced its methodology in 1938 to Monsignor Reynold J. Hillenbrand, rector of St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, who became its ardent proponent throughout the Chicago area. Activist Mary Irene Zotti, for example, remembers first hearing of the Jocist YCW organization through a British pamphlet distributed by Catholic Worker Fr. John Hayes, who learned of it through his contact with Hillenbrand. Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., who had also studied in France, promoted Jocism at Notre Dame, where he succeeded in establishing a Young Christian Student (YCS) group by May 1940. According to Gleason, during World War II Jocism spread outward from Chicago and Notre Dame to become the predominant and “most self-consciously activist” Catholic Action ideology on Catholic college campuses across the nation.⁶²

In addition to Hillenbrand’s influence, Jocism reached Chicagoans through the articles and lecture tours of Australian writer Paul McGuire, who attended the Jocists’ 1937 Paris conference and, beginning in 1938, traveled the United States to promulgate

⁶¹ Gleason, *Contending with Modernity*, 159-161.

⁶² Gleason, *Contending with Modernity*, 159-161; Mary Irene Zotti, *A Time of Awakening: The Young Christian Worker Story in the United States, 1938-1970* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1991): 7, 12.

specialized Catholic Action. In May 1939 McGuire conducted a “School of Catholic Action” at Chicago’s Our Lady of Sorrows parish and in the following months assisted the establishment of YCW groups or “cells” at parish level. According to Zotti, it was McGuire’s work that exposed her—then a student at Chicago Normal College—to specialized Catholic Action as a structured, practical system as opposed to a vague European ideal. Throughout the 1940s Chicago YCW cells of office and factory workers pushed for unionization, improved working conditions, and the erosion of racial and gender discrimination on the job.⁶³

Even before the YCW’s arrival in Chicago, CISCA members imported Jocist affirmations of the “dignity” of manual labor into the Catholic student federation, thereby challenging students’ assumptions concerning the superior status of professional or white-collar occupations. At a 1938 meeting, for example, Eucharistic-Our Lady chairman David Scanlon, a De Paul student, lamented that “...office workers are jostling one another to get a [clerical] vacancy” despite an ongoing societal need for domestic and skilled labor. To offset the class prejudices underlying this tendency, Scanlon recommended attention to the Jocists’ “Christian theory of work” as an offering to God in union with Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. “We Ciscans can learn from them [Jocists]... to make our typewriter, dishpan, or even our school desk a true altar where we as priests with Christ offer our sacrifice,” high-school student Geraldine Boquist subsequently explained. The general discussion that followed Scanlon and Boquist’s presentations centered on the perceived status of “servile laborers” and students’ need of avoiding

⁶³ Zotti, *A Time of Awakening*, 8-12.

“snobbish” behavior toward their spiritual equals in steel mills and assembly lines.⁶⁴ At a later meeting Apostolic Committee members reiterated the Jocist interpretation of labor as liturgical offering through a skit enacting “The Divine Office of the Kitchen.”⁶⁵ Outside Jocist influences, then, encouraged CISCA’s Catholic students to level occupational class hierarchies in favor of a lay egalitarianism inherent in Catholic liturgical structure.

Jocist methodology of specialized Catholic Action had lesser impact on the federation’s mainstream than among marginal groups of highly-committed students and graduates. In 1939, for instance, a small CISCA Alumni circle known as the Crusaders for a Catholic Revolution (CCR) debated training members for the implementation of Cardijn’s “cell” methodology. An unsigned CCR typescript—possibly authored by Ed Marciniak, whom Fr. Carrabine identified as initiating this effort--proposed reorienting CISCA toward the formation of Catholic “militants” who would organize small cells or “equipes” in the “milieux” of their parishes, neighborhoods, or workplaces. These cells then would address problems specific to their community through the Jocist observe-judge-act technique.⁶⁶ Although the proposal was never implemented throughout CISCA, other CCR materials seemed to reflect Jocism’s value for highly specific or specialized fields of activity as well as intense individual leadership formation. For example, the CCR’s initial meeting in Fall 1937 involved individual members

⁶⁴ J. Riordan Billsbury, “Discuss Christian Theory of Work at Eucharistic-Our Lady Meeting,” *New World* (11 March 1938): 11.

⁶⁵ Mary Malloy, “Retreat Committee Sells Christian Theory of Toil,” *New World* (25 March 1938): 11.

⁶⁶ Carrabine to George Fleming, 9 May 1939, CISCA Records Box 9 Folder 2: 3; “Qualifications of Militants,” CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 25.

meticulously planning and justifying their separate social action projects—such as vacation-school teaching or Catholic Worker activity--in direct consultation with moderators. At subsequent meetings, members were expected to report on the progress of their individual projects and seek advice regarding unresolved issues. Meanwhile, CCR members followed a program of spiritual reading and mental prayer that went above and beyond expectations for the rank-and file CISCA member.⁶⁷ Fitting the overall pattern of Jocist cell meetings and ideology as described by Gleason and Zotti, this CCR meeting format suggested an affinity with specialized Catholic Action that predated the YCW's organized presence in Chicago.⁶⁸

Emphasizing communal power and cross-class solidarity, off-campus movements such as the Catholic Worker and the Young Christian Workers impacted Catholic students' interpretations of class and individual social mobility. As discussed in chapter 1, during the 1920s Catholic students were fascinated by the class fluidity that the city's anonymous masses and fleeting social contacts made happily—sometimes alarmingly—possible. This fascination translated into a preoccupation with establishing a middle-class “cultured” image through proper dress in the proper setting; social skills; and respectable moral conduct. The image of the Catholic campus community also mattered, as students expected to be judged as individuals according to public perception of the student body. At the same time, students frequently perceived the (uncultured) lower classes as excitingly free, uninhibited, and exotic. Despite the attractions of lower-class

⁶⁷ Carrabine to Crusaders for Catholic Revolution, (30 September 1937) CISCA Records, Box 2, Folder 25; Carrabine to Crusaders for Catholic Revolution (21 October 1937), CISCA Records, Box 2, Folder 25.

⁶⁸ Gleason, *Contending with Modernity*, 160; Mary Irene Zotti, *A Time of Awakening*, 11.

expressiveness, however, Catholic students tended to locate virtue in the middle class, which to them represented qualities of personal responsibility, morality, and leadership.⁶⁹

Furthermore, during the prosperous 1920s, students did not posit irreconcilable conflicts between their religious principles and middle-class roles in a capitalist economy. As late as Fall 1929, students expressed faith in individual Christian altruism within American market structures: For example, a short story by De Paul student Robert Kirschten imagined a positive encounter between an impoverished newspaper vendor and a Catholic business graduate on a bitterly cold Christmas Eve. The alumnus “wasn’t sentimental” about poverty, stressed Kirschten, “for he was a businessman,” this statement implying a philosophical commitment to the operation of competitive markets. However, perceiving that the vendor--a very frail old lady--could not effectively hawk her newspapers to homebound shoppers, the Commerce graduate applied his professional training to the situation and expeditiously sold the entire stock, thereby freeing the shivering vendor to return home early with the day’s earnings. Notably, he did not simply donate money to the vendor; rather, he helped her to earn it. “Before I forget,” Kirschten again reminded his peers, this heroic youth was “just another business man, another product of De Paul.” The narrative optimistically suggested that the upward mobility of educated Catholics would benefit all of society, if aspiring Catholic professionals compassionately applied their skills to assist the underprivileged within the prevailing market structure.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ See Chapter 1, especially 49-54.

⁷⁰ Robert Kirschten, “One of Us,” *De Paul Quarterly* (Fall 1929): 212-213.

Nevertheless, the fact that a De Paul student would consider such a plot relevant and interesting to a campus audience suggested that, even before the economic Depression fully unfolded, Catholic students had begun to feel that the American middle class needed Catholicism's redemptive influence. Hinting at ambivalence toward middle-class consumerism, even Kirschten's unsentimental De Paul graduate paused to reflect on passing shoppers' obliviousness to the hardships of the poor and the duties of Christian charity. "No time to buy papers. The eager throng saw nothing save the vision of a happy home—expectant faces around the blazing fire," wrote Kirschten, projecting a narrow self-absorption onto last-minute holiday shoppers. "What care they for those who have no cheerful place to greet them, no one to extend welcome?" By contrast, Kirschten's protagonist "fully appreciated the incongruousness of it all. Why should these people hurry past [the poor vendor] without so much as one kind word?"⁷¹ Even as it advanced individual altruism as a means of reconciling upward mobility with Christian selflessness, Kirschten's story suggested a fear that, as Catholic students entered the middle class and adopted its consumer culture, they risked developing a self-centered blindness to the underprivileged. De Paul University was special, Kirschten seemed to argue, because, unlike secular universities, it produced graduates that would integrate Catholic social concern with their middle-class identities.

As the 1930s progressed, student writings increasingly questioned the spiritual value of middle-class identification, often echoing the Catholic intelligentsia's indictment of the "pagan" materialism, sensualism, and status aspiration of middle-class consumer

⁷¹ Kirschten, "One of Us," 212-213.

culture.⁷² In 1933, for example, Mundelein student Doris Barnett posited a dichotomy of faith and world self-interest in her rebuttal to Edna St. Vincent Millay's famous poem "God's World" (1913), which, according to Barnett, celebrated individual gain at the expense of spirituality. By contrast to Millay's earthly sensualism, Barnett depicted "fame, wealth, and love itself" as "snares" and a "siren song"—sweet, but false and ultimately unfulfilling. To support this negative interpretation of worldly interests, Barnett cited literary examples of passionate, worldly women who met tragic ends. "Francesca, is she beautiful in hell?" Barnett wondered, referencing Dante's *Inferno*; and "Was Guinivere so happy after all?" Even these moral reflections, however, did not preclude a personal struggle between the flesh and the spirit: the poem instructed the "pleading heart" to "be you strong," fortifying it with the paradox that "by rejecting life, life you shall win"—meaning, eternal life in heaven.⁷³ In Barnett's view, Catholic students should focus their energies on succeeding, not by man's standards, but by God's.

Similarly, a 1936 *Skyscraper* editorial urged students to subordinate the socio-economic system's material standards of success to God's supernatural standards, by which one gained other-worldly status in Heaven. "Wealth is to a great extent disproportionately distributed because men make material prosperity their sole aim, unmindful of the eternal havoc they are wreaking on themselves and others," the student editors warned their peers. Instead of aiming to rise above others in socio-economic class status, students should focus on obtaining the "One Essential--eternal happiness with

⁷² Arnold Sparr, *To Promote, Defend, and Redeem: The Catholic Literary Revival and the Cultural Transformation of American Catholicism* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990), 27.

⁷³ Doris Barnett, "'God's World'—An Answer," in *Quest* v. 2 (1933) 61.

God,” which individuals gained through attention to the common good of their earthly community. Consistent with this goal, the Catholic educational system in general placed character and values above “the equipment of its universities, the renown of its faculties, or the material success of its graduates,” *Skyscraper* asserted.⁷⁴

Drawing upon these rather abstract critiques of materialism, Loyola and Mundelein Arts students in particular articulated a harsher vision of the entrepreneurial class as complicit in an economic system that excluded Catholic principles. For example, in a marked contrast to Commerce student Kirschten’s faith in the altruism of individual Catholics, Mundelein Arts student Ruth Tangney’s poem “Modernus” envisioned a prosperous Chicago businessman’s ineffectual struggle to reconcile the imperatives of material success with Christian compassion and humility. Reflecting on the meaning of Christmas, “[i]t must have been on such a night as this [that Christ was born],” the businessman speculated, adding that even a fur coat—a symbol of luxury and status—“is no warmth in such a blast.” Drawing upon this posited contrast between his own prosperity and Christ’s humility, the businessman went on to protest that Christ’s message was “impossible” to implement in the competitive commercial world:

His teaching, too, was beautiful—too beautiful!
 How can a man apply His practices?
 To put our neighbors first, ourselves the last,
 And meekly turn the other cheek, when struck;
 To sell all things and follow Him?
 I, were I to try alone,
 Reversion to His harsh creed, would be dubbed odd.
 Oh, well, a man might try. But there’s that deal
 With Hopkins, and that secretary’s cut
 In salary. No, the thing’s impossible.

⁷⁴ “Why Catholic Education?,” *Skyscraper* (6 November 1936): 2.

But why preach fairytales and cause us such unease?
And yet one can't forget. . .⁷⁵

Tangney's poem implied that the systemic route to material success—the capitalistic prioritization of self-interest that rendered a business competitive and profitable--necessarily involved a rejection of Christ's social message. To Tangney's businessman, the apparently merciless "Hopkins" deal and the employee's salary reduction were practical imperatives, even though he saw that they conflicted with his Catholic ideals of meekness, compassion, and self-sacrifice. In this interpretation, commercial capitalism pushed ambitious Catholics to choose between personal economic gain and a full commitment to the core tenants of their religious faith, so that upward mobility implied, not faithful service to the community, but moral compromise.⁷⁶

Indeed, as CISCA absorbed Catholic Worker and Jocist influences in the late 1930s and early '40s, student writings began to idealize the working class as closer to God than the educated, professional classes with their moral dilemmas and entanglements. Ideologically, this idealization had the effect of collapsing or inverting the accepted class hierarchies in a Christocratic "Catholic Revolution" which—as one might speculate--invoked college students' increased anxiety concerning their own prospects of employment and financial security. For example, a meeting of the CISCA

⁷⁵ In 1955 *Mundelein College Review* reprinted Tangney's poem "Modernus" from an unspecified earlier volume, which unfortunately Loyola University's Women and Leadership Archives does not possess. However, since Ruth Tangney graduated from Mundelein College in 1935, one might speculate that her poem first appeared at some point between 1931 and 1935. Ruth Tangney Timke, "Modernus," *Mundelein College Review*, v. 25 (1955) : 77.

⁷⁶ The greater likelihood of a Mundelein graduate occupying the position of wronged secretary than business owner or manager no doubt made Tangney's religious message more palatable to her female audience.

Alumni group mentally prayed on De Paul alumnus Henry Rago's poem "The Exiles," which used the concept of personalism to invert the social ladder so that the homeless and dispossessed, rather than the financially and socially secure, occupied the uppermost rung—that of Christ, paradoxically both King and Victim:

...Angels attend the man who has
 No place to lay his head:
 Who break beneath the tyrant's rod
 And least of these are sons of God,
 And royal blood is shed....

Who left the stranger suffering
 And gambled while he died
 Will grovel at his garment's hem
 And weep with fear when he shows them
 The spear-mark in his side.⁷⁷

So that the homeless man's identification with the crucified Christ might not be missed, appended questions invited CISCA readers to approach Rago's poem analytically, as they might in the classroom setting. "Who is the 'stranger suffering'?" CISCA members were asked, with the clear intention of illuminating the poem's personalist metaphor. Further questions led readers to think of the poem's possible implications for the broader socio-economic class structure, asking "Why is this poem revolutionary? Does it turn a society upside down? Or does that make it right side up?"⁷⁸

⁷⁷ Henry Rago, "The Exiles" [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 11.

⁷⁸ Henry Rago, "The Exiles" [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 11.

Student expressions of “revolutionary” personalism intensified during the Second World War, strengthened by Pope Pius XII’s encyclical affirming human unity in the “Mystical Body of Christ.” In 1945, Mundelein CISCA student Mary Louise Hector’s award-winning poem “Whatsoever I Do” similarly identified the destitute with Christ, Who, according to the Gospel of ---, at the end of time would reward and punish individuals according to the principle “Whatsoever you do to the least of My people, that you do unto Me”:

I break my smooth, full loaf of warm white bread
 And give the half away. The beggar’s eyes
 On mine, I hear the lark say in her song
 Who goes in the stranger’s guise.

As I ride richly by, a poor man weeps
 With cold—I divide my warmth in one glad stroke.
 You move my heart and hand who are the one
 I cover with my cloak.

When I am called from western windows in
 The spring’s gold evening, by a tear-burned face,
 I ask to share the alien sorrow, watch
 One hour in the lonely place.

I give away these dear, small things—but for wealth
 A hundredfold. . . .⁷⁹

Although Hector’s poem did not name God directly, the lines “...watch/ One hour in the lonely place” referenced Jesus’s reproach to His sleeping disciples at Gethsemane; while “Who goes in stranger’s guise” invoked the personalist ideology to which the title also alluded.

⁷⁹ Mary Louise Hector, “Whatsoever I Do,” *Mundelein College Review*, v. 15 no. 2 (March 1945): 126.

In a striking promotion of class interaction, Hector's poem emphasized the importance of personal contact with the lower classes to the individual Catholic's accumulation of spiritual "wealth." Her identification of the poor with Christ assigned them, not only superior dignity, but also agency and power: "You move my heart and hand who are the one/ I cover with my cloak," she wrote. Likewise, it was the "tear-burned face" that "called" the speaker to the meritorious deed of consolation, rather than the speaker's own isolated initiative. In this interpretation, the poor, as Christ, were wellsprings and dispensers of grace, and interaction with them offered almost sacramental opportunities for spiritual gain that would not be present in, say, the impersonal act of donating to a charitable organization. Conversely, distance from the poor would carry with it the risk of one's soul, since to hold aloof from the poor was to hold aloof from God. Whereas student writers of the 1920s tended to view the lower classes from afar with wonder and curiosity and to seek association with a supposedly virtuous middle class,⁸⁰ by the 1940s Catholic students expressed a spiritual desire to transgress class boundaries in the hope of accessing an elevated, privileged poor.

In some ways, this personalist emphasis on contact and interaction tended toward an egalitarian rather than hierarchical or elitist vision of society. In poetry, for example, Hector and Rago's use of lower-case rather than capitalized pronouns in reference to Christ's Presence in the poor collapsed hierarchical distinctions, suggesting that the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ had blurred divisions between God and man—and, by extension, between upper and lower classes, clergy and laity, Caucasian and African-American races. More generally, CISCA students and educators also explicitly

⁸⁰ See Chapter 1, especially 49-54.

correlated mankind's supernatural unity in the Mystical Body of Christ to the concept of a "Brotherhood of Man" employed both by Marxists and by New Deal officials, an identification that suggested an egalitarian, democratic tendency in Catholic Action ideology. Indeed, in the late 1930s and World War II CISCA members at times seemed to merge their religious rhetoric with the spiritual tones of what historian Philip Gleason terms an American "civil religion of democracy," thereby identifying Catholic Action with American democratic ideals.⁸¹

However, in elevating and somewhat romanticizing poverty, personalist rhetoric could also reinforce a sort of reverse elitism in Catholic circles that evoked the *avant-garde* celebration of "authentic" experience—the grittier, the better.⁸² Some middle-class visitors to Chicago's Catholic Worker House of Hospitality clearly were searching for lower-class atmosphere: In 1939, for example, a North-Side visitor, objecting to the house's fresh coat of paint, accused CW volunteers of "going bourgeois." "Painted and decorated, the house loses all its charm for her!" the *Chicago Catholic Worker* exclaimed with amusement.⁸³ Likewise, in 1937 editors remarked that some visitors were "incurably romantic and the very poverty and nakedness of the house intrigues them."⁸⁴

This fascination with the lower classes also appeared in Rago and Hector's personalist-

⁸¹ Philip Gleason, "Pluralism, Democracy, and Catholicism in the Era of World War II," *Review of Politics* v. 49 no. 2 (Spring 1987): 208-230; 218. For an example of "brotherhood of man" rhetoric, see Sister Cecilia Himebaugh, "Communism and the Missal," [1935] quoted in Sister Mary Roberta Bauer, S.S.N.D., "CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists," (M.A. Thesis, De Paul University, 1945), 36-39.

⁸² See T. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 5-6, 191.

⁸³ "Notes Along the Way," *Chicago Catholic Worker* (March 1940): 4.

⁸⁴ "Hunger, Want Break Down Old Barriers," *Chicago Catholic Worker* (April 1939): 1,4.

themed poetry, which honored the poor as Christ-bearers and described their plight with an emotionalism that no doubt rendered it highly interesting to student readers. From this perspective, to be middle-class was to be staid, phony, and morally suspect; while to be poor was to be brashly honest and sanctified through the drama of Christlike victimization. Over the course of the Depression, students' 1920s-era fascination with lower-class freedom, self-expression, and unconventionality had gained moral legitimacy through radical applications of Catholic Action's personalist ideology.

Despite this idealization of the lower classes, however, Catholic college students of Loyola, De Paul, Mundelein did not abandon their status aspirations; rather, they sought to construct middle-class identities that could accommodate Catholic Action's social values. Undeterred by Catholic Action criticisms of corporate greed and entrepreneurial selfishness, in 1935 fully 29% of Loyola Arts students registered for at least one commerce course, leading the *Loyola News* to conclude that "the tendency of the modern student.... seems to be toward a business life."⁸⁵ Indeed, Arts students showed such interest in acquiring practical business skills that in Fall 1937 Loyola inaugurated an undergraduate Commerce program offering specializations in economics, accounting, and finance.⁸⁶ Of the 22 CISCA Alumni present or represented at a 1945 reunion meeting, five—23%-- worked in business as entrepreneurs, executives, or office

⁸⁵ "BSC Favorite Curriculum," *Loyola News* (15 November 1935): 8.

⁸⁶ "Commerce Unit on Arts Campus," *Loyola News* (25 May 1937): 1.; "New Day School of Commerce on Arts Campus," *Loyola News* (29 July 1937): 1.

staff, a proportion suggesting that CISCA members had only slightly less interest in commerce than did Loyola Arts students overall.⁸⁷ While pro-labor rhetoric possibly eroded class prejudices, it did not alienate Catholic Actionists from white-collar careers.

Indeed, many CISCA students—especially those of De Paul, with its emphasis on Commerce and Law—continued to describe Catholic Action in “modern” commercial terms that implied admiration for business training and methodology. In March 1936, for example, the *De Paulia* CISCA columnist offered a “really good definition” of CISCA that portrayed the Catholic student federation as (ironically) fighting material values through business techniques: “An organization, practical, businesslike, modern, a force in the busiest and most commercialized of cities—yet dealing wholly in things most unworldly, ‘selling’ to its customers prayer, life, zeal for the kingdom of Christ, charity for the neighbor, interest in the things of the soul; asking in payment the coin of sacrifice, of unselfish service, of courage to rebel against the paganism of the day...”⁸⁸ Similarly, in 1938 CISCA’s General Meeting included an afternoon discussion on “Selling Christianity to a Pagan World.”⁸⁹ By contrast to Tangney’s implication that commercialism was inherently hard-hearted, this interpretation of CISCA as commercial enterprise simultaneously condemned “pagan” consumerism while celebrating the practicality and efficiency of the economic system and entrepreneurial classes.

In keeping with Catholic Action’s earlier emphasis on concrete, practical projects, Depression-era students also continued to assume that the extension of Catholic influence

⁸⁷ Carrabine to CISCA members, 11 July 1945, CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 4.

⁸⁸ “CISCA,” *De Paulia* (12 March 1936): 2.

⁸⁹ “Ciscans Meet in General Session at Fenwick High,” *De Paulia* (24 February 1938): 1.

in America depended on the systemic upward mobility of Catholic individuals and institutions. For example, CISCA's "Infiltration Plan"—though more prominent in the early than late 1930s--encouraged individual Catholics to achieve positions of status and success within the existing socio-economic framework so as to direct or reshape it according to Encyclical principles. Interpretations of CISCA as a "school for lay leaders," a provider of "spiritual leadership" training, also encouraged collegians to view status attainment in terms of religious and cultural influence rather than moral compromise.⁹⁰

Likewise, some students, particularly those of Commerce-oriented De Paul, maintained Kirschten's implicit argument that a practical attention to commercial self-interest could support, rather than contradict, the exercise of Catholic values. In 1935, for instance, a *De Paulia* column defended a hospital's right to limit extensions of credit and press for collection of outstanding fees, arguing that such practices supported, rather than contradicted, the hospital's charitable mission. Creatively adapting the Golden Rule to business principles, "as [the hospital] gets Credit, so it must extend Credit," *De Paulia* argued, and "as there is a limit to the Credit it gets, so there must be a limit to the Credit it extends." This limit resulted from financial considerations which even charitable institutions ignored at their peril. "In keeping with the charitable nature of its work, the Hospital will go to greater lengths [in extending credit]... than the ordinary business organization," stipulated *De Paulia*, but "...payment must eventually be made, or the hospital cannot survive. . . . [U]pon this depends the fulfillment of the extensive

⁹⁰For example, see "The History of CISCA, 1926-1944," CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 11: 6.

charitable purpose of the Hospital.”⁹¹ As in the infiltration plan, Christian action depended on the achievement and maintenance of institutional stability.

Moreover, Catholic students did not recklessly abandon the 1920s-era project of attaining or maintaining individual middle-class status through careful construction of a “cultured” image. Deprivations and anti-materialist ideology aside, tasteful clothing and a refined atmosphere still mattered—perhaps the more so since, in an era of limited means, they seemed all the more reflective of personal taste, economy, and ingenuity. Thus CISCA students teasingly remarked on Eucharistic-Our Lady chairman Henry Rago’s salmon-colored ties and matching handkerchiefs, terming him “the essence... of the well-dressed chairman.”⁹² At Mundelein, female students closely attended to changing fashions, as evidenced by *Skyscraper* columnists’ detailed descriptions of what students wore, on campus and elsewhere. In 1931 the Mundelein Home Economics department staged “Vogue Hour,” a Spring fashion exhibit of students’ own sewing projects; while in December 1936 even CISCA secretary Catherine Heerey modeled winter fashions for a “Mundelein revue” at the Carson Pirie Scott department store.⁹³ While Depression-era Catholic students emphasized economy over showiness in their choice of clothing, they still did care about contextualizing themselves in middle-class culture through adherence to the latest trends and a general attention to self-presentation—all material expressions of class identification.

⁹¹ “Credit Department Efficient Financier,” *De Paulia* (7 November 1935): 3.

⁹² “CISCA Chatter,” *The New World* (26 February 1937): 10.

⁹³ “Vogue Hour Appeals to Feminine Hearts,” *Skyscraper* (27 March 1931): 3; “Carson’s Sponsor Mundelein Revue,” *Skyscraper* (4 December 1936): 1.

Indeed, at Mundelein College a religious ideology of gracious and hospitable “Catholic womanhood”⁹⁴ invoked secular and material constructions of class status that Catholic students still found important. Mundelein geared Home Economics courses, for example, toward the achievement of domestic refinement on a narrow budget. Preparing to someday host a white-collar husband’s boss or professional colleagues at home, Mundelein’s female college students approached “entertaining” as an art form involving extensive preparation, taste, courtesy, and an efficient use of material resources. Students learned “to budget family income so as to allow funds for entertaining,” reported *Skyscraper*. Moreover, they aimed to stretch the value of their dollar through exquisite attention to presentation and environment, since “...although the food they offer must of course be the best, the manner in which it is offered and the atmosphere surrounding the function are the vital details, and have the power to stamp the occasion a failure or success.”⁹⁵ The placement of a colorful plate, for example, could embellish an ordinary bowl of cereal, lending it a “delightful and interesting appearance.”⁹⁶ At a practice St. Patrick’s dinner party, Home Economics students—as well as *Skyscraper* reporters—attended carefully to the table setting. “Dainty green napkins matched the tablecloth, which was decorated with a design of green-and-white figures. The floral centerpiece was of Erin carnations and fern. Fragile glassware and appropriate favors were placed to

⁹⁴ See Chapter 6.

⁹⁵ “Future Housewives Gain Experience,” *Skyscraper* (27 February 1931): 3.

⁹⁶ “Cereal in Gala Dress,” *Skyscraper* (27 March 1931): 3.

the right of each plate. The arrangement was one,” concluded *Skyscraper*, “that would have made any hostess proud. . . .”⁹⁷

Even as they aimed for “classy” occupations and self-presentations, however, Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein students nevertheless explored ways of exerting Catholic Action “spiritual leadership” to reduce class inequities. Under CISCA auspices, for example, Mundelein and Loyola Arts students studied alternative economic structures that emphasized cooperation rather than competition. In 1935 Mundelein debaters constructed a case for socialized medicine that triumphed over the opposition.⁹⁸ Leading a CISCA campaign for cooperative markets, in 1936 Mundelein CISCA students also invested in a campus “consumer cooperative” that purchased stockings wholesale, sold them on campus at current retail price, and then distributed the profits among cooperative members. Since investors and consumers hailed from one and the same group—in this case, the Mundelein student community--cooperative transactions theoretically eliminated class exploitation and promoted a broader distribution of wealth.⁹⁹ The experiment proved popular: By February 1937, Mundelein’s student cooperative had more than doubled its initial membership of 25 students, who received dividend checks ranging from \$.20 to \$3.00.¹⁰⁰ By June 1938, it boasted 60 members and roughly 180

⁹⁷ “Students Preside at Shamrock Dinner,” *Skyscraper* (27 March 1931): 3.

⁹⁸ “Socialized Medicine Takes Debate Decision,” *Skyscraper* (27 November 1935): 4.

⁹⁹ *Skyscraper* (6 November 1936): 3; “Sodalists Plan Cooperate Shop for Student Use,” *Skyscraper* (4 December 1936): 1; “Student Co-operative Plans Initial Order,” *Skyscraper* (18 December 1936): 3; “Executives Report Cooperative Success,” *Skyscraper* (5 March 1937): 3.

¹⁰⁰ “Cooperative Issues Initial Dividends,” *Skyscraper* (19 February 1937): 3.

customers.¹⁰¹ Exploring another possible response to economic woes, in 1939

Mundelein also hosted a CISCA College Forum on rural life that celebrated the stripped-down simplicity of agricultural labor and discussed the possible relocation of impoverished urban families “back to the land.”¹⁰²

Reflecting CISCA’s “infiltration” strategies, Catholic college students also framed their professional aspirations in terms of social justice and cultural redemption, thereby accommodating Catholic Action values within middle-class identities. For instance, in the mid-1930s *Loyola News* articles promoted legal studies as crucial to the interpretation of progressive New Deal legislation. Likewise, in 1937 an editorial urged Catholic students to consider civil service careers as a means of implementing socio-economic reforms.¹⁰³ Consistent with Catholic Action’s “infiltration” of campus media sources, for example, other CISCA members explored journalistic careers or sidelines in Catholic media that had the potential to influence popular opinion in favor of Catholic Action reforms.¹⁰⁴ Loyola’s John Cogley and the University of Chicago’s James O’Gara—who in 1945 founded the CISCA magazine *Today*—later went on to edit *Commonweal*, a prominent middlebrow Catholic publication. Loyola graduate and former CISCA president Edward Marciniak founded the journal *Work* to support his Chicago Labor Alliance, an organization that promoted Encyclical principles of social

¹⁰¹ “Cooperative Thrives; Has 17 Percent Profit,” *Skyscraper* (2 June 1938): 3.

¹⁰² Mary Margaret Mitchell, untitled speech (25 January 1939), CISCA Records Box 2, Folder 27.

¹⁰³ “The Collegian Looks to the Nation’s Capitol for a Career,” *Loyola News* (9 February 1937): 4.

¹⁰⁴ Arnold Sparr observes CISCA members’ tendency toward journalism and creative fields in *To Promote, Defend, and Redeem: The Catholic Literary Revival and the Cultural Transformation of American Catholicism* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990), 119-121.

justice.¹⁰⁵ When in 1945 CISCA Alumni met to share their personal stories, six out of 22—over 25%—were working for newspapers or media organizations.¹⁰⁶

Reflecting the values of the Jesuit-led Catholic Literary Revival, Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein educators even encouraged students to view creative writing as a form of spiritual leadership that encouraged the development of religious social consciousness in readers and writers alike.¹⁰⁷ Financial awards offered incentive to aspiring writers while requiring exposure to Catholic Action ideology through CISCA or other student groups. Mundelein College, for example, offered one-year liberal arts scholarships (potentially renewable) to the winner of CISCA's Annual Writer's Club contest, which was open only to participants in campus publications or CISCA writers' circles. *Skyscraper* reported that Loyola and St. Xavier offered "similar" scholarships.¹⁰⁸ In 1936 the national Sodality *Queen's Work* journal held a short story contest intended, in part, to "develop Catholic writers who will refrain from serving the public... sentimental twaddle" that encouraged pious complacency rather than active social commitment.¹⁰⁹

At Mundelein, aspiring writers established the "Charles O' Donnell unit" of Francis X. Talbot, S.J.'s Catholic Poetry Society of America,¹¹⁰ which likewise

¹⁰⁵ Gleason, *Contending with Modernity*, 157-158.

¹⁰⁶ Carrabine to CISCA members, 11 July 1945, CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 4.

¹⁰⁷ See William M. Halsey, *The Survival of American Innocence: Catholicism in an Era of Disillusionment, 1920-1940* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980), especially 99-123; and Arnold Sparr, *To Promote, Defend, and Redeem*, especially 17-18, 31-50.

¹⁰⁸ "President Announces Cisca Scholarship," *Skyscraper* (19 March 1937): 1.

¹⁰⁹ "'And They Lived Happily Ever After,'" *Skyscraper* (14 February 1936): 2.

¹¹⁰ For background on the Catholic Poetry Society of America, see Halsey, *The Survival of American Innocence*, 59-60, 105-106; and Sparr, *To Promote, Defend, and Redeem*, 27.

represented the acts of writing and reading as personalist encounters with Christ's presence in oneself and others. The content of Mundelein's poetry anthology *Quest*, published under Catholic Poetry Society auspices, interpreted the creative, solitary act of writing as an exercise, not in individualism, but in personalism: that is, the poets' individual experiences would reveal, not only the self, but the redemptive presence of Christ within the self and its surrounding environment. Beginning to suggest this thought, in 1934 Mundelein student Doris Barnett instructed "A Poet" to "[s]eek not for inspiration in a rose," outside of the self, but to "look within your soul at frustrate dreams/ And hold the broken pieces to the light." The resulting poem would be "born in fire," the product of an inner crucible vaguely analogous to Christ's redemptive suffering.¹¹¹ More explicitly, critic Jessica Powers introduced the 1946 volume of *Quest* by reflecting that a developing poet "ceases to listen at every doorway and turns to hear the Spirit of God speaking in his own soul. And the song that evolves, though learned in part from many masters, is colored always by something that is utterly God's and his." According to educator Harold C. Gardiner, S.J., it was the intellectual discipline involved in poetry-writing that revealed to a young author the relationship of her own thoughts and feelings to a transcendent, divine experience that gave her own life meaning and significance. To Gardiner, writing was the ultimate act of aligning oneself within Catholicism's pre-existing interpretive framework and, in the process, discovering value,

¹¹¹ Doris Barnett, "To a Poet," in *Quest* v. 3 (1934): 49.

dignity, and beauty. The importance of the *Quest* poems, he concluded, was that “the young authors have grown” spiritually “in the writing of them.”¹¹²

Critics expected a poem’s readers to “grow,” too, by recognizing the poet’s revelation of Christ and the reader’s own intimate connection with the poet. “Poetry may perhaps be defined as the most scenic view of the soul, “ wrote Jessica Powers, and to read a poem was “to glimpse another soul”—a soul that was like a “secret planet of God,” at once strange to the reader and filled with the familiar divine presence. The pleasure of reading, then, was a “thrill of discovery” of God deep within another, different person.¹¹³ In this interpretation, writing was a form of spiritual witness, and reading a form of spiritual experience. The text itself—that brief glimpse of an individual mind—became important as a currency of social interaction, a way in which people encountered one another and, in that encounter, acknowledged and appreciated the presence of God on earth.

Aspiring poets and novelists eagerly responded. In 1934 Loyola Academy student John Langdon found “too many writers” to be his greatest challenge in forming a CISCA writers’ circle at his high school.¹¹⁴ Even CISCA Alumni included a writer’s circle. In 1936 eleven Mundelein students contributed short stories to *The Waif’s Messenger*, organ of the charitable Mercy Home for Boys; in 1937, three Mundelein

¹¹² Harold C. Gardiner, S.J., “Forward,” *Quest* (1944) : v-vi.

¹¹³ Jessica Powers, “Forward,” *Quest* (1946): v-vi.

¹¹⁴ Joan Hart to John Langdon, [1934], CISCA Records, Box 6 Folder 4.

students published fiction in that same magazine.¹¹⁵ That same year Mundelein student Roberta Christie won the Chicago *Daily News* short story contest.¹¹⁶ Under the editorship of Loyola professor Morton Zabel, the Chicago-based literary journal *Poetry* published Henry Rago's submissions in 1931, while he was still a senior at Austin High School.¹¹⁷ Throughout his years at De Paul, Rago continued to write poetry in addition to columns in *De Paulia* and the *New World*, one-act plays for CISCA, and even lyrics for a musical, entitled *Experiment 23*, that De Paul students performed in 1936.¹¹⁸ Rago later became *Poetry*'s editor-in-chief.¹¹⁹

In addition to influencing students' interpretation of their careers, Catholic Action ideology also encouraged CISCA's aspiring "spiritual leadership" to initiate social change on a day-to-day basis by deliberately transgressing social boundaries and initiating unconventional contacts. Discussing personalism's practical applications, in 1940 the *St. Anthony Messenger* offered the example of a CISCA student who observed an African American sit down next to a white man on a crowded El. Apparently offended by the black man's proximity, the white man promptly crossed the aisle to sit next to the (white) CISCA student. In response, the CISCA student brushed past the white man with a "Pardon me" and, crossing the aisle, sat down next to the African American. This student's small, incidental stand against racial prejudice was a "practical

¹¹⁵ "Students Contribute to Waif's Messenger," *Skyscraper* (8 October 1936): 3; "Senior Scribes Write for Waif's Messenger," *Skyscraper* (30 April 1937): 4.

¹¹⁶ "Wins Daily News Short Story Prize," *Skyscraper* (19 March 1937): 1.

¹¹⁷ "News Notes," *Poetry* (December 1931): 173.

¹¹⁸ "'Experiment 23' Cast Chosen; Show Will be Staged May 13, 14, 15," *De Paulia* (16 April 1936): 1.

¹¹⁹ Gleason, *Contending with Modernity*, 157-158.

illustration of what CISCANS mean when they talk about ‘daring to be different,’” the *Messenger* article proudly stated.¹²⁰ In another individual initiative against racism, during World War II CISCA alumnus Al Beranger volunteered to train the U.S. Marines’ first African-American recruits.¹²¹ Reaching out to lapsed Catholics, another alumna “converted” a woman married outside the Church, “even at the cost of that woman’s home and sole support.”¹²²

Likewise, students addressed ideological conflict through personal appeals and interactions that aimed to defuse rather than exacerbate existing tensions. When in 1938 a Protestant evangelist attacked the Catholic Church in a series of public presentations that involved such inflammatory gestures as stomping on a rosary, CISCA students responded by quietly distributing Catholic pamphlets and making individual contacts with people in his audience.¹²³ Adventurously, in the summers of 1935 and 1936 Rosary College CISCA students traveled to Protestant-dominated cities of Tulsa and Oklahoma City to engage in “street preaching” under the auspices of the Catholic Evidence Guild. During the school term the Rosary women prepared for this interactive effort through special training sessions conducted by Monsignor Reynold Hillenbrand, rector of St. Mary of the Lake Seminary.¹²⁴ At a 1938 CISCA General Meeting Marciniak similarly

¹²⁰ Robert A. Senser, “Screwballs Extraordinary,” *St. Anthony Messenger* (November 1940): 3-4, 50-51; 4.

¹²¹ Carrabine to Joe Golden, 17 July 1942, CISCA Records, Box 6 Folder 8: 2; “The CISCA Organization, Pro and Con,” [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 14: 7. It is unclear whether or not the Marines accepted Belanger’s request for this assignment.

¹²² “The CISCA Organization, Pro and Con,” [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 14: 7.

¹²³ Robert A. Senser, “Screwballs Extraordinary,” *St. Anthony Messenger* (November 1940): 3-4, 50-51; 4.

¹²⁴ Mary Jane O’Shea, “Catholic Evidence,” *New World* (15 January 1937): 11; Rita Mary Fitzgerald, “Another Protest,” *New World* (15 January 1937): 11.

urged Catholic students to counter secular “paganism,” not by remaining within a countercultural Catholic Action enclave, but by “setting good examples” in the presence of secularists.¹²⁵

Some CISCA students advocated a similar approach to combating Communist organizations, eschewing distant attacks in favor of personal interactions that appealed to common goals. For example, in 1937 an anonymous student described a recent personal conversation with a Communist to CISCA’s *New World* editors. “I told her all about the Brotherhood of Man, Charity, and ‘Our Utopia.’ I am to give her copies of *The Catholic Worker*, which I know will help to impress her,” the student wrote. “Each contact with people like this strengthens me a millionfold...”¹²⁶ Similarly, at a 1937 meeting of CISCA’s Anti-Communist Committee a student proposed that “well-informed Catholic students” should attend local Communist Party meetings in order to introduce a Catholic perspective into general discussions.¹²⁷ Following up on the idea, CISCA students discussed ways of disseminating information concerning Communist organizations’ scheduled events for the convenience of students interested in this approach.¹²⁸ Indeed, CISCA correspondence includes an invitation to the Young Communist League’s membership rally in November 1940, a circumstance suggesting that CISCA students made at least some contact with their ideological opposition. “We know that you are not a Communist,” wrote Jack Kling, the League’s state secretary, to an unspecified CISCA

¹²⁵ J. Riordan Billsbury, “Paganism, How Christianity Once Defeated It,” *New World* (4 March 1938): 15.

¹²⁶ “CISCA Correspondence,” *New World* (5 February 1937): 14.

¹²⁷ “Anti-Communist and Catholic Citizenship Reports Emphasize Social Justice,” *New World* (15 January 1937): 11.

¹²⁸ “CISCA Chatter,” *The New World* (15 January 1937): 11.

member. "...Yet, we also know that you are democratic, that you are interested in the viewpoint of the Communists just as you are interested in the viewpoint of all groups."¹²⁹

When interacting with Communist peers, CISCA members listened as well as spoke. In an undated letter to Sr. Himebaugh, for example, CISCA alumnus Joe Golden described a constructive conversation with a Communist woman whom he met at a CIO office workers' dance. "We began discussing techniques, propaganda that is, and it impressed me what a great deal of time and thought they devote to the little details that often made their programs successful [sic]," wrote Golden, who argued that Catholic Actionists could learn a lot from the targeted personal appeals of Communist organizers.¹³⁰ Likewise, in 1937 CISCA's Apostolic Committee suggested that members emulate the Communists' "superior" propagandists by directly addressing "the people who need it—the laborer, the workers on strike for social justice, those who are on the border line, wavering between Communism and Catholicism..."¹³¹ Again, the emphasis on individual initiative and interaction across social boundaries allowed Catholic Actionists to further social justice principles in small ways, without necessarily sacrificing their own career aspirations or financial security.

Despite CISCA's Depression-era idealization of the lower classes, then, Catholic students at Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein sought ways of accommodating social justice principles within middle-class identities. Catholic Action's highly flexible

¹²⁹ Jack Kling, State Secretary of the Young Communist League, 6 November 1940, CISCA Records Box 5 Folder 3. The invitation's context among John Langdon's correspondence suggests that he may have been its recipient.

¹³⁰ Joe [Golden] to Himebaugh, n.d., CISCA Records Box 7 Folder 5.

¹³¹ "Apostolic Committee Discusses Communism, Social Relations," *New World* (30 April 1937): 14.

concept of “spiritual leadership” enabled students to interpret white-collar careers, creative endeavors, and even social interactions as transgressions of social boundaries, so that—paradoxically—they could use their middle-class status to undermine social division and affirm mankind’s essential unity in Christ’s Mystical Body.

Meanwhile, however, within the CISCA federation radical proponents of “Mystical Body” inclusiveness and cross-class interaction ironically formed a new spiritual elite amid the overall relaxation of Sodality membership requirements. As the 1930s drew to a close, members and observers increasingly contrasted a subset of highly-motivated Catholic Actionists—sometimes termed “100 percenters”—with the broader, rank-and-file membership of CISCA’s subcommittees and mandatory “academy” groups. Strident in their anti-materialism, interracialism, and prioritization of religious values, CISCA’s “100 percenters” comprised a distinctly religious counterculture: In November 1940 the *St. Anthony Messenger* admiringly characterized them as “screwballs extraordinary.” “You see, these young people are ‘nuts,’” it explained. “... To the material world their way of thinking and acting is crazy.”¹³² Likewise, Himebaugh described an inner circle of aspiring “saints,” supporting one another in religious practice and social virtue while discouraging racial slurs, sex talk, and uncharitable gossip. The prospective CISCA member, predicted Himebaugh, “will discover that many of them receive Holy Communion daily and no one is surprised. He will observe that prejudice and lack of charity are frowned upon as off-color stories are not frowned upon in other

¹³² Robert A. Senser, “Screwballs Extraordinary,” *St. Anthony Messenger* (November 1940): 3-4, 50-51; 3.

circles...”¹³³ Although perhaps a bit exaggerated, these descriptions still were more than window-dressing, as a CISCA member’s handwritten note of apology suggested in 1941. “I’m beginning to realize how silly it was to get mad last night,” writers’ group secretary Marguerite Gallagher wrote to John Langdon. “There is no place for hurt feelings in Catholic Action. Excuse it please.”¹³⁴ Her private note suggested the existence of a consensus concerning priorities and social behavior that helped to delineate a small, ardent circle of CISCA leaders.

In some instances these elite “100 percenters” were key to CISCA’s recruitment capability, as the social attractions of committed members’ friendliness and enthusiasm could counteract any dryness or preachiness in the educational program. Speaking on the topic of “How CISCA ‘Gets You,’” De Paul student Rita McGrogan, for example, claimed that she was “excruciatingly bored” at her first CISCA meeting, which she attended as an Immaculata high school student, and immediately vowed that “never again” would she sit through such an event. Nevertheless, she was “amazed” at the way that her Immaculata peers in CISCA enthused over her visit, and later decided to return “just for the heck of it.” “Before I knew it,” McGrogan marveled, “I changed my mind about how dull sodalists were—realized that they could be very charming—that that charm lay in their earnestness.”¹³⁵

¹³³ Sister Cecilia Himebaugh, OSB, “The Origin of CISCA,” [1940], CISCA Records Box 1 Folder 17: 7-8.

¹³⁴ “Marguerite G” to John Langdon, (9 June 1941), CISCA Records, Box 6 Folder 5. Reference to the CISCA Alumni mailing list and writers’ club reports suggests that the author was Marguerite Gallagher. “Mailing List—CISCA Alumni,” CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 11; “Writer’s Club Report, “ [27 May 1939] CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 13.

¹³⁵ “General Meeting Plan—February 22, 1940,” CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 18: 1.

Still, those earnest members represented a small minority in tension with the bulk of CISCA's expanding membership base. In 1940 the *St. Anthony Messenger* estimated that out of the reportedly 20,000 students involved in the CISCA network, only 3,000 were "active"—and of these, only about 1,000 were "true blue," the "real spark-plug" of the organization.¹³⁶ No doubt the Catholic journal's estimate was generous. Indeed, plans for the February 1940 General Meeting showed that motivated CISCA leaders perceived the general membership as overwhelmingly lukewarm. For instance, De Paul student Rita McGrogan lamented that "there were considerably few CISCA 100%-ers" and threatened less-committed members with exclusion. She couldn't understand, she claimed, why they bothered to attend at all if they preferred to remain on the sidelines. "Too *stiff* for them? *Then why do they come? Social contacts? Can't they take it? ...Do they see the reasons for a revolution? And are they ready to suffer for its success?;*" McGrogan challenged. "I don't think so. If they aren't, they don't belong in CISCA; there is no room for such timid, selfish people."¹³⁷

No doubt many rank-and-file members were in it mainly for the social life. In 1965 even Himebaugh speculated that it had been the Great Depression "that made high school youngsters and college students, having neither jobs nor money, spend their last—I think it was—fifteen cents in those days to ride the 'L' for a Saturday morning CISCA

¹³⁶ Robert A. Senser, "Screwballs Extraordinary," *St. Anthony Messenger* (November 1940): 3-4, 50-51; 3.

¹³⁷ "General Meeting Plan—February 22, 1940," CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 18: 1. McGrogan's threat to exclude less-committed CISCA members recalls the likewise exclusionary rhetoric of the Jocist student group at the University of Notre Dame, as described by historian Philip Gleason. See Gleason, *Contending with Modernity*, 162-163.

discussion.”¹³⁸ Cut off from pricey amusements, Depression-era students likely found CISCA and Sodality events to be economical venues for meeting and making friends. General Meetings included lunchtime dancing. At Loyola, the affiliated Sodality organized smokers and theater parties, while De Paul’s coed unit also held dances. After the Saturday morning CISCA committee meetings, high-school members typically gathered in Carrabine’s office for an “all-afternoon bull session” over “Spam sandwiches and coffee.”¹³⁹ Rosemary Nelson Kalin remembered these gatherings as lively. “He [Carrabine] had the patience to put up with our exuberance... after meetings. Exuberance meant many cups of cocoa, home-made cookies, and tossing people up in the air in blankets—fun!”¹⁴⁰ Similarly, in 1941 the *CISCA News* disapprovingly observed that “...Ciscans talk more after the meeting than they do in it...,” implying that, at least for some, the social rather than spiritual atmosphere could be the group’s main attraction.¹⁴¹

In meetings, too, students’ minds were not entirely on God. At the 44th General Meeting (November 21, 1941), for example, girls used the backs of their programs to play games of tic-tac-toe and carry on written conversations. Penciled notes such as “Charles O’Reilly [CISCA president] is an angel!” and “I know a girl who has a case on him, but I won’t tell who...” suggested that not every attendee was absorbed in spiritual matters.¹⁴² A Loyola student, the angelic O’Reilly was an attraction in himself: *CISCA*

¹³⁸ Sister Cecilia Himebaugh, OSB, “CISCA in Retrospect,” (1965), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 19.

¹³⁹ Himebaugh, “CISCA in Retrospect,” 1.

¹⁴⁰ Rosemary Nelson Kalin (1986), CISCA Records Box 1 Folder 21.

¹⁴¹ *CISCA News*, (1 November 1941), CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 22.

¹⁴² Agendas, General Meeting (21 November 1941), CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 18.

News reported in November 1941 that "...Charlie O'Reilly spoke before a girls' sodality and thrilled 'em with his masculine delivery."¹⁴³ Still, a scribbled comment of "Sum up the whole point now" perhaps reflected frustration with that same O'Reilly's speeches—which, for some, must have taken second place to the social opportunities offered by the General Meeting assemblies.¹⁴⁴

Some members and moderators perceived the factionalization mainly as a conflict between enthusiastic high-schoolers and apathetic, self-centered collegians. Despite Mundelein's high level of Sodality membership, "John, you're in for a surprise upon entering college," wrote a Mundelein CISCA member to Loyola Academy student John Langdon. "It will simply amaze you to see the indifference and uninterested attitude that college students can show. There are about ten students at Mundelein who are interested in sodality work in general, and of those ten, five are affiliated with CISCA..."¹⁴⁵ At Loyola University, "[i]n the face of the necessity for the 'Catholic Revolution,' the apathy and sheer ignorance of most students is appalling," a *Loyola News* columnist declared in 1937.¹⁴⁶ In 1938 Kathleen Garvey lamented that, although enthusiastic college students had founded the CISCA federation, since then "CISCA has not succeeded in attracting any considerable number of college students."¹⁴⁷ Composing the 1935 CISCA history, Mundelein students Virginia Woods and Catherine Heerey

¹⁴³ *CISCA News* (1 November 1941): 3.

¹⁴⁴ Agendas, General Meeting (21 November 1941), CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 18.

¹⁴⁵ "Maryhelen" to John Langdon, n.d., CISCA Records, Box 6 Folder 4: 1-2.

¹⁴⁶ "Wisdom They Foster," *Loyola News* (23 November 1937): 4.

¹⁴⁷ "Alumni Group Plans to Work with CISCA for Catholic Action," *New World* (4 February 1938): 11.

themselves credited high schools with the majority of CISCA's accomplishments. "The fact cannot be too strongly stressed that it is in these participating schools [high schools] that the real work of Cisca is carried on," the college students stated.¹⁴⁸ Indeed, discussion agendas distributed among CISCA moderators in 1937-38 suggested a perception of lax leadership among the college students who chaired CISCA committees. "How handle remissness of direction?" prompted one agenda point, which also indicated a need for "increased personal participation and responsibility" among CISCA officers.

149

Advocating greater collegiate participation in CISCA events, CISCA's *New World* page also frequently admonished college students to relate their studies less to personal success than to the possibility of finding and implementing Catholic solutions to world problems. "Most young men and women annually pouring into our colleges... could be found only after a long quest, hidden behind musty books, absorbing knowledge and 'preparing for later life,'" complained one article. "Get them out! we begged. Dust them off! Give them, and their newly acquired knowledge, back to CISCA!"¹⁵⁰ A month later the fictional "Grace Cisca" reminded her college brother that "You're going to school to broaden your life outlook, to build up an ability to live and judge by God's principles, not to broaden the columns in your bank book, and certainly not for the sole purpose of building up an ability to earn a living."¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁸ "Crusaders in Student Catholic Action," (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 22.

¹⁴⁹ Agendas, 1937-1938, CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 16.

¹⁵⁰ "Erudite Collegians! Where Are You? Where Will You Be April 4?," *New World* (12 March 1937) 14.

¹⁵¹ "Jim and Grace Cisca Agree!" *New World* (2 April 1937) 14.

To address collegiate apathy, moderators began to approach CISCA college students as a distinct group with different priorities and greater intellectual depth than high school members. In February 1936 General Meeting minutes showed a division of the day's discussions into separate high school and collegiate seminars.¹⁵² In 1937-38 CISCA Alumni collaborated with moderators in organizing a separate college CISCA program of lecture groups and forums designed to intellectually challenge the students.¹⁵³ The *New World* expressed the College Forum's aim as "...to connect Catholic Action with college lectures. Why not," it proposed, "present forums on current questions of economic or political nature and interpret them in the light of Catholicity?"¹⁵⁴ Similarly *De Paulia* advertised the college meetings as "open discussions" designed "to give students a chance to talk over freely some of the important religious problems of the day."¹⁵⁵ Certainly Forum topics were relevant, provocative, and intellectually rigorous. For example, at the Mundelein College Forum on Industrial Peace (February 1938) college students presented papers on the importance of a guaranteeing a living wage; the contentious relationship of capital to labor; comparisons and contrasts among present-day labor groups; and the Catholic Church's contributions to industrial relations. Following the presentation, students hashed out their differences in a lively discussion. "In reply to the speakers dissenting opinions were aired, especially regarding the American Federation of Labor and the CIO..." reported *De Paulia*. "At the close of the forum,

¹⁵² General Meeting Minutes (22 February 1936), CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 18.

¹⁵³ Agendas, 1937-1938, CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 16; "Alumni Group Plans to Work with CISCA for Catholic Action," *New World* (4 February 1938): 11.

¹⁵⁴ "Jim and Grace Cisca Agree!" *New World* (2 April 1937): 14.

¹⁵⁵ "Religion Forums to be Inaugerated," *De Paulia* (31 March 1938): 1.

Father Carrabine, Cisca moderator, expressed a desire that college students remember that results in the campaign for Social Justice will be realized when each individual is a living, working organism in the Mystical Body of Christ.”¹⁵⁶

Highly-motivated Cisca collegians who concurrently worked with the CW or YCW further complicated the social landscape, introducing controversial ideas that exposed further rifts within Cisca membership. With war in Europe imminent, for instance, Dorothy Day’s pacifism became a wedge issue. “The October meetings did not work o[u]t so well, however, because our President this year [Ed Marciniak] is a Catholic Worker, completely sold on the policy of Christian non-resistance, while there is a decided tone of belligerence among the rank and file,” Himebaugh reported to Michel in 1938. “Lavery’s peace propaganda play, *The Monsignor’s Hour*, read and discussed at the literature meeting, almost led us into open war.”¹⁵⁷ Catholic Worker Henry Rago’s peace play “Lucifer Fixes the Furnace” must have caused similar conflict when Cisca Alumni enacted it at the Summer School of Catholic Action in 1940, mere months after German and Soviet invasions of Poland ignited World War II in Europe.¹⁵⁸ Similarly, when in 1939 Cisca president Marciniak favored re-organizing the Alumni Crusaders group according to the Jocist “cell” method employed by the YCW, other members objected. “I suggested this to some of them at the meeting,” wrote Carrabine to George Fleming, “...but I met with considerable indignant opposition and ran into about the best

¹⁵⁶ “Peace Topic of Cisca Forum at Mundelein,” *De Paulia* (24 February 1938): 1.

¹⁵⁷ Himebaugh to Michel, 24 October 1938, Cisca Records Box 7 Folder 4. During World War II Marciniak registered as a conscientious objector.

¹⁵⁸ Hank Rago, “Lucifer Fixes the Furnace: A Play in One Act,” *De Paulia* (7 May 1936): 4, 6; Cisca Records, Box 3 Folder 11.

regular meeting we have had.”¹⁵⁹ While Carrabine’s letter did not specify members’ objections to the suggested changes, Gleason writes that Jocist claims to represent the only valid form of Catholic Action often sparked opposition; and Zotti indicates that Jocist acceptance of women in the workplace conflicted with Catholic Worker ideology of women as homemakers.¹⁶⁰

For their part, members who sympathized with outside movements—specifically, the Catholic Worker—seemed to feel that CISCA was plodding and conservative by comparison. At a 1937 CISCA meeting CYS member John Langdon, now a student at Northwestern, tried to arouse students’ pro-labor, anti-Communist passions by playing devil’s advocate. “The reason I made the accusation of radicalism against *The Catholic Worker* is because I wanted some Ciscan to get up and challenge my statement,” he explained. “What Ciscans need is an increase of fighting spirit!”¹⁶¹ Loretta Fitzmaurice of Trinity High agreed, saying “What we need is some radicalism to combat Communism.”¹⁶² Later, while teaching at Loyola during World War II, Ed Marciniak perceived a marked contrast between his views and those of his CISCA-influenced students. “I’m back at my normal routine. . . trying to subvert the student body and faculty,” he joked to Alumni member Joe Golden. “The minute I begin saying something

¹⁵⁹ Carrabine to George Fleming, 9 May 1939, CISCA Records Box 9 Folder 2: 3; “Qualifications of Militants,” CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 25.

¹⁶⁰ Mary Irene Zotti, *A Time of Awakening*, 62-64.

¹⁶¹ “Heard at the Meeting,” *The New World* (12 March 1937): 14.

¹⁶² “Heard at the Meeting,” *The New World* (12 March 1937): 14.

that affects the capitalistic pocket books, the students begin to see ‘red.’”¹⁶³ Remarks such as these suggested that involved leaders increasingly felt that their pro-labor ideology set them apart within CISCA and its federated institutional communities.

As CISCA became ever more inclusive in the late 1930s, “100 percenters” took the initiative to form their own small, elite circles of Catholic “militants,” ironically distinguished by their radical commitment to deconstructing social barriers.¹⁶⁴ Devoted to creating social change through leadership of concrete projects, in 1937 the CISCA Alumni group Crusaders of the Catholic Revolution (CCR), for example, constructed membership in Ignatian terms of a complete, self-sacrificial commitment to the “Cause of Christ” of which only few were capable. The admission ceremonial dramatically emphasized that members were making an extreme commitment that required a high level of fortitude and sacrifice to maintain. “...[R]emember that Christ, your Leader, was struck before Annas, the high priest; mocked before Pilate, the Governor; beaten with scourges and crowned with thorns; ...before all people nailed to a Cross; mocked and wounded...,” the priest reminded CCR candidates, whom he commanded to share Christ’s death through “your life of sacrifice.” Accepting this responsibility, candidates offered themselves as “shock-troops for the Catholic Revolution” and, in their formal “pledge of fealty,” as soldiers “for the honor of God and Christ’s Kingdom on earth.” This dramatic rhetoric implied that CCR members expected to be on the forefront of

¹⁶³ Ed Marciniak to Joe Golden, n.d., CISCA Records, Box 6 Folder 9.

¹⁶⁴ Historian Philip Gleason observed that the Jocist student group at the University of Notre Dame also exhibited an elitist “spiritual snobbery” that almost “bordered on the gnostic.” Much of the rhetoric of CISCA’s CCR group is similar in tone and content to Gleason’s descriptions of Notre Dame Jocism, suggesting that the Jocist movement did indeed strongly influence the CCR. See Gleason, *Contending with Modernity*, 162-163.

social and economic change, meeting and shattering a conservative opposition.¹⁶⁵ Such a mission demanded particularly intense spiritual formation, including a full year's probation prior to admission and, subsequently, adherence to the CCR's "qualitative standards" of prayer and social action.¹⁶⁶ Despite the CCR's goal of initiating a "revolution" that would collapse social hierarchies, its members self-consciously embraced an exclusive organizational model for purposes of leadership training.

Meanwhile, CISCA's mission of transgressing social barriers continued to clash with some college students' personal aspirations to an elite social status that, as they believed, would increase Catholicism's respectability in American society. In 1947 a student, identified only as fraternity member J.M., took issue with CISCA's Dorothy Day-inspired rejection of consumerism, status aspiration, and social boundaries. "If we listened to people like you, Catholics would never make any progress in this country," he asserted. "My grandparents came over to this country, and they were poor. Does that mean I have to stay poor? They met a lot of prejudice when they came over because they were foreigners. But that doesn't mean we will meet prejudice, if people like you stop causing trouble." J.M. went on to argue that the CISCA's advocacy of racial integration damaged rather than repaired Catholics' reputation among Americans. "I have to admit," he concluded, that you are not the only people who talk like this. . . . But I can't see that it will accomplish any good at all; all you people are just going to make people lose respect for the Church." Most telling of all in terms of college society, J.M. remarked

¹⁶⁵ "Ceremonial for Admission of Crusaders," CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 25.

¹⁶⁶ "Ceremonial for Admission of Crusaders," n.d., CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 25; Carrabine to Crusaders (30 September 1937) CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 25; Carrabine to Crusaders (21 October 1937) CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 25.

that “If I followed your ideas and the ideas of most of your contributors, the guys in my fraternity would think I was going crazy!”¹⁶⁷ The letter was perhaps too forthright for credibility: Subsequent communications accused *Today* editors of composing this missive as a rhetorical “straw man,” claiming that its frank arguments made for an implausibly easy target.¹⁶⁸ Regardless of authorship, however, the missive’s content at least represented editors’ perception of opposing student opinion—a perception which no doubt had some basis in reality.

Importantly, Catholic Action’s ideological transgression of social barriers also intensified yet another cultural division—between Catholic college students and the older, rank-and-file members of their local parishes. By the Depression’s onset, Catholic Action leadership training had already opened a generational divide: As early as 1926 the national Sodality journal *Queen’s Work* observed a strained relationship between students and elders within parish organizations—a tension that the journal attributed to students’ intellectual snobbery and parishioners’ consequent resentment. Students felt that “their college education has put them above the rest of the parish” or that “the larger life of the college” made parish activities seem less exciting by contrast, speculated the 1926 editorial, entitled “The Bridge from College to Parish.”¹⁶⁹ In 1930 student Mary J. Kennedy’s article “Too Big for the Parish” likewise deplored conflicts of “too-conservative-old-reliable against the enthusiastic-young-recent-graduate” that originated in collegians’ on-campus experience of leadership training and active, even outspoken,

¹⁶⁷ J.M., “Going Too Far,” *Today* (April 30, 1947): 10.

¹⁶⁸ Eds., “Going Too Far,” *Today* (May 20, 1947): 10.

¹⁶⁹ “The Bridge from College to Parish,” *Queen’s Work* (June 1926): 141.

participation. To Sodality members, parish meetings seemed “woefully old-fashioned and tiresome,” lacking “spirited discussions or suggestions such as we have at our student meeting,” she explained. Still, Kennedy invited her peers to view their conduct from the ordinary parishioners’ point of view. “We’re snobs! We’re would-be high brows! We’re cock-sure of ourselves, and we try to take complete charge of everything,” she elucidated. “That’s why the older members look upon us with such marked disfavor.” Without disputing that parish organizations ought to become livelier, more active, and more intellectual—in other words, more like the campus Sodality--Kennedy urged students to approach their elders with patience and respect, trusting to a gradual modernization of parish life under clerical guidance.¹⁷⁰ Such editorials suggested that the experience of Catholic campus life had already altered students’ expectations for religious organization and the role of laity, which students trained for the “lay apostolate” constructed as more assertive and active than did their parents. Throughout the 1930s CISCA programming would consistently promote “parish loyalty” in an effort to keep campus “lay apostles” connected to their local parish and the authority of their pastor.

As CISCORA activities transitioned into CISCA’s coordinated educational agenda, its programming encouraged college students to view Catholic Action as an ideological break with their parents’ secularism, materialism, and racial bigotry. In 1935 CISCA members presented a skit on the Christian Home that not only deplored students’ selfishness, but also targeted parents for the secularism of mixed marriages, lack of prayer, disregard of Legion of Decency standards, choice of public rather than Catholic

¹⁷⁰ Mary J. Kennedy, “Too Big for the Parish,” *Queen’s Work* (June 1930): 2, 8.

schools, disrespect for Sundays, and failure to support the Catholic press.¹⁷¹ As interracialism gained prominence on member campuses—due in part to the influences of the Catholic Worker movement and the activism of Jesuits John LaFarge and William Markoe—student advocates of racial integration likewise identified parents as sources of racial bigotry. “The parents are prejudiced against the Negroes,” Rosary College student Mary Jane O’Shea declared at a 1937 CISCA meeting, adding that “the need is for the education of future parents.”¹⁷²

By 1939 CISCA’s generational critique and “radical” influences had become so pronounced as to antagonize parents and embarrass some CISCA officers. Writing to Loyola alumnus and former CISCA president George Fleming, Fr. Carrabine reported internal conflict regarding CISCA’s response to parental complaints of youthful disrespect. “In fact, there was some warm opposition as to whether or not we dared make the Christian Family the topic of our special meeting for parents,” Carrabine wrote. “Definitely the officers went on record as opposed to the presentation of the skit on the Christian Family.... [since] it would be the rottenest kind of taste to have the kids ‘pan’ parents at a meeting to which the parents would be invited.”¹⁷³ Meanwhile, individual CISCA students and alumni could be pushy in their attempts to change parental attitudes and religious practices. Aiming to counteract secularism at home, for example, in 1942 Mundelein student Ellen Clare Doherty pressured family members to incorporate prayer

¹⁷¹ Sister Mary Roberta Bauer, S.S.N.D., “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” (M.A. Thesis, De Paul University, 1945), 94-96.

¹⁷² McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries*, 44-53; “Heard at the Meeting,” *The New World* (23 April 1937): 10.

¹⁷³ Carrabine to George Fleming, 9 May 1939, CISCA Records Box 9 Folder 2.

into their mealtime rituals until finally “the clan gave up and decided to say grace.”

CISCA News lauded her persistence.¹⁷⁴ For their part, some parents pushed back against their children’s involvement in “radical” movements: For example, at least one Catholic Worker reportedly left the organization because “her capitalist-minded father forbade her such radical associations.”¹⁷⁵

Postwar articles in the *CISCA* magazine *Today* (edited by John Cogley and James O’Gara) suggested that generational divisions further widened as the intertwined Interracial and Liturgical Movements gained momentum during World War II, emphasizing Catholic Action’s integration of communal “Mystical Body” ideology into daily life. Linking prayer to social ideology, for example, in October and December 1946 editorial discussions straightforwardly condemned the “religious immaturity” that Liturgical Movement ideologues associated with such individual “pious practices” as Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, the singing of “sentimental” hymns, and the use of music and art to evoke emotion during prayer. *CISCA*’s intellectual embrace of community-oriented liturgy and contemplative mental prayer, by contrast, was cast as “religious maturity”—a generational inversion that encouraged young, educated Catholics to view themselves as spiritually superior to older, less-educated parishioners.¹⁷⁶ Similarly, in 1948, a *Today* column entitled “Mother and the Missal” divided Mass-goers into two categories: the younger, educated set, which used missals to follow the Mass, and an older, less-educated generation that tuned out the liturgical

¹⁷⁴ *CISCA News*, (7 February 1942), *CISCA* Records, Box 2 Folder 22.

¹⁷⁵ Himebaugh to Michel, January 1937, *CISCA* Records Box 7 Folder 4.

¹⁷⁶ “Religious Maturity,” *Today* (December 1946): 2.

action in favor of rosaries and other private, individualistic devotions. Describing her own unsuccessful attempts to acquaint her mother with the missal, the author explained that the elder generation focused on quantity—squeezing as many short, indulged prayers as possible into Mass time—and regarded the liturgy itself as a distracting necessity that decreased devotional productivity. “I guess you have to start them young” in liturgical participation, the author concluded, giving up on her more traditional mother.¹⁷⁷

Chicago’s escalating racial tensions further highlighted the ideological divide between CISCA members and less-educated Catholic parishioners. In 1949, for example, Mundelein alumna Ruth Reynolds Fleming described the painful experience of watching her fellow Catholic parishioners cheer the arson of a nearby home that an African-American family had recently purchased. Running after the dispossessed family in the wake of the conflagration, Fleming yearned to offer some word of apology or friendliness—but what? “Welcome to our parish?”¹⁷⁸ Overall, those CISCA students and alumni who took Catholic Action seriously—the “100 percenters”—felt set apart from parents and ordinary parishioners by a differing vision of religious community and social obligation.

In 1950 conflicts between inclusive and elitist interpretations of Catholic Action organization ultimately split CISCA from the Jesuits’ national Sodality organization—

¹⁷⁷ June Verbillion, “Mother and the Missal,” *Today* (March 15, 1948): 15

¹⁷⁸ Ruth Fleming, “Fire by Night,” *Today* (March 1949): 17.

and through it, from Chicago's Catholic college campuses. In 1948 Pope Pius XII's Apostolic Constitution on the Jesuit Sodality stressed that only Catholics willing to embrace the full Sodality "way of life" should be admitted to membership, a stipulation in conflict with the Archdiocesan mission of catechizing every Catholic student. This papal directive prompted Bishop Sheil to separate CISCA from the Sodality organization by transferring the position of Archdiocesan CISCA Moderator away from the Jesuit order. In 1950 Fr. Francis Lawlor, O.S.A. succeeded Fr. Carrabine, who continued to serve as Provincial Sodality Moderator.¹⁷⁹

Notably, almost as soon as the charismatic Carrabine relinquished his Archdiocesan post, motivated college students overwhelmingly left CISCA in favor of the newly-organized National Federation of Catholic College Students (NFCCS), a unit of the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC), abandoning the local CISCA organization to Chicago's high schools. From then until CISCA's dissolution at the time of the Second Vatican Council, CISCA would function as a broad-based Archdiocesan organization largely focused on secondary students.¹⁸⁰ Throughout the 1950s clerical authors would dominate the CISCA publication *Today*, which CISCA students and lay alumni had written and edited during the late 1940s. Ironically, through its endeavor to expose every Catholic student to an inclusive "Mystical Body" ideology, the CISCA federation completed a centralization process, begun in 1934, that effectively reduced the laity's voice in local Catholic Action.

¹⁷⁹ The CISCA Story" [1957], CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 19: 11-14.

¹⁸⁰ The CISCA Story" [1957], 11-14.

Amid the Depression era's class-related tensions and anxieties, however, by World War II the influence of organized Catholic Action had produced on Catholic campuses a new collegiate archetype: the social justice ideologue. "No matter what question is asked in class or out of it, he becomes painfully sincere in answering it," Loyola student H. Warner Pierson mocked in 1943. "His voice has a poignant ring to it, even when telling someone what time it is. ...[He] shows up best in any class where some problem dealing with suffering humanity appears. At this juncture... [he] breaks out into tears, sobs heavily and weeps for the world's wrong."¹⁸¹ Combining professional and spiritual leadership ambitions with a seemingly contradictory antagonism toward social boundaries and a religious idealization of the working class, this new and distinct incarnation of the Catholic college man or woman marked the emergence of Catholic liberalism from the "campus life" spirituality of 1920s' Catholic Action.

¹⁸¹ H. Warner Pierson, "1,001 Days at Loyola," *Loyola News* (16 February 1943): 2.

CHAPTER FIVE

ETHNICITY AND STUDENT ORGANIZATION, 1925-1950

“November 5, 1937, will go down in the annals of the history of the Archdiocese of Chicago as Catholic Action day de luxe,” *De Paulia* exulted. That Saturday at Loyola stadium a massive CISCA youth rally welcomed James Roosevelt--emissary of his father, the U.S. president--in a public demonstration of Chicago Archdiocesan alignment with the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration’s New Deal program. Their classes cancelled, De Paul students joined 20,000 Catholic high school and college students from across the city in a morning program of speeches and songs that juxtaposed “The Star-Spangled Banner” with both “Long Live the Pope” and the Catholic Action hymn “An Army of Youth.” As Chicago Auxiliary Bishop Bernard Sheil accompanied Roosevelt into the stadium, “[o]ne of the most tremendous ovations ever given two personalities at Loyola was extended to this couple,” reported the *Loyolan* yearbook. In the afternoon, CISCA committees conducted forums on the practical integration of Catholic social justice principles with the nation’s economic, political, and social life. The event seemed to officially seal a partnership between the Roosevelt administration and Chicago Archdiocesan Catholic Action for reform of the American nation.¹

¹ “President Roosevelt Appoints Son to Deliver His Message to Chicago Catholic Students,” *De Paulia* (28 October 1937): 1; “President’s Son to Speak at Meeting of Catholic Schools,” *De Paulia* (4 November 1937): 1.; “Peace Keynote of President’s Plea to Catholic Youth,” *De Paulia* (12 November 1937): 1; “Roosevelt Visits Loyola,” *Loyolan* (1938): 231.

This Archdiocesan commitment to New Deal policies, however, would impact ethnic expression at CISCA member schools De Paul, Mundelein, and especially Loyola, where Polish, Italian, and Jewish American students had adopted the structure of American fraternity organization as a means of preserving culture while also claiming a place in campus life. Onwards from 1937, as the Archdiocesan CISCA organization embraced anti-fascism and interracialism as benefiting the American nation, ethnically-restricted Italian-American, African-American, and Polish-American campus organizations were jettisoned as unethical and even potentially subversive. While they lasted, however, the ethnic fraternity experience had the potential to transform students' approach to ethnic identity and community.

During the interwar period American fraternity life provided a flexible template for religious and ethnic acculturation, as the collegiate tradition of "Greek" social organizations enabled students to form comfortable, distinctive enclaves that simultaneously established their participation in the broader campus community. Historian Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz explains that exclusive social fraternities with their standards, secrets, and initiation rituals provided fish-out-of-water collegians with the support and comfort of a homogenous group; a defined status within campus society; and mutual assistance in social advancement. Committed to enhancing group prestige, fraternity members supported one another in acquiring leadership positions in high-profile extracurricular activities, such as student government or publications. They structured members into the broader campus community by fielding intra mural sports teams, sponsoring cultural and social events, and organizing a united presence at pep

rallies and other “campus life” events. Often they co-operated with their school administration by exerting peer pressure in favor of institutional boosterism and “spirit.” Members also had access to exclusive parties and entertainments, as well as alcohol and, whenever possible, a fraternity house to serve as haven from parental and institutional authority. In the long-term, membership benefits included an exclusive social network that offered students a ready-made slate of alumni and peer contacts who might aid their future career and social prospects.²

Eager for the mystique and benefits of Greek social organization, during the 1920s students of fledgling universities Loyola and De Paul initially integrated the American fraternity tradition with the institutional need for Catholic religious identity—and perhaps with a personal need to assert religious pride in the face of outside criticism. In examining the resulting student groups, it is important to note that, unlike fraternities at many secular institutions, Loyola and De Paul students organized under the same principle of faculty moderation that applied to other extracurricular groups, such as debate and publications, so that each Greek organization acted under nearly constant university supervision. Judging from *Loyola News* reports, priestly moderators and guests frequently attended such fraternity events as pledge smokers and initiation banquets. Also, the majority of Loyola and De Paul organizations were unable to finance residential fraternity and sorority houses, a limitation that surely curtailed opportunity for

² Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth century to the Present* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 36-37, 56-57, 138-142.

unsupervised socializing.³ These controlled circumstances skewed Greek social life decidedly in favor of administrative aims.

Indeed, with the exception of Loyola's oldest fraternity, Pi Mu Chi, at Loyola the social fraternities founded during the 1920s were explicitly Catholic enclaves dedicated to assisting the administration in constructing an identifiably Catholic community life. In 1925, for example, a circle of brainstorming Loyola commuters initiated the first chapter of Alpha Delta Gamma, a national "Jesuit social fraternity" that took as its mission the promotion of religious service ideals, school spirit, and institutional boosterism exclusively at Catholic schools. Consistent with campus life ideals, Loyola's Alpha Delta Gamma members declared their own interests "necessarily subordinate to those of the university" and aimed to "further the purposes of the university by requiring their members to act as promoters of school activities and spirit, by supplying them with a clean social life and by rewarding them for scholastic achievement."⁴ From Loyola Alpha Delta Gamma spread to De Paul, where in 1928 students established the Catholic fraternity's second chapter; and from there the Loyola-founded social fraternity spread to Catholic colleges and universities nationwide.⁵

Similarly, in 1924-25 a circle of Loyola students founded the social fraternity Pi Alpha Lambda for the implied purpose of assisting their faculty moderator, Fr. James Mertz, in his campaign to construct the student chapel of Madonna Della Strada on the

³ William G. Bowman and E.J. Clark, "A Vote for the Joiners," *Cadence* v.2.no.1 (Fall 1947): 35-38; 35-36.

⁴ "A Brief Sketch of Each of the Social Frats," *Loyola News* (December 9, 1942): 4.

⁵ "Alpha Delta Gamma," *De Paulian* (1934): 190.

Loyola Arts campus in Rogers Park. During the 1920s and 30s Pi Alpha Lambda members promoted Mertz's chapel campaign through the "Della Strada" speakers' bureau; the organization of fundraising dances and events; and the mobilization of peer pressure in support of chapel fundraising and Catholic religious practice at Loyola.¹ Like Alpha Delta Gamma, Pi Alpha Lambda expressed its mission in explicitly religious terms, aiming to promote "the development of a Catholic philosophy of life, and its resulting moral, athletic, and scholastic applications."⁶

Not surprisingly, during the late 1920s and early 1930s much of Loyola's early Catholic Action "boosterism" proceeded from these religiously-oriented Greek organizations. In addition to the chapel campaign, Pi Alpha Lambda members claimed a history of "expending every effort within...[their] power to advance the interests of Loyola" through various initiatives, such as the establishment of Loyola's Student Council (the first president of which was a Pi Alpha Lambda member); the founding of the Blue Key Society, successor to the embattled Booster Club organization; and the creation of the publications honor fraternity Beta Pi.⁷ Consistent with their religious mission, members of Loyola's Catholic fraternities were prominent in Sodality and CISCA, with, among graduating seniors, four of five Alpha Delta Gammas and five of six Pi Alpha Lambdas claiming Sodality membership in 1935. By 1938, at least three Pi Alpha Lambda members—Louis Tordella (1932-33), James Yore (1934-35), and George

⁶ "Fraternities," *Loyola News* (1 April 1925): 2; "A Brief Sketch of Each of the Social Frats," *Loyola News* (December 9, 1942): 4.

⁷ *Loyolan* (1933), 185; *Loyolan* (1934), 271.

Fleming (1937-38)—had served as CISCA president.⁸ In 1929 a *Loyola News* editorial and letter credited campus fraternities with contributing to Loyola's "Catholic Environment," thereby guiding lapsed freshmen back to the faith.⁹

However, religious identity and faculty supervision did not prevent Catholic social fraternities from engaging in the lavish entertainments and rituals of American "Greek" student life, all of which contributed to the image of their sponsoring campus as a fun and active student community. By 1934 Alpha Delta Gamma's annual "Kazatska" dance, for example, had established "an enviable reputation as one of the most entertaining college dances held in Chicago," the *Loyola News* reported with pride. With over 500 couples in attendance in 1933, this joint Loyola-De Paul event was, moreover, according to the *De Paulian* yearbook, "the largest Fraternity dance" in the city.¹⁰ Like secular fraternities, both Pi Alpha Lambda and Alpha Delta Gamma also staged house parties, smokers, formal holiday events, and the secretive pledging and initiation rituals that heightened the excitement of their social year. By replicating these customs of American fraternity and sorority life, Catholic students of Loyola and De Paul could help to place their institutional community on par with that of secular schools while also promoting distinctively "Catholic" socialization, symbols (Mertz's chapel), and rituals (such as the student Mass).

⁸ *Loyolan* (1935), 31-38; *Loyolan* (1933), 150; "James Rogers Yore," *Loyolan* (1935), 38; "George Joseph Fleming, Jr.," *Loyolan* (1938), 99.

⁹ "The Catholic Environment," *Loyola News* (30 October 1929): 2.

¹⁰ "Alpha Delts to Hold Kazatska; Pledges Inducted," *Loyola News* (24 April 1934): 2; "Two Alpha Delt Chapters Hold Tenth Kazatka [sic]," *Loyola News* (3 May 1934): 7; "Alpha Delta Gamma," *De Paulian* (1934): 190.

Against the backdrop of this Catholicized fraternity culture, during the late 1920s and early 30s Polish, Italian, and Jewish students likewise co-opted “Greek” organizational forms to reinforce ethnic distinctions while simultaneously structuring them into American campus life. Historians Horowitz and Paula Fass establish that ethnically-restricted fraternities and sororities first appeared on secular public and private campuses during the late 1920s and early 1930s. Likewise Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein students established social organizations that formally limited membership to particular ethnic groups, thereby echoing the patterns both of collegiate culture and the Church’s national parish system. Throughout the 1930s Loyola boasted the greatest range of visibly ethnic student organizations, including the Polish medical fraternity Pi Mu Phi (1929); the Polish social fraternity Sigma Pi Alpha (1933); the Italian medical fraternity; the downtown women’s Italian club (1930); the Italian Arts social fraternity Alpha Delta Sigma (1931), preceded by the cultural club *Il Circolo Dante Alighieri* (1930); and, sporadically, the African-American cultural “Guild” (1930) and Jewish Akibeian Club (1932). Although De Paul’s University Council discouraged ethnically-restricted organizations, De Paul students nevertheless founded the Polish organization Pi Sigma Phi in 1932, as well as a number of less-visible Jewish fraternities and sororities with *de facto* rather than *de jure* ethnic restrictions.¹¹ Mundelein’s Polish Society likewise enjoyed a high profile.

Ethnic fraternities often developed in the context or structure of national ethnic associational movements. Among Polish clubs, for example, the Loyola medical

¹¹ John L. Rury, “Student Life and Campus Culture at De Paul,” in John L. Rury and Charles S. Suchar, eds, *De Paul University: Centennial Essays and Images* (Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1998), 171-222; 186-187.

fraternity Pi Mu Phi (1930), lauded as “the first organization of Polish medical students in the country,” affiliated as early as February 1930 with the Polish Medical Association and afterward served as the initial “student unit” of that professional entity.¹² Likewise, Loyola’s Arts fraternity Sigma Pi Alpha (in March 1934), De Paul’s Pi Sigma Phi, and Mundelein’s Polish Society almost immediately networked with the immigrant-led Polish National Alliance (PNA) through membership in the Polish Students and Alumni Association (PSAA), a national PNA branch that linked collegiate Polish-American clubs to one another as well as to the central PNA organization.¹³ Within the PSAA structure, an ever-varying number of other Chicago-area Polish-American student organizations also federated into a local “Chicago Council” that arranged dances, entertainments, sports tournaments, and cultural events for Polish-American students across the city. This network of federal relationships defined Polish-American college students as a distinct category within the PNA organization, while also enabling local and campus groups to retain identity and autonomy.

While overall ethnic Italians lacked the Poles’ tightly organized national structure, the local fraternity Delta Alpha Sigma was founded in the context of a national and, indeed, international Italian study club movement precipitated by fascist premier Benito Mussolini’s rise to power in 1922. Mussolini’s “new Italy” awakened Italian-American pride and inspired even non-Italian fascination, much of it Catholic.¹⁴ At

¹² “Pi Mu Phi Is New Fraternity: Polish Frat Organizes at Medic School,” *Loyola News* (19 February 1930): 3.

¹³ “First District Convention in South Bend,” *The New American* II no. 6 (April-May 1935): 6.

¹⁴ John P. Diggins, “American Catholics and Italian Fascism,” *Journal of Contemporary History* v. II no. 4 (October 1967): 51-68.

Columbia University in 1925 Italian Teachers' Association officer Leonard Covello initiated a local federation of Italian student clubs known as *Casa d'Italiana*, which, in cooperation with the Italy-America Society--an upper-crust association of overwhelmingly non-ethnic cultural aficionados--inspired a general movement toward the establishment of Italian-American student clubs or *Circolo* in cities across the nation.¹⁵ Similarly, in Chicago, in Fall 1929 Loyola Italian language instructor Gennaro Albachiara united Italian-American student clubs at Loyola University, Crane College, and the University of Chicago into an unnamed federation "to facilitate the study of Italian culture by these Italo-American youths."¹⁶ That in April 1929 Albachiara had arranged for Italian Consul Giuseppe Castruccio to lecture to Italian-American students at the University of Chicago on "Fascist Revolution and the Conquests of Fascism" hints at the political slant of his program for Loyola's new Italian clubs, the Arts *Il Circolo Dante Alighieri* and an unnamed, perhaps short-lived downtown Italian club for female students.¹⁷ Indeed, in December 1930 Loyola *Il Circolo* secretary Salvatore Dimicelli himself interviewed Castruccio and even secured him as principal speaker at the club's

¹⁵ Leonard Covello, "Italian Societies in the Social Life of Italians" (1932), Leonard Covello Papers, Box 20, Folder 7, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA: 7-8.

¹⁶ "Professor Gennaro Albachiara," *Vita Nuova* (November/December 1929): 31, in Works Progress Administration, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, (Chicago: Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, 1942), Italian, v.1.

¹⁷ "Colonial Activities," *Chicago Italian Chamber of Commerce*, 17, in Works Progress Administration, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, (Chicago: Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, 1942), Italian, v.1; "Downtown Italian Club Elects Canella President," *Loyola News* (7 May 1930): 1.

January 1931 meeting, signifying Loyola students' openness to association with Mussolini's representatives.¹⁸

The Arts club title *Il Circolo Dante Alighieri* further suggested an ideological connection with Chicago's branch of the international Dante Alighieri Society, an association, founded by the Italian government and based in Rome, for the preservation and promotion of Italian culture—and, implicitly for the dissemination of fascist propaganda.¹⁹ Indeed, Loyola publications occasionally referred to *Il Circolo* as “The Dante Alighieri Society”; and the 1934 yearbook even went so far as to state that “[t]he present fraternity had its origins in the Dante Alighieri Society,” although it never fully explained this statement.²⁰ Moreover, the overlap between the Dante Alighieri Society's promotion of Italian language programs and the Loyola *Circolo*'s hope of establishing such a program on campus suggests that the international organization might have influenced the university study club. Despite these external relationships, however, the Loyola fraternity's money troubles and comparative lack of amenities—such the off-campus meeting space enjoyed by Poles—makes it likely that the fraternity's ties with outside organizations tended to be ideological rather than financial.

Even after Loyola's *Circolo Dante Alighieri* reorganized as the Delta Alpha Sigma fraternity in Spring 1931, members continued their activity in Italian-American collegiate circles beyond the Loyola campus. In winter of 1936 Alpha Delta Sigma

¹⁸ “Dante A's Plan Big Program; Team Defeated,” *Loyola News* (16 December 1930): 2.

¹⁹ Chicago's branch of the Dante Alighieri Society produced at least one pro-fascist tract. See Mario Palmieri, *The Philosophy of Fascism*, (Chicago: Dante Alighieri Society, 1936).

²⁰ *Loyolan* (1934): 275.

member Alex Panio became president of the Aquinas Eclectic Club, identified by *Loyola News* as a coeducational “Italian intercollegiate organization” consisting of students and alumni of Loyola, DePaul, the University of Illinois, the University of Chicago, Illinois State Normal, and North Park College. According to the paper, the Aquinas Club’s purpose was “to further education and a life in harmony with Christian principles,” goals embodied in “[Italian] Thomas Aquinas, Catholic philosopher of the thirteenth, greatest of centuries.” The choice of Aquinas, a theologian from Naples who also had come to symbolize the Catholic scholastic tradition revered by CISCA members, evoked Delta Alpha Sigma’s earlier symbol of Florentine Catholic poet Dante Alighieri in its implied union of religious and national identities. At least six other Loyola students, all of Italian descent, participated in the organization, whose members included Delta Alpha Sigma founder Salvatore Dimicelli.²¹

For Polish-American students, PSAA/PNA relationships expanded the social and educational opportunities available to ethnic club members. For instance, participation in the PSAA’s Chicago Council allowed Loyola’s Sigma Pi Alpha to access the Council’s meeting space at the Webster Hotel, a small step which—though short of the universally-coveted “fraternity house”—nevertheless raised the Polish fraternity’s perceived status above that of less-established “Greeks.”²² Chicago Council dances, such as the 1938 Spring Frolic, enabled Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein students to affirm the social status of the Polish-American community through participation in the sort of elegant ballroom event that American fraternities routinely organized. Notably,

²¹ “Loyolan Elected President of Intercollegiate Club,” *Loyola News* (February 11, 1936): 2.

²² “New Headquarters,” *The New American* VI no. 4-5 (April-May 1939): 14.

Spring Frolic publicity emphasized that the scheduled orchestra had become “a favorite with the fraternities and sororities in the Chicago area,” suggesting—not only that this function would be worth the ticket price—but that Polish-American “campus life” enjoyed parity with mainstream offerings.²³ In addition, the English-language PSAA organ *New American* enabled communication among Polish clubs and provided Polish-American college students with an alternative forum for their opinions, thereby building a sense of Polish-American community across the ethnically-mixed campuses.

Attractively, too, PSAA membership also gave the Polish-American access to the (limited) scholarship aid and travel opportunities that the PSAA and PNA offered. For instance, each year the PSAA allowed Sigma Pi Alpha’s “two outstanding men” to compete for all-expense-paid summer tours of Poland, funded by the Polish government and intended to “acquaint the young Polish students with the language, literature, and customs of the home country.” Moreover, students could receive course credits for the lectures in “Polish civilization” conducted over the course of the six-week trip.²⁴ Loyola fraternity members John Krasowski and Caesar Koenig took advantage of this opportunity in summer 1935.²⁵ Sixteen annual PSAA scholarships, funded by the New York-based Kosciuszko Foundation and the World Alliance of Poles Abroad, also enabled Polish-speaking American students to attend university in Poland.²⁶ In 1937-38 De Paul student Larry Kaminski, for example, studied in Poland on scholarship and sent

²³ “Chicago Council of the PSAA Plans Spring Frolic for May 6,” *New American* V no. 4 (April 1938): 4.

²⁴ “Kosciuszko Fund has 50 Applications,” *New American* (March 1934): 1-2.

²⁵ “Polish Frat Again Wins Student Tour,” *Loyola News* (October 11, 1935): 5.

²⁶ “An American Coed Makes Poland Her Home,” *New American* III no. 7 (September 1936): 2.

home to *De Paulia* regular columns on Polish student life.²⁷ In 1935 Janine Nowakowska, who taught Polish literature at Mundelein College while concurrently pursuing a Loyola chemistry degree, received a Kosciuszko Foundation scholarship to study Polish literature at the University of Krakow.²⁸

By contrast, Delta Alpha Sigma members lacked many of the financial advantages of national affiliation, such as a nationwide organ and hotel meeting space. Still, national organizations such as the Italy-America Society, the Dante Alighieri Society, and the National Italian-American Civic League did offer individual Italian-American collegians financial support for travel and study in their country of origin. Scholarships from the National Italian-American Civic League, for example, enabled Loyolan Alexander Panio and De Paulian Antony Rosinia to tour southern Italy in summer of 1935, “where he [Panio] made a study of the economic and social conditions in the land of his parents.”²⁹ Returning to Chicago, Panio related his experience at an Alpha Delta Sigma fraternity smoker.³⁰

On campus, these ethnic subcommunities assisted students who did not quite fit into the ethnic, class, and religious demographic of pre-existing Greek organizations, which solidly middle-class Western and Northern European Catholics tended to dominate. 32 of 35 Pi Alpha Lambda student members, for example, bore surnames that

²⁷ “Former Student Writes of Life at Warsaw U.,” *De Paulia* (24 March 1938): 1.

²⁸ “Polish Instructor Merits Distinction,” *Skyscraper* (November 20, 1936): 3.

²⁹ *The Loyolan* (1936): 110; “Winners of Italian Tour Prizes to Start for New York Today,” *Chicago Tribune* (28 June 1935): 25.

³⁰ “Delta Alphas to Hear Panio Talk of Italian Trip,” *Loyola News* (December 20, 1935): 5.

suggested Irish, German, Scottish, and possibly Swedish extraction.³¹ Exceptionally, one high-achieving member, Anthony C. Tomczak, was the son of a Polish immigrant; while another, Louis W. Tordella, was third generation Italian-American.³² Consistent with Horowitz's findings, however, these breaks with Pi Alpha Lambda's overall ethnic profile perhaps recognized unusual academic and extracurricular stardom: In addition to their ongoing presence on Loyola's academic honor rolls, Tomczak's *Loyola News* editorship and Tordella's CISCA presidency must have been feathers in the fraternal cap.³³ Apart from these two outstanding "New Immigrants," however, Western and Northern European last names such as Quinn, McCabe, Callahan, and Strobel dominated Pi Alpha Lambda, with many students representing their family's third generation in the United States.

Besides being ethnically outnumbered among campus "Greeks," Polish and Italian ethnic students were still at some disadvantage in terms of occupational class and economic assets. While not a completely homogenous group, the Pi Alpha Lambdas generally descended from families engaged in business or the professions who lived in residences suggesting a middle or upper-middle income range. The 1930 census shows that, of nineteen identifiable student members, at least six were sons of professionals—an accountant, an optometrist, a civil engineer, an attorney married to a public school teacher—while an additional five descended from an entrepreneurial class of business

³¹ *Loyolan* (1931): 318-319.

³² *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 473, 19B; Roll 428, 13A.

³³ Horowitz, *Campus Life*, 47; *Loyolan* (1931): 319; *Loyolan* (1933): 150-151.

owners, real estate and other “brokers,” and even one corporate president.³⁴ Also in business, another member’s father was on record as manager of a lumber yard, although here the line between white and blue collar might be said to blur.³⁵ At least four other members lived in families with independent incomes.³⁶ Only three of the nineteen identifiable Pi Alpha Lambda students (including Tomczak, the second-generation Pole) had obvious working-class backgrounds, with fathers employed in the police force, a motor plant, and the electric company—although even here positions such as “tool inspector” suggested that their labor enjoyed the status of “skilled.”³⁷ Judging from rents and property values, all families seemed to be in comfortable circumstances: A majority of homeowners, including both the attorney and the motor worker, lived in homes with an estimated value of \$10,000 to \$12,000. Above this range, the real estate broker’s family owned a house worth \$20,000, while two families of independent means enjoyed costlier properties, valued at \$45,000 and \$50,000 respectively. One of these households even engaged live-in servants, so that two Pi Alpha Lambda members—

³⁴ For James F., Donal, and Robert J. Rafferty, see *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 425, 31A; for John L. Lenihan, Roll 422, 3B; for Louis W. Tordella, Roll 428, 13A; for John T. Janszen, Roll 485, 5A; for Joseph L. Frisch, Roll 493, 6B; for Ayrley Anderson, Proviso, Cook County, IL, Roll 507, 18A; for Mark Guerin, Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 420, 29 A; for Charles Sweeney, Roll 495, 7A; for George J. Zwikstra, Roll 483, 26A.

³⁵ For James Vonesh, see *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Berwyn, Cook County, IL, Roll 414, 13A.

³⁶ For Daniel W. and David B. Maher, see *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 420, 7A; for Roger F. Knittel, Roll 496, 15B; for Charles H. Mann, Roll 496, 21A.

³⁷ For Charles E. Mallon, see *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 490, 1A; for Anthony C. Tomczak, Roll 473, 19B; for John Strobel, Roll 494, 9A.

brothers Daniel W. and David B. Maher—enjoyed unusual privilege.³⁸ While as many as eight families rented rather than owned their dwellings, the rents themselves, which ranged from \$62.50 to \$160 per month, suggested that for this group renting was a matter of personal preference rather than a symptom of reduced circumstances.

By contrast, the campus organizations of second-generation Polish-American students suggested families on the cusp of middle-class status, with occupational backgrounds in semi-skilled labor, skilled labor, and non-corporate business vastly outnumbering the professions. In regard to Loyola's Sigma Pi Alpha fraternity, for instance, the immigrant father of founding member Louis Potempa held a long-term position as machinist in a Chicago manufacturing firm, while the fathers of fellow members Felix Gordon and Eugene Kwasinski worked as a maintenance and general foreman.³⁹ Another member, Raymond Komajda, was the son of a skilled woodworker.⁴⁰ Others could claim an entrepreneurial background: Arthur Tarchala's first-generation parents, for example, were "in the wholesale meat business," while Raymond Shepanek's immigrant father was a North Side real estate broker who simultaneously owned a road machinery firm in Warsaw, Poland.⁴¹ Similarly, the 1930 census identified future Sigma Pi Alpha member Aloysius Poklenkowski as the son of an

³⁸ For Daniel W. and David B. Maher, see *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 420, 7A.

³⁹ "Parents of 10 Will Observe Golden Wedding," *Chicago Tribune* (January 14, 1951): NW A2; Obituaries, *Chicago Tribune* (November 22, 1952): B23; for Kwasinski, see *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 470, 2B.

⁴⁰ *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 473, 10B.

⁴¹ "Wed 50 Years," *Chicago Tribune* (November 22, 1957): NW9; Albert Shepanek, Obituary, *Chicago Tribune* (January 4, 1947): 26.

immigrant undertaker with his own business establishment.⁴² Only one Sigma Pi Alpha member potentially hailed from the professional classes: Waclaw Wawrzynski's father might be tentatively identified as Polish-born physician William Wawrzynski.⁴³ At the opposite end of the social spectrum, two of the twenty Sigma Pi Alpha members came from family groups headed in 1930 by identifiably unskilled laborers: Boleslaus Dydek's father washed bottles at a dairy, while Edward Marciniak's father worked at a foundry.⁴⁴ A grocery clerk, a chauffeur, and a soft-drink salesman rounded out an overall picture of immigrant families that had just achieved, or were on the verge of achieving, middle-class status.⁴⁵

Although the De Paul yearbook's tendency to abbreviate first names rendered the membership of its Polish-American fraternity Pi Sigma Phi less certain, an identifiable five out of twelve members suggest a similar class base of skilled labor and small business.⁴⁶ One member, Clement Gosiewski, was the son of a coppersmith.⁴⁷ Marie Kielbasinski's father was a butcher, and Stephen Lisowski's father owned an undertaking

⁴² *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 472, 3A.

⁴³ *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 472, 1A.

⁴⁴ *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 464, 19A; *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 469, 12B; Philip Gleason, *Contending with Modernity: Catholic Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 158.

⁴⁵ For John Krasowski, see *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 435, 17B; for Leroy Olsta, *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 473, 19A; for Joseph Zygmuntowicz, *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 437, 5A.

⁴⁶ "Pi Sigma Phi," *De Paulian* (1934): 225.

⁴⁷ *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 468, 12A.

establishment.⁴⁸ Fraternity founders John Troike and Walter Klimek had slightly more humble origins, as Troike's father worked as a bank watchman and Klimek's, a bricklayer.⁴⁹

As with the Polish-Americans, sons of shopkeepers and skilled workers dominated the 1932 membership of Loyola's Italian-American fraternity Delta Alpha Sigma.⁵⁰ For example, of the eleven out of fourteen Delta Alpha Sigma brothers whose families could be identified with reasonable accuracy in the 1930 federal census, as many as six (Jacob Giardina, Anthony Favata, Salvatore Cali, Joseph Buttitta, Joseph Cerniglia, and Joseph Martoccio) were the sons of small business owners—the proprietors of produce and meat markets, barber shops, furniture stores, and auto repair centers.⁵¹ A seventh, Sal Dimiceli, was the son of a skilled worker, a railroad machinist.⁵² Of the four students remaining, only one, Felix Tornabene--the son of physician Vincent Tornabene--could claim a professional background⁵³; two others, Joseph Contursi and Philip Vitale, clearly hailed from unskilled labor, their fathers driving trucks and performing general

⁴⁸ *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 465, 7A; *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 463, 17B.

⁴⁹ *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 436, 30A; *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 474, 17B.

⁵⁰ "Delta Alpha Sigma," *Loyolan* (1932): 336.

⁵¹ *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 470, 16B; *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Proviso, Cook County, IL, Roll 506, 29A; *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 470, 14B; *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 469, 14B; *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 470, 13A; *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 489, 4A.

⁵² *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 470, 2B.

⁵³ *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 470, 4A.

construction work.⁵⁴ 1930 Census records suggest that Delta Alpha Sigma's 1935-36 membership had a similar class profile, with shopowners and shop clerks—butchers, shoe repairmen, grocers, fruit sellers—dominating family occupational backgrounds.⁵⁵

While both Polish-American and Italian-American families had generally achieved home ownership by 1930, the Italian-Americans outdid the Poles both in the percentage and value of owned residences. Given Polish immigrants' documented goal of property ownership, it not remarkable that a majority of Sigma Pi Alpha's 1937 membership hailed from families that had purchased their own homes by 1930, with at least five properties (those of Zegiel, Kwasinski, Wawrzynski, Komadja, and Poklenkowski) valued in the \$12,000-14,000 range. The census showed that in 1930 even Krasowski the grocery clerk and the steelworker Marciniak owned modest homes of \$3,500 and \$6,000, leaving the bottlewasher, the chauffeur, and the soft-drink salesman as the only renters of the group. Likewise, the sampling of De Paul's 1934 Pi Sigma Phi membership included only one 1930 renter, Kielbasinski family, while the parents of other students owned homes ranging in value from \$6,000 to \$10,000. Reflecting the Poles' general tendency to purchase a residence as soon as they could possibly afford the mortgage, the group's renters paid between \$15 and \$30 per month—considerably less

⁵⁴ *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 497, 18B; *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 442, 23B.

⁵⁵ "Delta Alpha Sigma," *Loyolan* (1936), 267; for Joseph A. Bertucci, *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 470, 17B; for Peter Zullo, Roll 460, 14B; for Maurice D'Andrea, Roll 441, 16A; for Dominic LoCascio, Roll 470, 10B; for Alfred Berley, Roll 462, 7A; for Ignatius Palmisano, Roll 417, 20A.

than the more affluent Irish and German-American renters of Pi Alpha Lambda, who paid \$62 and even \$150 per month for their living space.⁵⁶

In terms of the property ownership and values reported in 1930, however, the 1932 membership of Italian-American fraternity Delta Alpha Sigma was even better established than the Poles. By contrast to the Sigma Pi Alpha families of 1937, which according to the 1930 census included a few renters, in 1932 every identifiable Delta Alpha Sigma student hailed from a family that had purchased its own home by 1930. Moreover, the 1930 census estimated at least 55% of these residence at \$10,000 or above, with the Dimiceli and Contursi homes valued as high as \$28,000 and \$17,500 respectively. Only one dwelling, the Buttitta residence, was valued as low as \$5,000. While the 1935-36 membership sample included one student whose estimated family home value in 1930 had been lower still (\$3,000), the complete absence of renters and the ongoing presence of \$24,000, \$16,000, and \$10,000 residences suggest that the fraternity continued to draw its membership from homeownership families that could afford to invest in their residences.

Indeed, in terms of property values the Italian-American Delta Alpha Sigma fraternity was on par with all but the richest of Pi Alpha Lambda members, although it lagged behind in terms of occupational status. Unlike the Pi Alpha Lambdas, the Italian-American families generally had not yet entered the professional occupations so characteristic of the American middle class. By contrast, members of the Polish-American Sigma Pi Alpha fraternity were behind both in occupational class and property,

⁵⁶ For Roger F. Knittel, see *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 496, 15 B; for Charles Sweeney, see *Fifteenth Census of the United States* [1930], Chicago, Cook County, IL, Roll 495, 7A.

with only 25% of member families owning homes valued at \$10,000 or above, and—of these—the most valuable property worth a relatively modest \$14,000. Moreover, the fraternity’s annual tradition of organizing a “Scholarship Dance” to assist a needy Sigma Pi Alpha member with his educational expenses indicated that not every Polish fraternity brother lived in secure circumstances.⁵⁷

In addition to class differences, Jewish students faced an entrenched anti-Semitism that limited both their academic and extracurricular opportunities. Fearing that increasing Jewish enrollments soon would precipitate a Gentile flight from academia, during the interwar period many private colleges instituted admissions quotas designed to restrict the number of entering Jews.⁵⁸ Loyola, by contrast, actually solicited Jewish applicants, as demonstrated by a 1921 advertisement in the Yiddish-language newspaper *Daily Jewish Press*; moreover, historian Ellen Skerrett points out that by 1934 Loyola had established a “long-standing policy” that prohibited “any religious test or particular religious profession” in student admissions.⁵⁹ Within the University individual schools and departments, however, might have had their own overt or covert policies: According to a 1931 rejection letter, Loyola’s medical school restricted its Jewish admissions to the

⁵⁷ “Fraternity Row,” *Loyola News* (November 20, 1940): 7.

⁵⁸ Horowitz, *Campus Life*, 106.

⁵⁹ Clipped advertisement, *Daily Jewish Press* (20 September 1921), private collection of Dr. Jeffrey V. Mallow, Department of Physics, Loyola University Chicago (Chicago, IL); Ellen Skerrett, *Born in Chicago: A History of Chicago’s Jesuit University*, (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 2008), 153.

Chicago area.⁶⁰ De Paul, by contrast, appeared to accept Jewish students indiscriminately.⁶¹

Once on an American campus, social prejudice interfaced with class difference to form barriers to Jewish extracurricular participation that, ironically, re-inforced pre-existing stereotypes and cast Jewish students as dangers to the campus community. Horowitz's study shows that many Christian students frankly shunned their Jewish peers, excluding them from social organizations and, often, even from such activities as debate, athletics, and student publications. Less financially secure than many of their Christian peers, Jewish students also tended to concentrate their energies on academic and professional achievement to the exclusion of costly dances, parties, and athletic events, thereby reinforcing a reputation for antisocial, single-minded acquisitiveness that set them at odds with American student culture's communal values.⁶² Indeed, Horowitz shows that, in general, Gentile students tended to associate the Jewish presence on campus with any perceived disunity or "slackerism" in the campus community. For example, Horowitz cites the 1922 findings of a Harvard professor who, upon questioning Christian students in his social ethics course, discovered that they perceived their Jewish peers as more interested in "academic knowledge" than in the "social, intellectual and athletic achievement[s]" acquired through campus life. "Governed by selfishness,"

⁶⁰ Agnes Durkin, Registrar, Loyola University School of Medicine to Abe H. [last name withheld by request], (18 August 1921), private collection of Dr. Jeffrey V. Mallow, Department of Physics, Loyola University Chicago (Chicago, IL).

⁶¹ Albert Erlebacher, "De Paul University, 1920-1945: Years of Growth and Crisis," in *De Paul University: Centennial Essays and Images*, 227-250; 237.

⁶² Horowitz, *Campus Life*, 76-78.

Jewish students threatened to “destroy the unity of the college,” claimed these Harvard undergraduates.⁶³

At Loyola and De Paul, the religious difference posed a further threat to student communities that were increasingly premised on a “Catholic Action” consensus. Even as CISCORA’s Fr. Reiner publicly reached out to Chicago’s Jewish leaders,⁶⁴ circumstantial evidence suggested that many Catholic students suspected their Jewish peers of undermining the ideological unity of the campus. For example, one week after Law student Leo Shapiro had argued against the establishment of movie censorship boards in a 1934 debate on “Catholic Action with Regard to the Movies,” censorship proponent Henry Rago felt it prudent to clarify to fellow De Paul students that “although his opponent [Shapiro] was a non-Catholic,” Shapiro’s stand against the official Catholic Action position had been purely academic. Shapiro was no “pagan,” Rago assured De Paulians; indeed “he [Shapiro] believed as firmly as any present in a code of ethics and a movie board of censorship.”⁶⁵ Either Shapiro’s religion had exposed him to unpleasant suspicions of secular hedonism, prompting Rago—a CISCORA committee chair with “Catholic Action” credibility—to publicly defend him in the following week; or personal attacks occurring within the debate had sparked the resentment of Jewish students, leading Rago to smooth over a misunderstanding. Either way, Judaism was at issue, and Rago was attempting to sever a perceived connection between Shapiro’s background and

⁶³ Horowitz, *Campus Life*, 79.

⁶⁴ James O’Donnell Bennett, “Rabbis, Parson, and Priest Dine; Vow Friendship: Jews Hosts to ‘Good Christian Brothers,’” *Chicago Tribune* (3 December 1926): 1, 3.

⁶⁵ “Deem Forum Session very Interesting,” *De Paulia* (8 March 1934): 1.

his “academic” opposition to student community values. Importantly, too, Rago’s defense of Shapiro preserved the image of community consensus: Jewish students should be accepted, Rago implied, not because dissent was tolerable, but because at heart they conformed to Catholic opinion.

However, *Loyola News* reports on a 1934 Loyola Economics Society meeting reinforced the popular stereotype of Jews as greedy for individual gain—a material acquisitiveness that American collegians and Chicago Catholic Actionists both rejected, at least in theory. Describing the economy of Chicago’s predominantly Jewish Maxwell Street commerce district to Loyola students, alumnus David Wax “pointed out that the main object of the lives of these Jewish people, from childhood to old age, is ‘to sell, sell, SELL’” and illustrated this claim with “several amusing stories.”⁶⁶ While Wax did not explicitly mention Catholicism in this economics lecture, his apparent tone of condescension implied that he considered his Loyola student audience above such petty money-grubbing. Meanwhile, the ideology of “campus life” condemned the pursuit of individual gain as “selfish” neglect of the community, while Catholic Action more generally opposed a “materialistic” worldview that prioritized market forces over human dignity. Catholic students who stereotyped Jews as Shylocks would naturally suspect their Jewish peers of diluting or undermining the Catholic campus community.

Divisions of ethnicity, class, and—in the case of Jewish students—religion and religious discrimination, then, separated members of ethnically-restricted organizations from their peers in the better-established Catholic fraternities. In response to the sense of exclusion and inferiority implied by these differences, the Polish, Italian, and Jewish

⁶⁶ “Economics Group Hears Four Talks,” *Loyola News* (27 February 1934): 2.

social organizations adapted the American fraternal tradition to meet their own perceived social needs.

While Loyola and De Paul's Catholic fraternities concentrated on the promotion of institutional religious identity, extracurricular participation, and school spirit, the exclusive Italian-American and Polish social fraternities sought to combine "campus life" values with a somewhat more introverted focus on internal social support and the retention—or development—of ethnic identity. In 1936 Alpha Delta Sigma stated its dual purpose as promoting "a betterment and development in the scholastic and social side of the individual in his collegiate activities" while also "providing a common bond for the students of Italian extraction on the campus."⁶⁷ Stressing this supportive bond, the 1937 yearbook entry summarized the fraternity's purpose as "the enfolding in a common cause the cultured gentlemen of the Italian race," an endeavor which included mutual assistance "in their scholastic and social activities."⁶⁸ Likewise, in 1942 Loyola Polish fraternity Sigma Pi Alpha described its mission as "the molding of friendships and social contacts" among "students of Polish extraction" as well as "preserving the culture and traditions of their nationality."⁶⁹

Polish-American and Italian-American students hoped that ethnic fraternity programs and traditions would increase their fellow students' respect for Polish and Italian cultures, as well as their own self-respect. In their 1934 yearbook entry, for example, Alpha Delta Sigma members claimed to have enriched "the cultural life of

⁶⁷ *Loyolan* (1936): 110.

⁶⁸ *Loyolan*, (1937): 232.

⁶⁹ "Sketch of Each of the Social Frats," *Loyola News* (December 9, 1942): 7.

Loyola” with “the traditions of the fraternity’s forefathers,” a statement suggestive of a need for affirmation, acceptance, and social context.⁷⁰ When in April 1930 sophomore Samuel Cali and nine other Italian-American students formed Delta Alpha Sigma’s predecessor organization, *Il Circolo Dante Alighieri*, its officers planned a lecture program of “speakers prominent in Chicago Italian-American circles” as well as a campaign for the inclusion of Italian language in Loyola’s course offerings—both steps that would not only promote Italian-Americans’ own education and ethnic pride, but also provide public affirmation of their contributions and cultural greatness.⁷¹ Under Albachiara’s direction, in June 1930 *Circolo* members joined students of Crane College and the University of Chicago in presenting an “Italian Night” consisting of Italian, song dance, and drama, including Giacosa’s dramatic sketch “The Chess Match.”⁷² Similarly, Sigma Pi Alpha members used fraternal tradition to express their ethnic pride, adopting the Polish eagle as their crest and the red and white of the Polish flag as their official colors.⁷³ In October 1935 the Polish fraternity opened its social calendar with an address by its moderator, philosophy professor Rev. John F. McCormick, S.J., entitled “Contribution of Polish Culture to America.”⁷⁴

⁷⁰ *The Loyolan*, (1934): 275.

⁷¹ “Italian Club Unfolds Plans for Semester,” *Loyola News* (October 7, 1930): 1.

⁷² “Italian Clubs Present Play,” *Loyola News* (28 May 1930): 1; “Italian Cultural Activities at Crane College,” *Vita Nuova* (May 1930): 1., in Works Progress Administration, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, (Chicago: Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, 1942), Italian, v.1.

⁷³ *Loyolan* (1937): 234.

⁷⁴ “Sig Smoker Fetes Two,” *Loyola News* (October 6, 1935): 7.

However, in forming fraternal organizations ethnic students—particularly the well-heeled Italian Americans--also sought to establish their social and ideological participation in Catholic “campus life.” According to the 1934 *Loyolan* yearbook, cravings for the “pomp and tradition” of American fraternity culture had motivated Loyola’s Dante Alighieri Club members to reorganize as Italian-American fraternity Delta Alpha Sigma in October 1930, within one year of the club’s original establishment.⁷⁵ Members eagerly adopted the trappings and rituals of American Greek organization. By February 1931 Delta Alpha Sigma boasted an official chant--composed by members Salvatore Dimicelli and Joe Mondo to the tune of “Just a Gigolo”--and a growing reputation for excellence in intramural tennis and campus social events.⁷⁶ Further enhancing fraternal respectability, their “long anticipated fraternity pins” arrived in 1932, and were extolled as “exceedingly striking in appearance.”⁷⁷ Like other campus fraternities, both the Italian-American and Polish-American fraternities subjected their pledges to a period of hazing that culminated in “hell week” and a secret initiation ritual: In 1947, for example, Sigma Pi Alpha pledges sported distinctive black derbies and umbrellas for ten weeks until their weekend “acid test” at an “undisclosed place” admitted them to equal status within the fraternity brotherhood.⁷⁸ The typical fraternity round of dances, smokers, house parties, and public lectures (nods to academic enrichment) soon characterized both Polish-American and Italian-American student

⁷⁵ *The Loyolan*, (1934): 275.

⁷⁶ “Socially Speaking,” *Loyola News* (10 February 1931): 3.

⁷⁷ *Loyolan* (1932): 337.

⁷⁸ “Fraternities,” *Loyola News* (18 December 1947): 8.

organization, although throughout the 1930s the Poles of Sigma Pi Alpha were perhaps the more serious group: Their 1937 yearbook entry almost apologized for members' concentration on academic achievement and "cultural endeavors."⁷⁹

In establishing their participation in "campus life," ethnic fraternities frankly hoped to acquire status according to the standards of collegiate peer culture. Alpha Delta Sigma "has placed itself on a par with the other kindred organizations through its vigorous activity," Italian-American students claimed in their 1932 yearbook entry, citing member cooperation in arranging the Interfraternity dance; their organization of a second, all-university dance; and member participation in Loyola's "musical and intermural activities."⁸⁰ The fraternity's 1937 entry likewise referred to Alpha Delta Sigma's "the struggle to gain campus prominence" through demonstration of school spirit. "Today the period of its apprenticeship at Loyola is ended and Delta Alpha Sigma ranks among the foremost of the social groups in the university, thanks to the efforts of the founders and earnest members...." declared the 1937 yearbook, praising members' perfect attendance at University parties, dances, and Interfraternity Council events as evidence of "the willingness of the fraternity to co-operate with the University."⁸¹ The adoption of Loyola's maroon and gold as Delta Alpha Sigma's official colors further emphasized the Italian-American fraternity's desire to identify with Loyola's institutional community.⁸²

⁷⁹ *Loyolan* (1937): 234.

⁸⁰ *Loyolan* (1932): 337.

⁸¹ *Loyolan* (1937): 232.

⁸² *Loyolan* (1936): 110.

While Polish-American student organizations also entered into campus life, overall they preferred to express their community identification through activities that stressed Catholic commitment rather than social exuberance—an approach that perhaps reflected Polish students’ personal financial disadvantages, as well as Poles’ general tendency to identify religion very strongly with ethnic identity. At Loyola, for example, Sigma Pi Alpha organized scholarly programs, such as a 1936 lecture series on the status of Catholicism in Mexico, that affirmed the religious tie between Polish students and their Northern and Western European peers.⁸³ They also entered Catholic Action activities on the individual level. In 1939 Sigma Pi Alpha member Ed Marciniak became CISCA president. At Mundelein College, the Polish Society president was concurrently the president of Mundelein’s Catholic Action unit—a direct identification of Polish ethnicity with the campus’ dominant religious influence.

Among Italian-Americans, at least two founding Delta Alpha Sigma members were also members of Loyola’s Sodality. Although De Paul lacked an official Italian-American organization, its Law student Henry Rago—the son of an Italian immigrant—chaired CISCA’s Eucharistic-Our Lady committee, becoming a prominent and articulate advocate of student Catholic Action during the 1930s.

Seemingly less worried about issues of cultural preservation and social support, members of Loyola’s Akibeian Club (founded in 1932) appeared to concentrate exclusively on counteracting Jewish students’ anti-social, “outsider” image by demonstrating their investment in the institution, its extracurricular life, and—to some extent—even its religious culture. The club’s founding objectives were “first, to better

⁸³ “Sigma Pi Alpha Selects Large Hotel Suite,” *Loyola News* (25 February 1936): 5.

and advance the Jewish student in Loyola University; second, to arouse and maintain school spirit; [and] third, to engage in extracurricular and intermural activities”—all mutually-reinforcing goals that suggested a primary concern for Jewish students’ status on the predominately Catholic campus.⁸⁴ Indeed, in its explicit reference to “school spirit” and extracurricular participation the Akibean mission statement resembled less the Polish and Italian-American emphases on “fraternal bonds” than Catholic fraternity Alpha Delta Gamma’s mission to “further the purposes of the university by requiring their members to act as promoters of school activities and spirit.”⁸⁵

To proclaim their participation in Loyola’s campus life, the Jewish Akibeans—like the Polish and Italian-Americans--eagerly adopted the symbols, rituals, and entertainments of Greek organizational culture. By December 1932 they had acquired a fraternity pin with which to decorate their first four pledges, Loyola students Gene Gavlin, Alen Benjamin, Nate Garritz, and Martin Sherman. House parties and smokers filled out their first semester’s schedule.⁸⁶ In addition, the *Loyola News* noted that the new Jewish organization was a “formidable contender for [intermural] football honors” against the established fraternities of Alpha Delta Gamma, Pi Mu Chi and Pi Alpha Lambda.⁸⁷ Like other Loyola fraternities, by 1934 the Akibeans also had inaugurated the tradition of an annual formal dance—in their case, a “Spring Frolic” at the popular

⁸⁴ “Jewish Men Organize on Arts Campus,” *Loyola News* (8 November 1932): 1.

⁸⁵ “A Brief Sketch of Each of the Social Frats,” *Loyola News* (December 9, 1942): 4.

⁸⁶ “Akibeans,” *Loyola News* (20 December 1932): 3.

⁸⁷ “Arts Frats Gird for Annual Fall Pigskin Strife,” *Loyola News* (15 November 1932): 1.

Edgewater Hotel.⁸⁸ Meeting space at the Steven's hotel established further prestige, setting the Akibeans above the Italian-American Delta Alpha Sigma in the unwritten terms of Greek hierarchy.⁸⁹ Like the Polish-American Sigma Pi Alpha, the Akibeans also contributed public lectures and forums to Loyola's extracurricular offerings. Notably, in 1934 their seminar series "on current problems of the day" included Eneas B. Goodwin, S.J.'s presentation on popular German reactions to Hitler's programs.⁹⁰

To further identify with the student community, throughout the 1932-33 term the Akibeans' conspicuously lively *Loyola News* column established a friendly goodwill toward institutionalized Catholicism even as it played ironically with Jewish students' liminal role. Recalling a December 1932 incident, for instance, "Say, how did you like the 'Glory Hallelejah' of [Akibean] Chuck Arbetman at the last assembly?," posed the Jewish columnist, adding that "It certainly gave a spiritual feeling."⁹¹ The fraternity column also made a point of wishing "all our fond readers a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year."⁹² Overall, Akibean club members showed a willingness to meet Loyola's Catholic campus life on its own terms, emphasizing points of agreement and interaction—such as intermural sports, event planning, and assembly activities—while defusing the perceived threat of religious disunity. Perhaps due to this overriding pursuit

⁸⁸ "Akibeans, Arts Frat, Will Hold Open Forum to Discuss Hitlerism," *Loyola News* (6 March 1934): 3; "Akibeans Dance at First Spring Formal," *Loyola News* (10 April 1934): 2.

⁸⁹ "Akibeans Dance at First Spring Formal," *Loyola News* (10 April 1934): 2.

⁹⁰ "Akibeans Meet," *Loyola News* (20 February 1934): 2.

⁹¹ "Akibeans," *Loyola News* (20 December 1932): 3.

⁹² "Akibeans," *Loyola News* (20 December 1932): 3.

of conformity, the Akibean Club was ultimately unsuccessful, disappearing from Loyola's fraternity columns in 1935.

Overall, the ethnic fraternities and clubs that students organized at De Paul, Mundelein, and especially Loyola functioned in varying degrees to provide ethnic students with social support; to strengthen their feelings of ethnic identity and pride; and to establish their investment in the Catholic institutional community. Replicating the divisions of the Catholic national parish system as well as the ethnic solidarity of immigrant associations, these ethnically-restricted student organizations seemed a reasonable means to upward social mobility in the context of a "campus life" tradition that prized community participation.

Challenging segregation

As John T. McGreevy demonstrates in *Parish Boundaries*, the importance of the national parish system to European immigrants conditioned the Church's approach to the African-American migrants who sought economic and social opportunity in the urban North. Viewing "ethnicity" and "race" as interchangeable concepts, Catholic missionaries ministered to Catholic and non-Catholic African-Americans in segregated churches and schools that reflected the pattern of separate German, Polish, and Italian institutions. Likewise, at Loyola the Federated Colored Catholic [FCC]'s mission to "weld [African-American Catholics]... into a solid unit for race betterment" influenced the formation of a Loyola African-American student group that aimed to assist black students; to combat on-campus racial prejudice; and, implicitly, to counteract a perceived

spread of Communism among Chicago's African Americans.⁹³ However—as with segregated parishes--the Loyola student club's strategy of uplift through racial solidarity proved controversial among many African Americans, who viewed any form of segregation as incompatible with racial equality. As, over the course of the Depression, Catholic Actionists increasingly advocated interracialism as a route to social justice, they undermined the rationale for an African-American student organization—and with it, for ethnically-restricted clubs as well..

An all-university African-American club, the “Guild” or “Athenian Guild” was established in November 1930 under the moderation of Loyola English professor Arnold J. Garvy, S.J., a cultural scholar in the process of compiling a complete bibliography of African-American literature. Its founding president was Dr. James E. Coleman, an outstanding medical graduate currently serving on Loyola's research staff; its vice president, Ethel Butler; its secretary and treasurer, Regina M. Falls. Other founding members included Charles Lumpkins and Law student Aloysius O. Morrison. “The club was organized to bring the colored students of the university together in a friendly organization, where they can discuss their particular problems and get to know one another,” the *Loyola News* explained. “Previous to its formation there were about thirty colored students in the university unacquainted with one another. Since the inception of the club this disadvantage has been overcome...”⁹⁴

During the Depression Loyola's admission of black students set it apart from other Catholic institutions, many of which were still all-white strongholds. Catholic

⁹³ McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries*, 13.

⁹⁴ “Loyola Colored Club Will Hear Father Reiner,” *Loyola News* (12 May 1931): 3.

University of America, for example, did not enroll an African-American student until 1934; while the University of Notre Dame would not graduate a black student until 1943.⁹⁵ In 1932 an article in the Jesuit journal *America* attributed the University's comparatively progressive admissions policy to a need of evangelizing Chicago's African-American community. "A recent article in *America* commends Loyola University for its broadmindedness in admitting students irrespective of race, color, or creed," the *Loyola News* reported in 1932, adding "Mention is made of the fact that such a procedure has much to do with changing the attitude towards the Catholic Church which is prevalent among Negroes nowadays."⁹⁶

However, to credit Loyola with admitting students completely "irrespective of race, color, or creed" might have been somewhat of an exaggeration: The *Chicago Defender* contended that, beneath the benign all-University bureaucratic level, covert departmental quota systems limited African-American enrollments to a mere trickle. In 1938, the medical school's policy was to admit only one African American per year, the *Defender* claimed, and "[o]nly exceptional scholarship... and the influence of Father Garvy... has ensured his remaining there." Social work had the "largest quota," while in 1938 the Law school could boast only five African-American students.⁹⁷

Furthermore, those African Americans who did enroll at Loyola tended to be of exceptional ability. James E. Coleman, for instance, graduated Loyola's medical school with the highest scholastic average of any medical school in the country; while in 1936

⁹⁵ "Admit Race at Catholic University," *Chicago Defender* (3 October 1936): 3.

⁹⁶ "Negro Guild Marks First Anniversary," *Loyola News* (12 January 1932): 1.

⁹⁷ Consuelo Young-Megahy, "Preface," *Chicago Defender* (9 April 1938): 13.

Law student Ulysses S. Keys, together with his (white female) debate partner Evelyn McIntyre, defeated all other class members over the course of four years to win Loyola's prestigious Brandeis competition. In 1936 Bachelor of Philosophy Clarice M. Hatcher was, at age nineteen, one of the youngest students ever to graduate from Loyola.⁹⁸ While no doubt the excellence of Loyola's African-American students in part reflected self-selection—as, amid Depression-era racial tensions, only a student with drive and ambition would reach the point of applying to an overwhelmingly white university—perhaps it also reflected an application of higher academic standards to African-American candidates.

Despite Loyola's alleged quota system, administrators were conscious—perhaps all too conscious—of remarkable progressivism in admitting African-American students at all, as demonstrated by Loyola President Samuel Knox Wilson's kneejerk reaction to public criticism of discriminatory policies. In 1937, for example, the Jesuit journal *America* published a letter from Dr. Arthur G. Falls, chairman of the Chicago Urban League's interracial commission, that accused Chicago's Catholic colleges and universities of not doing enough for African-Americans. Feeling that local Catholic institutions had already made considerable contributions toward racial uplift, Wilson construed Falls' criticisms as ingratitude or even deliberate slander. "From things I have seen recently in regard to colored agitators, I have yielded my former belief that they were guilty only of excessive zeal and now believe that they are of being very dumb [sic] or else of conscious duplicity," he wrote to Carrabine, from whom he requested further

⁹⁸ "Loyola Colored Club Will Hear Father Reiner," *Loyola News* (12 May 1931): 3; "Race Student One of Victors in Law Debate," *Chicago Defender* (25 January 1936): 10; "Two More Get Ph.D. Degrees," *Chicago Defender* (13 June 1936): 10.

information on “the colored trouble maker.”⁹⁹ Wilson’s comments render allegations of Loyola’s covert racism all the more plausible.

Meanwhile, behind closed doors De Paul University administrators admitted to deflecting African-American applicants with a series of unusual standards and demands. “Heretofore it has been the policy. . . to discourage the registration of colored students in this institution,” a University Council report stated bluntly in 1934. “Various devices have been used—such as the requirement of a complete transcript... the payment in full of tuition, the requirement of a higher standard of scholarship for admission, etc.” On encountering these obstacles, typically “the more intelligent applicant” sensed that he or she was “persona non grata” and dropped the application, stated the report. However, when the rare African-American applicant persevered, “[t]hen it has become necessary to speak more frankly and urge that in all likelihood, if he were to enroll, he would, in the view of the fact that he is the only colored student in the school, encounter an uncongenial atmosphere for which the institution would not like to assume responsibility.” As a result of these passive-aggressive strategies, “[t]hus far we have been able to avoid admitting colored students,” the report declared.¹⁰⁰

However, mounting pressure from other Catholic institutions was gradually rendering De Paul’s policy untenable, as the 1934 Council report suggested. Historian John T. McGreevy observes that, by the mid-1930s, white pastors of newly-founded African-American parishes often pushed Catholic high schools, colleges, and universities

⁹⁹ Wilson to Carrabine, 11 October 1937, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 44, Folder 1, Loyola University Archives, Chicago, IL.

¹⁰⁰ Minutes of the University Council (12 January 1934), De Paul University Archives, Chicago, IL: 167-168.

to accept individual African-American applicants, thereby increasing integrationist pressures within Catholic education.¹⁰¹ Likely something similar occurred at De Paul: In 1933, the Council report noted, De Paul had been recommended “as a Catholic institution” (by whom is unclear) to an African-American graduate of St. Xavier Academy, who subsequently encountered a blatant and embarrassing rejection that, in the Council’s words, highlighted “the religious phase of the situation.” In the implicit hope of averting future unpleasantness within the Catholic institutional network, the De Paul University Council recommended an unpublished policy of accepting a limited number of African-American students each year, on the condition that they be Catholic and of exceptional academic promise. “[U]nder no circumstances,” it specified, “would Non-Catholic negroes be admitted.”¹⁰² Even so, Council members expressed reservations: While cautiously optimistic about the prospects of “re-educating” De Paul students to accept racial mixing, they worried about the reaction of parents.¹⁰³

Indeed, during the 1930s Loyola and De Paul educators did attempt to reduce Catholic students’ racial prejudices through campus and media programming that initially reflected the Federation of Colored Catholics’ strategy of “racialism”—a focus on uplifting African Americans as a distinct group within the Church’s spectrum of ethnic categories. At Loyola, Fr. Garvy drew attention to African-American cultural accomplishments by inviting African-American artists to perform on campus, often

¹⁰¹ McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries*, 63.

¹⁰² Minutes of the University Council (12 January 1934), De Paul University Archives, Chicago, IL, 167-168.

¹⁰³ Minutes of the University Council (12 January 1934), De Paul University Archives, Chicago, IL, 167-168.

during the mandatory Arts student assemblies. In 1931, for example, African-American poet James Weldon Johnson lectured on “Negro Poets and Their Poetry” at a Loyola student assembly, culminating the talk with a reading of his own poetry. Garvy frankly intended the event to challenge students’ racial prejudices: Introducing Johnson, for example, he “pointed out the fact that since all the students were interested in the race problem confronting America today, he believed that the address by so learned a Negro as Mr. Johnson would do much toward informing the audience.... [and] give all an appreciation of the work of the Negro of today,” reported the *Loyola News*. White students apparently took the point. “Never in the history of the Arts Assembly has a speaker received greater applause and made a more favorable impression with the student body...” declared the *News*, which noted that Johnson had received an unprecedented “three encores.”¹⁰⁴ Guild member Aloysius O. Morrison was so pleased with this outcome that he reported favorably on the event to the FCC journal *The Chronicle*, recounting “how the Loyolans discarded all semblances of race prejudice to give Mr. Johnson the greatest ovation ever accorded to any speaker [at Assembly]...”¹⁰⁵

Nevertheless Loyola’s African-American Guild operated only in fits and starts, sometimes disappearing completely from *Loyola News* columns only to re-emerge in the following semester. While in 1932 the *Loyola News* suggested that as many as 30 students attended Guild meetings conducted at Loyola’s downtown campus and the convent of the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament, by 1938 the Guild consisted of 16 members who held their monthly meetings at the South Side African-American parish of

¹⁰⁴ “Three Encores Given Noted Negro Poet at Arts Assembly,” *Loyola News* (10 March 1931): 1.

¹⁰⁵ “Writes on Visit of Negro Poet,” *Loyola News* (14 April 1931): 3.

St. Elizabeth's (a focal point of the Federation for Colored Catholics). Indeed a 1938 *Chicago Defender* column seemed to credit Fr. Garvy with keeping the organization alive at all, praising his "absorbing hold" on Guild members, his "intense interest in the Race," and his ability to direct members' energy toward African-American "educational, professional... and social" betterment.¹⁰⁶

Unlike the mainly undergraduate Polish and Italian-American fraternities, the African-American Guild eschewed fraternal trappings and rituals in favor of sober, goal-oriented programs. Consistent with Garvy's guidance and the FCC's mission to "weld [African-American Catholics]... into a solid unit for race betterment," Guild meeting topics tended to emphasize racial self-help and achievement as a means of refuting racist arguments. According to the *Defender*, "aside from religious discussions" Guild meetings addressed such topics as the characteristics and leadership of the "new Negro"; social problems, "including divorce [and] birth control"; and "practical" methods of eliminating racial segregation and prejudice. In rather abstract terms, the article also stated that members engaged in the "continuous and written exposition of truths... enlightening the sinister sources of all prejudices... toward ultimate elimination," which probably meant that they used speech and letter-writing campaigns to expose the persistence and irrationality of racism. At meetings, individual members also reported on research projects "pertinent to current Race progress," again stressing goals of group achievement and uplift.¹⁰⁷ Along these lines, in 1932 the Guild conducted a symposium

¹⁰⁶ Consuelo Young-Megahy, "Preface," *Chicago Defender* (9 April 1938): 13; "Loyola Guild to Hold Assembly Sunday, May 15," *Loyola News* (28 April 1932): 1.

¹⁰⁷ Consuelo Young-Megahy, "Preface," *Chicago Defender* (9 April 1938): 13.

on “The Educational, Economic, and Moral Needs and Difficulties of the Colored Race,” to which member Charles Lumpkins contributed a presentation on the educational circumstances of African Americans. Again, the event approached African-American social problems from a perspective of self-help and racial solidarity.¹⁰⁸

Guild programming also reflected Catholic perceptions of the African-American community as a locus of the Church’s ongoing struggle against atheistic Communism—perceptions that had provided many Catholic institutions with an initial motivation for easing discriminatory policies.¹⁰⁹ For example, on the anniversary of Pope Leo XIII’s labor encyclical *Rerum Novarum* in 1931, Guild members heard Loyola Catholic Action leader Joseph Reiner, S.J. discuss the encyclical’s ethical and moral approach to labor relationships in a program no doubt intended to frame Catholicism as a credible alternative to Communist ideology. Pointedly, the *Loyola News* observed that “the Loyola Colored Club” was the only Chicago organization to commemorate the anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*, a fact that seemed to confirm the success of the Church’s African-American mission.¹¹⁰ Similarly, in December 1933 Loyola economics professor Dr. Peter Swanish contrasted Russia’s five-year plan with America’s National Recovery Act program in a Guild event organized for the National Student Club, an African-American intercollegiate association.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸ “Loyola Guild to Hold Assembly Sunday, May 15,” *Loyola News* (28 April 1932): 1.

¹⁰⁹ McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries*, 64-67.

¹¹⁰ “Loyola Colored Club Will Hear Father Reiner,” *Loyola News* (12 May 1931): 3.

¹¹¹ “Tells Guild of Russia’s 5-Year Plan,” *Loyola News* (19 December 1933): 1.

However, the Guild's "racialist" approach to achieving equality met with resistance from many African Americans, who, having fled segregation in South, vehemently opposed its implementation in the urban North—even in such apparently benign forms as the national parish model that Polish and Italian Catholics found useful and reassuring.¹¹² Consistent with this rejection of segregation in any form, Chicago's African-American community also challenged the ultimate social effect of African-American student clubs such as the Loyola Guild, arguing that social separations reinforced rather than eroded racial inequality. For example, a 1931 *Chicago Defender* editorial deplored the formation of an African-American club at Jesuit-led Creighton University as "How Jim Crow Gets Its Start." "We have seen other such groups as this one form... and the results have been startling, to say the least," contended the editor. "First, we can expect the authorities to look upon this Creighton Colored Co-operative Club with tolerance. Then, as it grows in influence and power, it will be referred to in all matters affecting dark students. Finally, all Race students at the school will find themselves shunted to this club for all their activities and the metamorphosis from a liberal to a segregated college will be complete. . ." In conclusion, the editorial lamented the "tragedy. . . that our young men and women in colleges will not profit by the experiences of others when it comes to the subtleties of segregation. They, of all people, ought to beware of anything that smacks of the Jim Crow principle."¹¹³

In reply to this editorial, Loyola Guild officer Regina M. Falls wrote a letter to the *Defender* that justified African-Americans' self-segregated organization through

¹¹² McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries*, 34-35.

¹¹³ "How Jim Crow Gets Its Start," *Chicago Defender* (31 January 1931): 14.

reference to “campus life” advantages and Catholic tradition. “Don’t you think you are exaggerating the situation?,” she asked the editor. “The possibilities of future segregation were thoroughly discussed from all angles before organizing,” and “[q]uite in opposition to hindering us, it will benefit us,” she countered, “for it enables the club to send a representative to the general council, an organization composed of students from all clubs. Heretofore our Race was not represented.” Furthermore, argued Falls, Loyola’s Guild only reflected a widespread pattern of ethnically-restricted student organizations: “...[W]hy should we look upon such a club with horror and scream ‘segregation’?” Do not all races form organizations in all universities? Why should we not do the same...?” In addition, Falls felt that the *Defender* editorial had failed to appreciate Catholic educators’ genuine good intentions and commitment to interracial justice. “The writer has overlooked the fact that the heads of Catholic universities are Christian men, and that the priest’s mission in life is to aid all, regardless of race, color, or creed,” she wrote. “...When the editor of that article has the opportunity to spend a semester in a Catholic university he will be convinced that the Colored students have a far better opportunity for progress and that a Race organization in such an institution will not encourage Jim Crowism.”¹¹⁴ Falls’ response showed trust that the structures of a religiously-based “campus life” would serve African-American students as well as Italian or Polish-Americans, so long as the students themselves made the effort to organize and participate in the pre-existing social tradition.

Pushed by Jesuits John LaFarge and William Markoe, by the late 1930s the FCC’s initial strategy of improving the reputation and self-esteem of a distinct racial group had

¹¹⁴ Regina M. Falls, “A Reason for Separate Clubs,” *Chicago Defender* (7 March 1931): 14.

given way—not without struggle—to a coordinated Catholic Action campaign for elimination of “the color line.”¹¹⁵ The embrace of interracialism prompted Fr. Powers and his De Paul CISCA unit to actively propagandize against bigoted thinking both on campus and in the pages of Chicago’s Archdiocesan newspaper *The New World*. In 1937, for example, De Paul student and CISCA Eucharistic/Our Lady chairman Henry Rago argued that the Pauline doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ mandated full racial inclusion. “We have known that smug complacency again in the polite applause of intelligent Catholics when a ‘social revolutionary’ makes a speech about ‘tolerating the Negro.’ Tolerate the Negro? If Christ were there He would drive those Pharisees, speaker and listeners, out of the hall with all the fury of a righteously angry God,” he wrote in *The New World*. “We do not tolerate the Negro; we share with him the intimate part of our existence, that small spark of Christ-life which alone raises us above the crawling things of the earth. Through his body and through our bodies runs the same current of the life of one Mystical Body.” When one part of the Mystical Body is harmed, all are harmed, asserted Rago.¹¹⁶

In this context of Mystical Body ideology, the ethics of racial segregation became a focus of intense debate. At De Paul, 1937 and 1938 student forums discussed “racial antipathies and injustices,” with the January 1938 event featuring a frank debate between students representing Northern and Southern attitudes toward race and race

¹¹⁵ McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries*, 44-53.

¹¹⁶ Hank [Henry] Rago, “Two Hot Shots,” *The New World* (5 March 1937): 10.

segregation.¹¹⁷ “Miss [Josephine] Modelli gave a typical Southern view-point on the racial question, and endeavored to show the justice of the Southerners’ attitude,” *De Paulia* reported. “Some of the points she presented were hotly debated, for nearly every one present had an opinion on the question. Due to the provoking nature of the topic, each point made was thoroughly questioned and each aspect discussed in length.”

Although *De Paulia* referred to Modelli’s speech as portraying “her views on the Inter-Racial Justice question,” one might wonder if she weren’t playing devil’s advocate.¹¹⁸

Extending this discussion into February 1938, De Paul Cisca student Frank Ready argued that African Americans’ *de facto* geographic limitations belied Chicagoans’ claims to ethical superiority over Southern segregationists. “...[M]any of us have grown indifferent to the problem. Not a few of us have even distorted the situation into an excuse for self-righteous complacency,” he wrote. “With a supercilious shrug we have deplored the enduring bigotry of the ‘deep South.’ We never permit ourselves to imagine that interracial injustice is perpetrated in the cultured North...” However, argued Ready, the racial prejudice of Chicagoans in fact confined African-Americans to a “narrowly restricted area” of substandard housing, rented at exorbitant rates to tenants with no other option. When families attempted to move even a block outside of this area, white neighbors, fearing a “black invasion,” set fire to the homes. “Since October this incident has occurred five times in a certain block on the South Side. . . .,” Ready observed. “Before you grant the all-time award for viciousness and ignorance to the

¹¹⁷ “Rev. T.C. Powers Discusses Chinese Customs at Forum,” *De Paulia* (16 December 1937): 1; “Catholic Mind Club to Hold Discussion on Race Prejudice,” *De Paulia* (13 January 1938): 1; “Catholic Mind Club Discusses Modern Racial Prejudice,” *De Paulia* (20 January 1938): 1.

¹¹⁸ “Catholic Mind Club Discusses Modern Racial Prejudice,” *De Paulia* (20 January 1938): 1.

prime actors in this local vignette, reserve a few laurels for a couple of the district's residents (not typical, we hope) who casually commented that it was 'a damn good idea.'"¹¹⁹ These ethical challenges to social segregation would later reshape ethnic expression at Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein.

The end of ethnic fraternalism

As James' Roosevelt's November 1937 rally approached, Loyolans perhaps found it expedient to sweep certain potentially embarrassing affiliations under the rug. Just one month before, President Franklin D. Roosevelt had announced a policy of Italian Fascist containment in a Congressional presentation known as the "quarantine speech." By this time Loyola, in common with most of Chicago's Archdiocesan leadership from Cardinal Mundelein downwards, had a history of support for Mussolini's Italy that could likely jeopardize the desired image of a partnership between Roosevelt's government and the Chicago Archdiocesan Catholic Action. For example, in 1929 the Directors of Loyola University granted Mario Lauro, Illinois delegate of the Fascist League of North America, downtown classroom space for his "Fascist Popular University," a series of lectures on nationalistic topics such as "Art in Italy" and "the birth of Rome."¹²⁰ Also in 1929, the Loyola-affiliated Glenola Club hosted Italian Consul Castruccio at the Rogers Park Hotel, where club members enthusiastically applauded his refutation of anti-fascist

¹¹⁹ Frank Ready, "We Don't Lynch 'Em," *De Paulia* (10 February 1938): 2.

¹²⁰ *Chicago Italian American Chamber of Commerce* (March 1929) II.b.2.g.II.H; (May 1929) III.b.3.a. II.H.HE IV, in Works Progress Administration, *Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey*, (Chicago: Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, 1942), Italian, v.2; Peter R. D'Agostino, *Rome in America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

arguments. In the presence of Bishop Bernard Sheil, in 1933 Loyola president Robert Kelly, S.J. conferred an honorary doctorate of Law on the Blackshirt aviator Italo Balbo, who had flown into the city for the Century of Progress exhibition.¹²¹ Even Mussolini's dentist received an honorary degree from Loyola's dental school in 1933, to which he conveyed greetings from Il Duce.¹²² Although Loyola's record was no more entangling than that of any other Catholic Church institution, the upcoming visit from Roosevelt—symbolic of Catholic loyalty to the United States—would focus nativist attention on any potentially subversive affiliations.

Meanwhile, Italian-American student groups' international connections were rapidly becoming a liability. As early as January 1936 *Casa Italiana*'s Leonard Covello clipped an article, entitled "Clubs for Mussolini," which argued that recent attempts to organize a national federation of Italian-American student circles demonstrated "treason to American democratic ideals." Quoting from previous 1934 and 1935 articles in *The Nation*, *The New York Teacher* further described *Casa Italiana* as "an unofficial adjunct of the Italian Consul-General's office" and recommended that Columbia University "make a clear break with fascist control" as its "one honorable way out" of the present embarrassment.¹²³ By January 1939 the U.S. House of Representatives' Special Committee on Un-American Activities would identify Italian-American student groups as potential agents of an internal Fascist movement operating "under the guise of education"

¹²¹ D'Agostino, *Rome in America*, 240, 242.

¹²² "Internationally Famous Dentists Receive Degrees at Golden Banquet Jubilee," *Loyola News* (26 September 1933): 2.

¹²³ Clifford T. McAvoy, "Clubs for Mussolini," *The New York Teacher* (January 1936): 40, in Leonard Covello Papers, Box 84, Folder 13, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

in cooperation with Mussolini's government. In support of this contention, the Congressional committee dwelt upon the relationship between Italian-American student organizations and the Italian consulate--and particularly on the Dante Alighieri Society's summer scholarship trips to Italy, which, the committee argued, functioned as a program of Fascist ideological indoctrination. "...[O]nce these youths arrive on Italian shores, they are regarded as part and parcel of the Fascist youth and military organizations," stated the report. "As guests of the Italian Government, these American children... are given Fascist uniforms and taken to training camps, where they are to be seen in military formations, drills, and exercises. Here they remain a month or so under the full surveillance of the Italian Government."¹²⁴

Catholic Action, however, formed a potential wedge issue between the student group and its former pro-fascist associations. In May 1931, even as Chicago's Catholic leaders and most of the American Catholic press overflowed with enthusiasm for *Il Duce*, Mussolini's government had forced the dissolution of Italy's Catholic Action youth organizations in a foreshadowing of Hitler's later actions. The subsequent diplomatic crisis between Italy and the Vatican was swiftly resolved through September (1931) Accords that revived the Catholic Action groups, but limited them to religious and educational activity under diocesan supervision.¹²⁵ While the youth group issue proved a minor disruption of generally positive Vatican-Italian relations throughout the 1930s, in Washington Monsignor John A. Ryan, chair of the National Catholic Welfare

¹²⁴ 75th Congress, *Report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities Pursuant to House Resolution 282*, January 3, 1939 (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1939), 114-115.

¹²⁵ D'Agostino, *Rome in America*, 223-229.

Conference's Social Action Committee, continued a long-standing critique of Italian fascism as incompatible with Catholic doctrine concerning the state and individual rights. Specifically, Ryan contended that Mussolini's laws contradicted the concept of organic society that Pope Leo XIII had articulated in *Rerum Novarum*, an encyclical close to the hearts of Catholic Actionists.¹²⁶

In October 1937, as Franklin D. Roosevelt "quarantined" Mussolini's government and the Archdiocesan CISCA federation prepared for James Roosevelt's visit to Loyola, Italian-American fraternity Alpha Delta Sigma seemed to seize upon Catholic Action as a means of distancing itself from a pro-fascist background.¹²⁷ Within the month members proclaimed their commitment to "Catholic Action" and promised to revise Alpha Delta Sigma's seven-year-old fraternity constitution and by-laws accordingly.¹²⁸ Since these now-objectionable documents dated from the year of the fraternity's founding as *Il Circolo Dante Alighieri* under the leadership of fascist sympathizer Gennaro Albachiara, no doubt they contained statements which, in the context of Roosevelt's "quarantine" policy, could prove an embarrassment to the University and its Italian-American students.

Onwards from January 1938 Delta Alpha Sigma was unaccountably absent from campus newspaper and yearbook listings, leading one to conclude that the Italian-American student organization disbanded quite soon after Christmas 1937. This disappearance was all the more striking in that it followed upon evidence of ongoing

¹²⁶ John P. Diggins, "American Catholics and Italian Fascism," *Journal of Contemporary History* v. II no. 4 (October 1967): 51-68; 66.

¹²⁷ D'Agostino, *Rome in America*, 304.

¹²⁸ "Cavallini Named Leader of Delta Alpha Sigma Frat," *Loyola News* (October 12, 1937): 7.

student interest and organizational viability. In Spring 1937 the Italian-American fraternity had inducted three new members—effectively replacing its graduating seniors—in a ceremony boasting “record attendance” of student and alumni members. Moreover, as late as October 1937 the fraternity’s campus-wide “Hallowe’en Frolic” dance, complete with “corn-stalks and colored lights,” at the West Town Ballroom attested to Delta Alpha Sigma’s increasing involvement in Loyola campus life as well as its ability to organize and financially support a large, campus-wide event.¹²⁹ While the fraternity’s expressed “immediate objective” of “higher scholastic attainment” might hint that members’ midterm averages had failed to meet university standards in Fall 1937, similar expressions of concern in previous years’ newspaper columns and yearbook entries render it unlikely that the fraternity’s 1937-38 academic standing was especially perilous.¹³⁰ Indeed, the fraternity’s October 1937 announcement of an annual “Doctor Michael J. Pistorio medal,” to be awarded to a member “on the basis of accomplishments and character,” suggested that—despite a need to improve its academic reputation—Delta Alpha Sigma had reason to anticipate future years on the Loyola Arts campus.¹³¹ The organization’s apparent health prior to its 1938 disappearance leads one to conclude that anti-fascist political pressures, aligned with Catholic Action, prompted Italian-American students to cease activity on Loyola’s campus. Alternatively or additionally, the Italian-American students might have discovered that the cutting of any potentially pro-fascist

¹²⁹ “Delta Alphas Initiate,” *Loyola News* (February 9, 1937) p7; “Delta Alphas Plan Frolic Hallowe’en,” *Loyola News* (October 26, 1937): 7.

¹³⁰ “Cavallini Named Leader of Delta Alpha Sigma Frat,” *Loyola News* (October 12, 1937): 7.

¹³¹ “Cavallini Named Leader of Delta Alpha Sigma Frat,” *Loyola News* (October 12, 1937): 7.

ties isolated Chicago-area Italian student organizations one from another, thereby depriving them of much-needed cultural and social support.

By contrast to the Italian-Americans' situation, during World War II the sympathy evoked by Poland's political plight transferred the project of Polish cultural preservation from the ethnic association to the academic department. Deprived of contacts abroad and war-directed PNA resources, the Polish-American clubs soon required alternative financial support and social organization. By November 1939 *Loyola News* reported that "[t]he funds provided for the [Sigma Pi Alpha] permanent headquarters have stopped coming," causing the fraternity to relinquish its Webster Hotel office and seek alternative accommodation at the Congress Hotel.¹³² Perhaps in an effort to replicate some of the advantages of the now-defunct PSAA, in May 1940 Sigma Pi Alpha and a similar club at the University of Buffalo briefly discussed the possibility of forming a nationwide Polish-American fraternity.¹³³ However, Loyola members apparently dropped their ambition to "go national" as the wartime draft depleted Sigma Pi Alpha's presence on campus, rendering survival the fraternity's foremost goal. After feting each departure, the remaining Sigma Pi Alpha brothers concentrated their efforts at maintaining communication among members and planning for the fraternity's post-war revival.

During the war, German and Soviet invasions of Poland intensified Catholic interest in Polish language and literary studies, while the presence of refugee Polish academics rendered such programs newly viable. Invoking sympathy for a displaced Polish judge, Dr. Wladimir Sokalski, in 1941 Monsignor Thomas Bona persuaded Loyola

¹³² "Fraternity Row," *Loyola News* (November 2, 1939): 7.

¹³³ "Fraternity Row," *Loyola News* (May 8, 1940): 7.

administrators to establish a lectureship in “Polish Literature and Culture” with funding from Bona and Archbishop Samuel A. Stritch of the Chicago Archdiocese. “I imagine that quite a number of students (my nephew, for one) would like to take up Polish in place of some other modern language,” Bona speculated in a note to president Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. “Those of Polish descent will need Polish.”¹³⁴ In a note of thanks to benefactor Stritch, Wilson also interpreted the new lectureship in terms of Polish cultural, ethnic, and religious preservation: “Particularly in these days when forces in Europe are apparently endeavoring to wipe out not only Polish letters and culture, but also the Polish race, this offering will enable Loyola to do its part in keeping alive a knowledge of literature and culture which have always been thoroughly Catholic,” he wrote.¹³⁵

As a result of these efforts, beginning in Winter 1942 Loyola offered two Polish language courses per quarter.¹³⁶ Upon learning that De Paul University had established both an undergraduate major and Masters program in Polish language and literature under the instruction of Dr. Wladimir Sklodowski, in 1943 Bona also pushed Loyola to initiate an undergraduate major in Polish.¹³⁷ Meanwhile the Polish National Alliance (PNA)

¹³⁴ Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. to Thomas A. Egan, S.J. (1 October 1941); Msgr. Thomas P. Bona to Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J., 25 October 1941; Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 5, Folder 10.

¹³⁵ Wilson to Most Rev. Samuel A. Stritch, D.D. (18 August 1942), Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 5, Folder 10.

¹³⁶ University College memorandum, Thomas A. Egan, S.J., n.d.; Wilson to Bona (8 May 1942), Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 5, Folder 10.

¹³⁷ Bona to Thomas A Egan, S.J., 18 October 1943; Thomas A. Egan, S.J. to Bona, 6 November 1943; Francis J. Gerst, S.J. to Joseph A. Egan, S.J., 9 November 1943, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 5, Folder 10.

and Polish Roman Catholic Union (PRCU) subsidized purchases of Polish books for the Loyola Library.¹³⁸

Ultimately, however, the wartime triumph of Catholic and American interracialism doomed the ethnically-restricted organizations of Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein, as the ideological and practical demands of mobilization against German and Italian fascism convinced American intellectuals that racial segregation contradicted democratic and religious ideals. Nativism gave way to a concept of American national identity that emphasized tolerance and civic duty. Also, “[m]ost remarkably,” writes historian John T. McGreevy, “Catholic liberals started to term segregation a sin.” In 1943 Pope Pius XII’s encyclical endorsed the Pauline doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, which American Catholics eagerly invoked in support of the interracial movement. Anti-Communists, including Baroness Catherine de Hueck’s Friendship House organizers, argued that Catholic segregationist policies only enhanced Communist prestige in African-American communities. In 1945 Chicago’s chapter of the Federation of Colored Catholics merged into the Catholic Interracial Council, declaring that African-American uplift depended on “affiliation with Catholics of all races”; in 1946 the National Catholic Welfare Conference’s Social Action committee likewise concluded that only “integration into the life of the community” could solve African-American social and economic problems.¹³⁹ Meanwhile, compulsory military service for males rendered any form of racial or ethnic segregation increasingly impolitic. By 1948 the Roosevelt and Truman administrations had succeeded in integrating all branches of the

¹³⁸ Wilson to Bona, 3 November 1943, Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers, Box 5, Folder 10.

¹³⁹ McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries*, 52, 63-71.

U.S. military, including—forceably—the recalcitrant Marines. On both national and religious levels, public opinion had clearly turned toward interracial organization.

On campus, student extracurricular groups reflected this American and Catholic ideological shift. In May 1949 college student delegates to the National Federation of Catholic College Students (NFCCS) resolved that no Catholic university student organization should “theoretically or practically discriminate” against other racial or ethnic groups.¹⁴⁰ Two years earlier Loyola’s Sigma Pi Alpha had renounced its ethnic restrictions, restating its mission in terms of American and “Christian brotherhood” rather than Polish solidarity. “As a result of this change of policy,” declared the 1950 yearbook, “there has been a further strengthening of the bonds of democratic fellowship among its members.”¹⁴¹ Throughout the Eisenhower era Loyola’s visible Polish cultural activity would be concentrated in the “Philarets” (founded November 1947) a coeducational Polish departmental club open to all interested Loyola students.¹⁴² Although by 1950 the Philarets had taken Sigma Pi Alpha’s place in a revived Chicago Intercollegiate Council, it remained primarily an academic rather than ethnic association.

Replacing the defunct Loyola Guild, also in 1947 Rev. Ralph Gallagher, S.J. founded Loyola’s unit of the Chicago Archdiocesan Catholic Interracial Council, which aimed to “illustrate the Christian viewpoint of the subject of race relations, and... dispel some of the factual misconceptions about racial differences which are so prevalent even

¹⁴⁰ “Catholic College Students Meet Here in Congress, Pass Five Resolutions in Session,” *Loyola News* (12 May 1949): 1-2. The NFCCS was the collegiate branch of the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC).

¹⁴¹ “Sigma Pi Alpha,” *Loyolan* (1950).

¹⁴² “Philarets Now in 4th Month in Organization,” *Loyola News* (4 March 1948).

among Catholic university students.” Membership was racially mixed: The Loyola unit’s 1950 yearbook photograph showed seventeen students, four of which were African-American.¹⁴³ The Council intended its social events, including card and theater parties, dances, and picnics, to model the application of Christian integrationist principles to social life.¹⁴⁴ Significantly, in 1950 Loyola’s Lake Shore Sodality yearbook photograph also pictured its first African-American member.¹⁴⁵

In the interests of supporting and reforming the American nation, then, Catholic students dissolved or reconfigured their constitutionally segregated organizations, ethnic as well as racial. Positive and necessary as was Catholic Action opposition to ideas such as racism and fascist totalitarianism, fighting these ills had unintended consequence of limiting the expression of cultural diversity at Loyola throughout the 1940s and 50s.

The ethnic impact of the Catholic campus

While they lasted, however, ethnic social clubs and fraternities possibly had significant impact on Catholic students’ understanding of their ethnic communities. A case study of Polish-American student organization shows that, as even as ethnic students enriched Catholic campus life with their clubs and cultural programs, the collegiate social experience in turn informed students’ approach to ethnic organization and, indeed, ethnicity itself. In the mid-1930s Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein students gained leadership positions in the national Polish Student and Alumni Association (PSAA),

¹⁴³ “Catholic Interracial Council,” *Loyolan* (1950), 167.

¹⁴⁴ “Catholic Interracial Council,” *Loyolan* (1950), 167.

¹⁴⁵ “Sodality of Our Lady,” *Loyolan* (1950), 137.

whose organ, *New American*, soon articulated a flexible concept of “Polish spirit” that related Polish ethnicity to Americanism by means of Catholic “campus life” values. In doing so, Polish-American Catholic students eschewed their parents’ focus on Polish language and nationalism, replacing it with an alternative, ideological concept of ethnic community that stressed communal unity, order, individual self-sacrifice, and the common good—values common both to Catholic Action and American collegiate society. They also applied the community-building strategies of the Catholic campus to the construction of a second-generation ethnic community.

This Polish-American example enriches historian Lizabeth Cohen’s insights regarding the complex relationship of ethnic and popular cultures, while also challenging her perception of the second generation’s economically-motivated turn from impoverished ethnic and religious organizations and toward the government’s broader resources. Consistent with Cohen’s findings, Polish-American students at Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein co-opted American fraternity and sorority culture in support of “Polishness,” much as Cohen’s working-class ethnics used such popular media as radio programming to reinforce and perpetuate ethnic identification. However, the synthesis of Catholic Action with the American New Deal complicates Cohen’s picture of a second-generation flight from impoverished ethnic and religious institutions. While the writings of Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein’s Polish-American students did indeed show deep ambivalence toward immigrant-led associations such as the Polish National Alliance (PNA)—an ambivalence at least partially fueled by the Depression-era scarcity of financial resources—they also suggest that an emerging Polish-American middle class

found in campus Catholic Action the social concern, leadership opportunities, and emotional support that, in students' perception, the immigrant associations were failing to provide. By contrast to Cohen's vision of institutional rejection, *New American* shows that, far from fleeing institutionalized Catholicism, Polish-American students embraced the Catholic campus as a locus of community ideology that, to them, both embodied Polish ethnicity and related it to American nationalism.¹⁴⁶

As the PSAA's center of influence shifted from Pittsburgh to Chicago in the mid-1930s, Polish-American students at Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein attained leadership positions that rendered the *New American*—albeit briefly—a window into their anxieties and biases. Although Loyola's Sigma Pi Alpha had only joined the PSAA in 1934, by 1936 Loyola Law student Arthur L. Korzeneski—having established his political influence at the University of Notre Dame's Charles Phillips Cracow Club as well as in the PSAA Chicago Intercollegiate Council—had attained the national PSAA presidency, an office that he occupied until 1939.¹⁴⁷ Another Loyola Law student, Alexander Penar, served as national Vice President.

Moreover, within Chicago itself the Catholic institutions of Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein enjoyed an increasing influence, cutting into a former hegemony of secular campuses such as Northwestern and the University of Chicago. For example, on the PSAA Chicago Intercollegiate Council, in 1936 De Paul's Pi Sigma Phi president John J.

¹⁴⁶ Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), especially 218-238.

¹⁴⁷ "First District Convention in South Bend," *New American* II no. 6 (April-May 1935): 6.; "Arthur L. Korzeneski Reelected President of the Polish Students and Alumni Association," *New American* IV no. 7 (July 1937): 1.

Marcinkiewicz succeeded Korzeneski as president ; Loyola's Sigma Pi Alpha president Ray Shepanek served as treasurer; and Mundelein's Polish Society president Czeslawa Niewinska held the office of corresponding secretary. ¹⁴⁸

As Chicago's Catholic students entered and acquired influence in the PSAA, its national organ, *New American*, became strikingly similar to collegiate newspapers in both format and content. This new affinity with student papers such as *De Paulia* and *Loyola News* involved a marked departure from the PSAA's 1929 bulletin, entitled *The Polish Student*, which had aimed for an elevated, even intellectual tone, publishing both Polish and English-language articles on Chopin, Sienkiewicz, and other Polish cultural icons. Consistent with the PNA's policy of disassociating culture from religion, *The Polish Student* also had avoided religious topics. Beginning in March 1934, however—the year of Sigma Pi Alpha's entry into the organization--the PSAA changed its magazine's focus from preserving Poland's national culture to reaching and organizing the second generation in America, a shift reflected in the title *New American* and a switch in policy to English only. ¹⁴⁹

Inheriting the organization in the unsettled period following this transformation, Korzeneski and Penar had ample opportunity to revise the *New American* according to their own experience of student publications, thereby expressing ethnic community in terms of “campus life” rather than intelligentsia. Dropping the journal format of its previous incarnation, *The New American* was restructured into news, editorial, letters,

¹⁴⁸ “Chicago Council Changes,” *New American* v. III no. 9 (November 1936): 5; “Marcinkiewicz Elected President of Chicago Council,” *New American*, v. III no. 10 (December 1936): 7.

¹⁴⁹ *New American* (March 1934): 1.

humor, and club or fraternity columns that roughly corresponded to the layout of the *Loyola News*, *Skyscraper*, and *De Paulia*. Although still present, didactic cultural articles now took second place to opinion and analyses of contemporary social problems. Perhaps reflecting the increased influence of Catholic organizations within the PSAA, as well as Korzeneski and Penar's Catholic university background, *New American* writers also increasingly referred to Catholic and Jewish institutions and practices in their discussions of delinquency, poverty, and "growing up Polish," although the students always stopped short of defining ethnicity in explicitly religious terms. Overall, *The New American* was much more colloquial and conversational than the self-consciously cultural *Polish Student*, allowing the students themselves to voice concerns and establish a sense of Polish-American collegiate community.

Under this new format, *New American* expressed second-generation ethnic anxieties that the Polish club members of Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein probably shared. *New American* content revealed college students' ongoing struggle with standards of Polish culture, ethnicity, and organization which hitherto their foreign-born, Polish-speaking parents had largely established. Far from indifferent to their Polish backgrounds, college students who joined the P.S.A.A. and its member clubs and fraternities did so in part because they wanted, not to wholly "Americanize," but to claim, preserve, and deepen a sense of distinctively Polish identity even as they succeeded in American social and economic life.

In maintaining ethnic ties, however, the Polish-American college students struggled against a perceived parental and institutional rejection of collegians as too

“American” in their cultural experience and expectations. Here language was a major issue of contention: The immigrant generation interpreted American-born students’ lack of Polish fluency as evidence of cultural degeneration, while college students struggled to improve their Polish in the midst of English-language term papers, textbooks, and peer groups, as well as courses in Latin and other non-Slavic languages. To some degree, the students internalized immigrants’ linguistic standard of ethnicity: Many articles expressed students’ shame at their inability to balance a thorough study of Polish language with their other academic, social, and religious obligations. “‘I’m sorry, but I can’t speak Polish,’” we frequently hear a flushed Polish student who thus makes his excuses. How terribly embarrassing it must be to make such admissions!,” exclaimed *New American* in 1936. “No matter what we choose to do with our lives there is one thing above everything else that we ought to determine to do, and that is to learn Polish...”¹⁵⁰ Similarly, a 1937 article equated a lack of language skills with a lack of ethnic pride. “A cultured person is never ashamed of his nationality, no matter where he is.... That is why every Pole, even though born and raised here, should endeavor to learn to speak, read and write his own language,” urged the author. “The Polish language is very beautiful and expressive.”¹⁵¹ At a 1936 pledge tea hosted by the Mundelein Polish Society, Janine Nowakowska, a student at Loyola and instructor at Mundelein, made a point of addressing the college students in Polish.¹⁵²

¹⁵⁰ “More on Learning Polish,” *New American*, v. III no. 5 (May 1936): 4.

¹⁵¹ Marie J. Sienkiewicz, “Our Language,” *New American*, v. IV no. 5 (May 1937): 3.

¹⁵² “Polish Society Has First Social Meeting,” *Skyscraper* (4 December 1936): 3.

Nevertheless, *New American* also complained that ethnic organizations such as the P.N.A. unfairly discriminated against second-generation students who had little time to improve their halting Polish. Leadership positions, it noted, were essentially closed to them. The resulting immigrant hegemony in ethnic officeholding—a common complaint among Polish-American youth—effectively discouraged student involvement in the immigrant-founded associations.¹⁵³ “[A]s far as our Polish organizations are concerned, a college education is a ‘sure death’ for all opportunity,” observed a *New American* editor, who went on to suggest language as the source of the problem: “...Perhaps, the older ones, who gave us that education, cannot understand this strange brood of theirs which is unable to speak the language of its fathers.”¹⁵⁴ Less sympathetically, in 1938 *New American* criticized a Polish-American organization, the national Inter-organization Council, for refusing English-language submissions to a collegiate essay contest on “contributions of Polish Culture to American Culture.” As a result of the Council’s insistence on Polish rather than English, observed *New American*, no entry had met the Council’s academic standards—and no wonder. “Of course the work fell short of the standard, and who in the world expected otherwise? Where in the United States will the Inter-organization Council find a Polish-American student trained for the research required in this topic and at the same time capable of writing about it in sure, smooth scientific Polish [?],” the editorial exclaimed. “Polish-American students who have done advanced work in English speaking circles, have read too many text

¹⁵³ See William J. Galush, *For More Than Bread: Community and Identity in American Polonia, 1880-1940* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 2006), 170.

¹⁵⁴ “Time to Learn Polish,” *New American*, v. IV no. 3 (March 1937), 4, 7.

books in English, have had too little time to devote to the polishing of their Polish to be able to use it fluently.” *New American* suggested that the Inter-organizational Council “remember that these conditions exist whether they like to admit it or not,” and allow submissions in English.¹⁵⁵ These and other student editorials expressed varying degrees of frustration with immigrant demands that the second generation learn Polish well before presuming to identify with its ethnic group and related organizations.

New American editorials also blamed ethnic associations’ overriding preoccupation with Polish nationalism for diverting attention and resources away from the second-generation’s welfare, education, and acculturation. For example, while in 1936 De Paul student Walter P. Wolczek praised the immigrant generation’s establishment of ethnic organizations “for the sole purpose of Polish nationalism”—which, he argued, had contributed significantly to the post-war establishment of the Republic of Poland—he claimed that this success came at the expense of the second generation. “[W]hat was the cost?” he asked. “The progress of the Poles in this country was sacrificed, the obligations of the parents to the children... was abandoned, because the parents had to settle a just historical debt.”¹⁵⁶ Similarly, a 1938 editorial urged Polish-American organizations to redirect attention toward their American communities now that their original goal—the restoration of Poland—had been realized. “Curtly, the point is that Poland is free now... It is time for Polish-Americans to turn to

¹⁵⁵ “A Suggestion,” *New American*, v. V no. 4 (April 1938): 4.

¹⁵⁶ Walter P. Wolczek, “Improving Polish Community Life,” *New American*, v. III no. 7 (September 1936): 2.

their own troubled fireside.”¹⁵⁷ More specifically, *New American* argued that the Polish associations could make significant progress against juvenile delinquency if, instead of spending time and energy on “patriotic rallying” and petty infighting, they instead organized and financed urban community centers for Polish-American youth. Other editorials pushed for the re-direction of ethnic fundraising toward the creation of additional scholarships to support Polish-language education, student travel to Poland, and higher education in general.

Poignantly, some second-generation students expressed frustration with the perceived impossibility of competing with their immigrant parents’ bias toward Poland and all its products. For example, when Polish-American Zdzislaw Skubikowski conducted a Chicago Civic Opera production of *Halka*, Poland’s national opera, *New American* editors were quick to point out a striking contrast between English and Polish-language reviews of the program. American critics, it observed, had been generous in praising the second-generation conductor as well as the Opera’s Polish-American choir. By contrast, “...our Polish newspaper found that the greatest detraction of the performance was the work of the young conductor,” while “[i]t found the best feature to be the ballet dancing of Loda Halama of Poland,” who had performed during the intermission. “We wonder if this strange contradiction of the criticisms of our American dailies was not inspired by the fact that Halama was an importation, and Skubikowski and the choir were native products,” *New American* speculated. “Halama was charming and deliciously spirited, but after all, her dancing was merely incidental...” The student editors used this incident to accuse immigrant parents of pushing the second generation to

¹⁵⁷ “Lost—Five Million Americans,” *New American*, v. V no. 6 (June-July 1938): 4.

succeed, while failing to emotionally support its progress. “There is a paradox here that is not understandable. Why constantly demand recognition for Polish-American youth—encourage study and hard work, and then, after the results appear, proceed to undermine what was constructed?”¹⁵⁸ There was, implied *New American*, no pleasing parents whose idealization of Poland itself prevented them from appreciating the Polish cultural achievements of their American-born children.

Second-generation college students responded to this perceived rejection with efforts to undermine immigrants’ claim to superior “Polishness” and, with it, their right to set and police the boundaries of ethnic associational leadership. In October 1937, for example, *New American* published Alice Szczesna’s short story “The Return,” a mournful, empathetic suggestion that the Poland of immigrant memory had faded away, leaving the first generation with no credible identity as Poles—and moreover, with no basis for financially and emotionally investing in Poland over America. Szczesna’s narrative told of an old factory worker whose children, as a gift, arranged for him to pay a summer visit to the Polish village that he had left 40 years ago. “He longed to see it,” Szczesna sympathetically explained. “No, not the entire country, just a minute part of it, only the village where he had been born....” However, on his return, the port and the village—and the villagers, including his relatives—were not as he remembered. “When he got off the train at the last station he did not recognize it,” wrote Szczesna. “There had been a little wooden hut here when he was leaving for America. The tall brick building with its shining windows almost angered him.” Villagers took him for a stranger, when he wanted to be recognized as a native inhabitant. His relatives, too, “were looking at his

¹⁵⁸ “Glissando in Goo,” *New American*, v. IV no. 11 (December 1937): 4.

face, his hands, his clothes. They tried to talk, he wanted to help them, but somehow the conversation was not flowing easily. . . . He felt more awkward and out of place with the passing of every minute.” Most painfully of all, he overheard his younger relatives—who by means of his financial support enjoyed a beautiful home and many comforts—privately express disappointment in his lack of American experience and mystique. “I asked him about the capitol of America and he said he never saw it... All he talked of was the factory where he worked,” a young niece complained, and went on to say that she was ashamed to introduce him to her friends. “Our whole summer spoiled,” she lamented. Reflecting on their words, “. . .he thought of all those years when the hunger for his land... and for his friends used to tear at his heart.” Ultimately, the returning immigrant discovered that throughout his life he had been emotionally investing in memories that no longer mapped onto reality—and moreover, in relations who valued him, not as a fellow Pole, but as a representative American. Even the immigrant generation, Szczesna’s story suggested, no longer really “knew” or belonged to Poland.¹⁵⁹

Perhaps unwittingly, *New American* travelogues further reinforced this perception of a gap between immigrant memory and cultural reality. For instance, as an American studying in Poland, Helen Smolenska had the opportunity to attend an authentic “village wedding,” where, to her disappointment, she noted the lapse of many expected customs. While the Polish bride did dress in her regional folk costume, Smolenska observed that the groom and his party instead chose “badly-fitted tuxedos” due to the prohibitive cost of handmade, folk-art clothing. Overall, the formerly colorful

¹⁵⁹ Alice Szczesna, “The Return,” *New American*, v. IV no. 9 (October 1937): 6, 8.

Polish peasant now seemed “a cheap imitation of a city inhabitant,” wrote Smolenska. “Unfortunately many of the customs and characteristics of the old Polish peasant are a thing of the past...,” she concluded. “...It is depressing indeed to note the slow disappearance of all of those highly interesting and symbolic customs which the older generation remembers. . . .”¹⁶⁰ While Smolenska’s account lamented the loss of Polish tradition, it also had the indirect effect of undermining immigrant claims to superior identification with a culture which had, after all, changed considerably since their pre-war migration. Indeed, Smolenska’s perception of an urbanized Polish peasantry might even hint that Chicago’s second-generation students held more in common with contemporary Poles than did their expatriate parents.

Frustrated with ethnic rhetoric, in 1936 Walter P. Wolczek of De Paul’s Polish club, Pi Sigma Phi, even went so far as to question the meaning and relevance of “Polish culture” as an identifying concept. “... [N]o one clearly indicates what it is,” he observed. “What is Polish culture? What are its constituent parts? Does it really exist and is it functional, or is it what we speak about—matter to fill the newspapers and afford good speech material?” Challenging generational claims to cultural superiority, “[d]id our parents possess it when they migrated to this country? Do they still possess the Polish culture, or did they discard the greatest portion of it?,” Wolczek asked. “Do American-born Poles possess it?” These questions returned Wolczek to his original problem of definition. If the Polish-Americans indeed did—or could—possess Polish culture, then “[d]oes it mean only Chopin’s music, Sienkiewicz’s literature, particularly *Quo Vadis*, some art, or does it have other elements of greater importance?” wondered

¹⁶⁰ Helen Smolenska, “A Krakowian Wedding Today,” *New American*, v. III no. 5 (May 1936): 1, 8.

Wolczek.¹⁶¹ For example, by memorizing long passages of the national epic *Pan Tadeusz*, were Polish college students acquiring anything of real value—or merely attempting to impress their parents, identify with a peer group, and assuage the feelings of guilt attendant on social mobility?

Reflecting “campus life” assumptions concerning community consensus and prestige, college students also challenged immigrant leadership by criticizing ethnic associational officers for their failure to unite Polish-Americans in support of broad political cultural projects. Like campus rebels and “slackers,” the immigrant generation was more concerned with individualistic rivalry than with the common good, claimed students familiar with institutional “spirit” campaigns at Loyola, De Paul, Mundelein, and other campuses. Rather than build an influential ethnic community, “.leaders of this mass are content to feud among themselves as to who among them is the greatest....,” *New American* contended in 1938. “[O]ur organizations are content to go along the lines formulated by their founders; snapping out of their lethargy only to take the opportunity to create uncomfortable irritations in their group or in some rival group.” The resulting fragmentation of Polish-American influence contributed to the ethnic group’s lackluster reputation: While “thousands” of Chicago’s German-Americans and Swedish-Americans gathered for large song festivals and choir performances, Polish-Americans formed “hundreds of choirs when there should be ten good ones” and “hundreds of small artistic clubs when there should be one great one,” *New American*

¹⁶¹Walter P. Wolczek, “What is Polish Culture?,” *New American*, v. III no. 4 (April 1936): 7.

argued.¹⁶² Similarly, in 1936 Loyolan and PSAA president Arthur Korzeneski blamed Polish-Americans' lack of political influence on the idea that "if I can't be king then I won't play."¹⁶³

Trained to seek consensus and accustomed to the orderly Parliamentary procedures of student government and CISCA committees, college students also condemned what they saw as a counterproductive individualism in the conduct of ethnic associational meetings. In 1936, for example, *New American's* humor columnist lampooned the chaos of P.N.A. politics in a piece that was reprinted in Polish-American newspapers across the country. "Did you ever go to a P.N.A. Commune meeting where members come to blows, where chairs fly in the air and tables are overturned? Well, we've had the pleasure of witnessing such scuffles before, and if you want some real fun, just get your group to send you to one as a full-fledged delegate," recommended the PSAA student columnist. "You will particularly enjoy the elections," at which, he reported, your elders will condescendingly dictate your choice of candidate. "Well, it's all the same to you, you think, so what's the diff? Besides, the beer and red hots that usually go with a caucus put you in the proper frame of mind," he continued. "But the elections are really fun. The whole commune is divided into two camps—yours and the enemy. You growl and scowl at the others, and if they want to say anything, as for example, put up their candidate, it's up to you to make a lot of noise—like a hooting owl—anything at all—and then when the other side reciprocates in kind you call back at them in your fiercest manner, "ty jestes swinia" [you are a pig] or something equally

¹⁶² "Lost—Five Million Americans," *New American*, v. V no. 6 (June-July 1938): 4.

¹⁶³ "I Just Thought," *New American*, v. IV no. 11 (December 1937): 7.

devastating,” he hyperbolized. “Then the armed detectives remaining in the back of the room until now begin to edge up toward the front—until the fray gets warmer and hotter and another meeting is broken up at 2 a.m.”¹⁶⁴ The satire was apt: Reportedly even Polish-American editors had to admit its the kernel of truth.¹⁶⁵ To trained student leaders who regularly ran and participated in formal meetings of student government, CISCA, Sodality, and various campus clubs, the open conflict of their parents’ associations seemed backward, pointless, even laughable.

To counter these perceived flaws in immigrants’ cultural constructions and organizational conduct, PSAA student leaders developed alternatives based on their experience of Catholic “campus life.” Indeed, under Loyolans Korzeneski and Penar, the PSAA appeared to borrow community-building strategies directly from Loyola University’s student campaigns to enhance the reputation of Catholic extracurricular life. In 1936, for example, president Korzeneski urged readers to support the P.S.A.A. and its organ in language that recalled Loyola’s “school spirit” editorials. “The battle-cry is: ‘Back *The New American!*’ Read it, subscribe to it, get all your friends to subscribe,” he editorialized. “It is *your* paper. It is for you, and every member of the P.S.A.A. should consider it a personal responsibility to do all in his power to boost the only publication of its kind in America! . . . The individual members—the whole organization—everyone should show a personal interest in the publication.” Again, Korzeneski stressed that “unity and cooperation” were necessary to achieve “the success we are after as an

¹⁶⁴ “With Humorous Intent, By the Gadfly,” *New American*, v. III no. 7 (September 1936): 5.

¹⁶⁵ “With Humorous Intent, By the Gadfly,” *New American*, v. III no. 8 (October 1936): 4.

organization.”¹⁶⁶ His language bore remarkable similarity to Loyola editors’ often heavyhanded appeals for greater student support of extracurricular publications, plays, athletics, dances, and even Masses, all of which contributed to the perceived “success” of the institutional campus community.

PSAA programs, too, seemed influenced by the Catholic campus. For example, recalling the efforts of Loyola Catholic Actionists to recruit high school students for admission to Catholic (as opposed to public) colleges and universities, under Korzeneski’s administration the National Council of P.S.A.A. in Chicago resolved to structure outreach and mentorship programs that would encourage Polish-American high-schoolers to enter college and stay there. PSAA upperclassmen should “visit high-schools where Polish youth studies, and lecture to them about university life, at the same time illustrating their lectures with the proper publications of the universities found in the locality,” the National Council declared, a direction reminiscent of Loyola students’ recruitment efforts at local high schools. On campus, ethnic upperclassmen should also “offer protection and aid to the lower-classmen.”¹⁶⁷ This ongoing mentorship was necessary, reflected the National Council, due to the financial disadvantages that discouraged Polish-Americans from choosing a college career. “With a very few exceptions a Polish student must count on financial aid from outside his immediate family to carry on his studies,” it wrote. Therefore “[u]pon the student organizations lies

¹⁶⁶ Arthur L. Korzeneski, “A Personal Appeal,” *New American*, v. III no. 4 (April 1936): 10.

¹⁶⁷ “A Bulletin from the National Council of P.S.A.A. in Chicago,” *New American*, v. V no. 4 (April 1938): 4.

the responsibility of expanding protection and friendly aid to its fellow members.”¹⁶⁸

Like members of a campus booster club, the new, Chicago-based PSAA leadership encouraged Polish-American students to make serious individual commitments to the greater good of their ethnic community on the campus as well as in the neighborhood

In attempting to work out accessible and useful understandings of Polish culture and ethnicity, PSAA students also argued that the essence of Polish literature, art, and music was its moral force, its self-sacrificial “Polish spirit”—an idea that recalled Catholic Action’s synthesis of communal “school spirit” with the religious obligation of service to others and support of New Deal Americanism. According to *New American*, the “Polish spirit” was the individual ability to heroically sacrifice personal needs and desires for the ideal of national liberty, whether that nation be Poland or the United States. One found the “Polish spirit,” for example, in the nineteenth-century novels of Henryk Sienkiewicz, whose heroes renounced romance, ambition, and pleasure in order to fight for Poland’s freedom from various invaders; in the unrestrained passion of Chopin’s piano music; in Polish Romanticism as a whole. Students argued that knowledge of these Polish works was crucial to the second-generation’s contribution to America, which *New American* interpreted as primarily moral and spiritual. “If we Americans of Polish descent are to contribute to American culture, we must be qualified. . . *spiritually* through a knowledge of our background,” declared an April 1939 editorial

¹⁶⁸ “A Bulletin from the National Council of P.S.A.A. in Chicago,” *New American*, v. V no. 4 (April 1938): 4.

[italics mine]. “. . . Poles have had the strength to live and die for freedom, and we must be sure that these characteristics do not disappear in our youth.”¹⁶⁹

Similarly, “. . .by adherence to Polish culture we do not mean the constant recital of the achievements of Kosciuszko and Pulaski,” another editorial clarified in March 1939. “Less bragging about them and more inquiry into the traditions of the Polish spirit which forced them to fight for the liberty of the United States is what Polish-American youth needs.” Addressing generational misunderstandings, the author also argued that immigrants’ appreciation of the applicability of Polish culture to Americanism had been inadequate due to the precedence of economic needs. While “[t]hey [our parents] were too busy working to show how well their racial traditions had fitted them for this liberty-loving America,” the author explained, “[w]e, their sons, were to make that contribution by our ability to work, to speak, to write, to do everything which would show their love and ours for America and Poland. . .”¹⁷⁰ Again, the heart of the Polish culture was interpreted as an active “love,” a spiritual impulsion “to do everything,” to give oneself completely.

While concern for Polish language persisted, the PSAA promoted language skills, not as an expectation or a litmus test of ethnic identity, but as the ideal means of access to the spiritual resources inherent in Polish literature. “A knowledge of Polish will permit our youth to sound the depths of Polish history and literature and this in turn will permit

¹⁶⁹ “The Duty of Our Educated,” *New American*, v. VI no. 4-5 (April-May 1939): 1.

¹⁷⁰ “Let Us Look into Our Traditions,” *New American*, v. VI no. 3 (March 1939): 1.

it to know its own depth,” argued a 1939 editorial.¹⁷¹ In this context translations of Polish literature into English also acquired new value and respectability. Previously, in 1929 *The Polish Student*—possibly envying enthusiasm for Constance Garnett’s recent translations of Russian authors—had encouraged Polish translation projects with the goal of exposing a general American audience to the great works of Polish literature, thereby enhancing Poland’s cultural reputation in the English-speaking American mainstream. The translations, however, were for non-ethnics, implied the newspaper: Of course Polish-Americans themselves would read these works in their original Polish.¹⁷² By contrast, in the mid-1930s PSAA students increasingly prioritized access to the heroic “spirit” of Polish culture over its language of communication. In 1936, for instance, *New American* published an excerpt from an English translation of Henryk Sienkiewicz’s *With Fire and Sword* apparently for the edification of its Polish-American readers.¹⁷³ Moreover, *New American* also increasingly praised English-language literary interpretations of Polish history, such as American Eric P. Kelly’s novel *The Trumpeter of Krakow* and his poem “The Golden Star of Halich.”¹⁷⁴

The Korzeneski administration’s tendency to borrow Loyola’s community-building strategies and “spiritualize” Polish culture in part reflected Catholic student leaders’ latent conviction that the Church—not the ethnic association—was Polish-American youth’s most significant patron. This implicit position brought the PNA

¹⁷¹ “The Duty of Our Educated,” *New American*, v. VI no. 4-5 (April-May 1939): 1.

¹⁷² C.F. Wells, “A Possible Field of Activity: On Translating Polish Literature,” *The Polish Student* (October 1929): 6.

¹⁷³ *New American* (November 1936): 3.

¹⁷⁴ Victoria Janda, “The Golden Star of Halich,” *New American* (November 1936): 2.

affiliate surprisingly close to the rival PRCU's argument for an essential connection between Catholicism and "Polishness." When, for example, in 1936 De Paul student Walter P. Wolczek inquired if Polish culture meant "only Chopin's music, Sienkiewicz's literature, particularly *Quo Vadis*, some art, or does it have other elements of greater importance?" his line of questioning seemed to hint at a thinness in the PNA's secular emphasis on the fine arts as opposed to religious values.¹⁷⁵

While in the interest of inclusion P.N.A. affiliates officially avoided associating their ethnic organization with any specific religious group, over the course of his presidency Korzeneski quietly departed from this policy, lending PSAA support to Catholic Action initiatives promoted on the Loyola campus. For example, in May 1938 he and other officers signed, on behalf of the entire PSAA, an unidentified pledge committing Polish-American students to avoid "lewd" media and refrain from patronizing establishments that distributed it. Undoubtedly this document was the Legion of Decency pledge.¹⁷⁶

Further clarifying his Catholic loyalties, in November 1938 Korzeneski awarded the PSAA's Medal of Honor to Cardinal Mundelein—a definite slap in the face to Polish immigrant leaders who had struggled against Mundelein's Americanizing policies during the 1920s. Korzeneski explained his choice by hinting that, unlike the contentious and nationalistic ethnic associations with their narrow overseas focus, the Church had taken an active interest in Polish-American youth. "The young men and women of our association... often feel a sense of appreciation to some men and women

¹⁷⁵Walter P. Wolczek, "What is Polish Culture?," *New American*, v. III no. 4 (April 1936): 7.

¹⁷⁶"Officers Sign Pledge for P.S.A.A.," *New American*, v. V no. 5 (May 1938): 7.

older than they who have by their interest and understanding, or actual aid, or even by their conduct in public and private life, done something for youth and its cause....” he said. “This token of esteem will in some small measure express the inner feelings of the young men and women of America and particularly those of the PSAA.”¹⁷⁷ No doubt it expressed as much resentment toward ethnic association leadership as it did admiration for the Chicago Archdiocese.

The Medal of Honor did not necessarily express the “inner feelings” of all PSAA students, however: In July 1937 Northwestern student Alex Olszewski opposed Korzeneski’s re-election on the grounds that Korzeneski had made many important decisions unilaterally, without consulting other members of the organization. As an example, Alex cited the awarding of the Medal of Honor. While PSAA voters did re-elect Korzeneski to the presidency, the very close election reflected an almost even split within the organization, suggesting that at best Korzeneski’s policies represented the mindset of half of his constituency.¹⁷⁸

Nevertheless, in applying their experiences of Catholic student community to the second-generation ethnic organization, these Polish-American students creatively addressed perceived problems and inadequacies in the associational life that their parents had structured. Students felt that the immigrant generation unfairly prioritized Poland over Polonia; clung to lingual standards that excluded upwardly-mobile youth from associational leadership; and focused on petty rivalries to the exclusion of constructive

¹⁷⁷ “Medal of Honor,” *New American*, v. V no. 8 (November 1938): 4.

¹⁷⁸ “Arthur L. Korzeneski Reelected President of the Polish Students and Alumni Association,” *New American* v. IV no. 7 (July 1937): 1.

action. In response, Chicago's Polish-American Catholic youth appropriated the collegiate value and rhetoric of self-sacrificial community "spirit" to develop an ideological concept of Polishness that closely related them to campus Catholicism, where they did find leadership opportunities, concern for local social reform, and orderly Parliamentary procedure. Hoping to construct a viable second-generation Polish-American community, students also drew upon the community-building strategies of the Catholic campus to develop ethnic support networks and create appealing communications media. Ultimately, this case study of the application of Chicago Catholic student leadership to the Polish-American youth organization suggests that the ethnic fraternal experience had a transformative effect on second-generation ethnicity, developing ideological and spiritual interpretations of ethnic identity that could ease students' transition from the immigrant home to American society. On campus as in parish neighborhoods, the Church served as a way-station.

In conclusion: during the interwar period the forms of American "Greek" student organization provided liminal groups with a means of building solidarity and expressing difference, while at the same time structuring their participation in American campus life. For example, at Loyola and De Paul, religiously-defined "Catholic" fraternities enabled students to increase the prestige of Catholic institutional life while also promoting Catholic collegiate distinctiveness. On the Catholic campuses of Mundelein, De Paul, and Loyola—especially Loyola—ethnically-restricted fraternities and sororities, often extensions of broader ethnic associations, provided second-

generation students with a means of retaining ethnic identity and while also relating to the overarching, Catholicized campus life. Catholic Action's commitment to New Deal Americanism, however, resulted in the elimination of formally segregated organizations. Anti-fascist pressures ended Loyola's Italian-American fraternity; while interracialism removed ethnic restrictions from Polish-American and African-American organizations. A case study of the Polish Americans suggests, however, that, while they lasted, ethnic fraternities of Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein brought ethnic students into contact with Catholic Action rhetoric and strategies that reshaped—and perhaps helped to Americanize--second-generation communities.

CHAPTER SIX

A “CHURCH MILITANT”: GENDER AND RELIGION IN DEPRESSION AND WAR

After the United States entered World War II in December 1941, Catholic students had plenty of time to ponder the personal implications. Enrolled in various Army, Navy, and Marine reserve education programs, most Loyola men would not be called to active service until the spring semester of 1943.¹ In the meantime, morale was low. Junior William B. O’Connell, editor of the school newspaper, described the mood as one of “pessimistic uncertainty.” “Among other things the great majority of the student body was troubled with indecision whether... to devote time to study when chances of completion of one’s education appear increasingly slim, etc.,” he reflected late in 1942. “Indeed many of the more depressed students had taken the stand to forget studies and have fun as long as possible.”² At Mundelein College, women also struggled to choose between their studies and the patriotic duties—and gains—of defense work. “...[I]t is not surprising that that collegians are prone to reconsider the advantages of continuing their college education,” wrote Mundelein student Ruth O’ Hearn in February 1942.

¹ “Urge Students to Stay in School Until Called,” *Loyola News* (12 January 1943) 1.

² “From Pessimism to Optimism,” *Loyola News* (9 December 1942) 2.

Today many students, perplexed by the general chaos, are dismayed to see in their present mode of life no apparent contribution to national defense.”³

In response to student anxiety and malaise, Loyola educators and student leaders made an aggressive effort to assert the importance of religious education by interpreting wartime military service as an extension and fulfillment of Catholic gender roles articulated during the Depression. Mundelein women, too, endeavored to justify continued academic pursuits by constructing campus life as a “Prayer-and-Study-Front” that enabled women to spiritually join in men’s active service of God and country, thereby relating their more passive wartime role to the Catholic Action leadership position that college women established during the 1930s. However, religious interpretations of wartime military culture invested a great deal of Catholicism’s importance and relevance into the spiritual experiences of Catholic men and women—an investment that proved risky when draftees and students did not always experience the war in the ways they had been led to expect.

In Depression

Wartime interpretations of gender developed from the discursive background of Depression-era Catholic Action. Throughout the 1920s and 30s CISCA frequently employed the catechetical phrase “Church Militant” to denote Catholics on earth, as opposed to in heaven (Church Triumphant) and purgatory. Building upon the phrase’s militaristic connotations, students often drew upon the metaphor of a “Church Militant” at war with paganism to express both male and female students’ commitment to

³ Ruth O’Hearn, “We Also Serve,” *Mundelein College Review* (February 1942): 169.

reforming society according to Catholic principles. Though not uncommon in Christianity, the military metaphor was a historical favorite of the Jesuits, whose founder, St. Ignatius Loyola, was a fifteenth-century Spanish nobleman who experienced his formative conversion while recovering from a battle wound. Drawing upon this heritage, Loyola University presented its curricula and community life as a sort of medieval boot camp for Catholics' crusade for the domination or redemption of American society. As discussed in chapter 2, at Loyola performances of Daniel Lord's *Pageant of Youth* had interpreted study and graduation in terms of knighthood training: At commencement, Alma Mater knighted her graduates; armed them with a sword "of justice" and armor to shield their purity; and sent them to battle the evils of Ambition and Pleasure, who dressed as Muslims in a visual linkage of medieval crusades to modern-day cultural struggles.⁴

Carrying on this tradition, in his 1933 Catholic Action program Reiner described the individual Catholic as a "soldier of Christ, a member of Christ's army which is always in active service," whose "glorious calling" was to "secure for the social gospel of Christ, as interpreted by His representatives on earth... recognition and application." Throughout the 1930s CISCA opened its General Meetings with a song proclaiming "An army of youth/ Flying the standards of truth..."⁵ Individual schools maintained "service flags" on which stars represented, not military servicemen, but students who had entered the priesthood or religious life, wherein they conducted "the continuous warfare that the

⁴ *Pageant of Youth, A Musical Masque by the Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S.J., Presented by The Catholics of Chicago in the Loyola University Alumni Gym*, (Chicago: Loyola University, 1923).

⁵ Minutes, 1933-1938, CISCA Records, Box 2, Folder 18, Loyola University Archives, Chicago, IL.

Church must wage against the powers of darkness.”⁶ Within CISCA ranks, the elite “Crusaders for the Catholic Revolution,” describing themselves as “SHOCK-TROOPS” for social reform, discussed the “Qualifications of Militants” and debated the Jocist technique of mobilizing cultural resistance through the formation of “cells” that would target and convert portions of the community. While the Crusaders’ actual activities were benign—for instance, distributing Catholic literature and boycotting businesses that appeared to mistreat workers—the rhetoric surrounding their projects suggested combat, confrontation, even an explosive quality.⁷

Underlying this aggressively masculine interpretation of Catholic Action, however, were student insecurities regarding female participation and leadership, both in Catholic Action and higher education in general. This was especially true at Loyola. While De Paul had been a fully coeducational university since its charter in 1907, Loyola, “Mother of Men,”⁸ relegated female students to the downtown campus alongside law, medical, and graduate students, leaving Rogers Park as a masculine preserve. Loyola’s Arts campus in Rogers Park would remain all male until 1950 when—having obtained the necessary permissions from Rome—Loyola cautiously admitted a few female students to its North-Side science courses. In 1952 Loyola’s nursing program was transferred to Rogers Park, thereby establishing a female presence on campus. However,

⁶ Sister Mary Roberta Bauer, S.S.N.D., “CISCA—An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists,” (M.A. Thesis, De Paul University, 1945): 55.

⁷ Crusaders for the Catholic Revolution, [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 2, Folder 25; “Ceremonial for Admission,” n.d., CISCA Records, Box 2, Folder 25.

⁸ This was a “school spirit” epithet by which Loyola students referred to their alma mater. For an example, see “Welcome to Loyola!” *Loyola News* (16 March 1937): 10.

not until 1965 would Loyola policy allow female applicants “unrestricted acceptance” to the Arts campus.⁹

Throughout the 1930s Loyola’s student community tended to discourage or ignore the participation of its female members. In 1932 the university’s student council adopted a new constitution that explicitly excluded female student representation, arguing that “Loyola was strictly a men’s University and that women students would form their own Union if they were really interested in Student Government for themselves.”¹⁰ Historian Ellen Skerrett also observes that in 1934 Jesuit censors’ interest in projecting wholesome institutional images discouraged the *Loyola News* from publishing photographs of female students—whether modestly dressed or not--thereby excluding Loyola women from an important visual record of university life.¹¹ In 1934 female Loyolans likewise complained that male student editors neglected to report women’s activities at the downtown campus, further reinforcing Loyola’s commitment to a masculine image.¹²

Relations with all-female Mundelein College further demonstrated a perceived need to designate “male” and “female” territory. Gender segregation could serve women’s interests: When the adjacent campus of Mundelein College opened in Fall 1930, B.V.M. policy dictated that Loyola men required an invitation to enter Mundelein grounds. The sisters intended this restriction to secure the Mundelein campus as private

⁹ Ellen Skerrett, *Born in Chicago: A History of Chicago’s Jesuit University* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 2008), 171-172.

¹⁰ A *Loyola News* editorial recalled this event in 1934. “Women Students,” *Loyola News* (6 November 1934): 4.

¹¹ Ellen Skerrett, *Born in Chicago: A History of Chicago’s Jesuit University*, 153.

¹² “Women Students,” *Loyola News* (6 November 1934): 4.

and controlled space for women's education.¹³ Despite a demonstrated eagerness to arrange dances and debates with Mundelein women, Loyola students were sensitive to female transgressions of what sociologist Charles S. Suchar terms the "extended campus"¹⁴—in this case, nearby Rogers Park restaurants. A 1930 letter to the *Loyola News* editor, for example, applauded the B.V.M. sisters' decision to keep Mundelein students in the Skyscraper building during the lunchtime rush, leaving local hangouts to the college men.¹⁵ As with their contemporary students at secular single-sex institutions, gendered space held meaning for Depression-era Loyola and Mundelein students, for whom the boundary between the adjoining campuses was sacrosanct.

Reflecting this predisposition to separate genders, when the Loyola-founded CISCORA federation first drew men's and women's Catholic organizations into a coeducational structure and common activities, the immediate outcome had been anxiety—especially for high school and college men, who, accustomed to the predominance of all-female devotional societies in their local Catholic parishes, already struggled with perceptions of Catholic piety as somewhat "feminine" in aesthetic. According to the 1935 CISCA history composed by Mundelein students Virginia Woods and Catherine Heerey, while discussing the possibility of federating Catholic student groups in 1928 some Loyola sodalists expressed concern that men in general would be

¹³This resulted more from B.V.M. policy of creating a secure and private space for women's education. Prudence A. Moylan, "The Mundelein Skyscraper: Building Space for Women," in Ann Harrington and Prudence Moylan, eds, *Mundelein Voices: The Women's College Experience, 1930-1991* (Chicago: Gannon Center for Women and Leadership, 2001): 330-54; 43.

¹⁴ Charles S. Suchar, "The Little University Under the El," in *DePaul University: Centennial Essays and Images* (Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing) 149.

¹⁵ King, "Student Comment," *Loyola News* (7 October 1930): 2.

reluctant to discuss religion openly among themselves—and especially in front of women—for fear of compromising their masculinity. “The boys won’t talk because the girls will be there, and the girls won’t talk because the boys will be there; and if the boys are alone, they won’t talk at all—at least not on religious subjects,” went their argument. The 1935 pamphlet, however, added that an opposing faction invoked the example of gender co-operation in the Eucharistic Congress to suggest that coeducational religious activity was possible.¹⁶

For female students, it proved remarkably possible. While unstated tradition reserved the CISCA presidency for Loyola men, relegating Mundelein women (again by tradition) to the supporting roles of treasurer and secretary, CISCA’s federal structure provided Catholic women ample opportunity to preside over committees and institutional subcommittees; host committee meetings at their respective schools; and, at least in the federation’s early years, report publicly on their committee and subcommittee activities to the General Meeting. Indeed, Chicago’s preponderance of all-female Catholic high schools ensured that female voices dominated the early CISCORA conventions. For example, in May 1932 female chairs presented fully 17 out of 18 student committee and subcommittee reports scheduled for CISCORA’s General Meeting. Similarly, the February 1934 General Meeting program shows that seven out of eleven reports were presented by female chairs, while in November 1934 women gave eight out of twelve reports. Even after CISCA’s new program curtailed the proliferation of committee and subcommittee business, in February 1938 women represented four out of eight student

¹⁶ “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action,” (1935), CISCA Records, Box 1 Folder 4: 14; Honor CISCA Founder in Memorial Pamphlet,” *Skyscraper* (8 March 1935): 2

speakers on the General Meeting program—a marked decrease from CISCORA days, but nevertheless a respectable 50%.¹⁷ Meanwhile, CISCA’s female members spoke publicly in afternoon symposia, skits, debates, and open discussion before audiences of hundreds, even thousands. In 1932, for instance, female students comprised 50% of a CISCORA General Meeting panel on “Catholic Action and Bolshevism.”¹⁸ In addition, female leadership was evident at CISCA’s highest level of student participation: Minutes of a February 1938 CISCA Board of Directors meeting show, for example, that female students proposed four out of the meeting’s eight recorded motions and amendments, at one point even sharply countering a measure set forth by a man.¹⁹

Holding the office of CISCA secretary, Mundelein College also secured the editorship of the CISCA page in Chicago’s Archdiocesan newspaper *The New World* for college women, so that they—rather than their male peers—constructed CISCA’s image for the broader Catholic population. That immediately after Fr. Reiner’s death Mundelein students Virginia Woods and Catherine Heerey led a small group in composing the 1935 CISCA history “Crusaders in Student Catholic Action”—which presented an official interpretation of the entire CISCA movement to date and stressed the role of student initiative within the organization—shows the important role that

¹⁷ Ironically, the new CISCA educational program initiated by a woman—Sister Cecilia Himebaugh, O.S.B.—had the effect of reducing the proportion of female student presenters at the General Meeting. “Program of the Sixteenth (Fifth Anniversary) Convention” [May 5, 1932]; “Program, Twenty-First General Meeting” [February 22, 1934]; “Program, Twenty-Third General Meeting” [November 1, 1934]; “Program, Thirty-Third General Meeting,” [February 22, 1938]; all in CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 18.

¹⁸ “Program of the Sixteenth (Fifth Anniversary) Convention” [May 5, 1932] CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 18.

¹⁹ Minutes, CISCA Board of Directors Meeting, [February 5, 1938], CISCA Records Box 2 Folder 16.

female college students played in interpreting the Catholic Action organization to other CISCA members, as well as to the public.²⁰

Women's prominence in CISCA did not go unobserved: An undated, unsigned internal report fretted that the boys' high school subcommittees lagged behind the girls' schools in CISCA participation. When high-school males did lead or contribute to CISCA projects, added the report, the boys could be reluctant to publicize their work at the female-dominated committee and General meetings. "They are not prone to write letters saying what they have done, nor do the majority of them enjoy getting up in a room full of girls and telling of their accomplishments," it stated, implying that male students often found the female gaze and organizational context a threat to their masculine self-image.²¹ By discouraging male students from participating in CISCA meetings and activities, the federation's reputation for female dominance further strengthened women's hold on CISCA's lower and middle leadership ranks—and alienated men.

This level of female student influence over a broad, coeducational Christian organization was unusual in the interwar period. Indeed, comparison with historian Lori Witt's analysis of conservative Protestant female leadership at the fundamentalist institutions of Wheaton College, Baylor University, and Calvin College, suggests that, while CISCA generally replicated the same pattern of female leadership as in contemporary Protestant student groups, Catholic women exerted greater overall influence over their religious organization than did Protestant counterparts. As in

²⁰ "Honor CISCA Founder in Memorial Pamphlet," *Skyscraper* (8 March 1935): 2.

²¹ Unsigned typescript, [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 6 Folder 4.

Protestant collegiate religious organizations, in CISCA women served as committee chairs; spoke publicly; and held office—though, significantly, never the CISCA presidency. Similarly, too, CISCA’s federal structure, which identified each formal subcommittee with a particular (usually high school) campus, ensured that female subcommittee chairs often presided only over their female peers, thereby removing the possibility of conflict with males. However, at the overarching committee level female CISCA collegians also regularly chaired mixed groups of men and women, a situation that Witt finds exceptional among the Protestant student organizations of her analysis. Only a specific Protestant association aligned with the egalitarian Holiness Movement placed women in leadership over men.²² By contrast, the broad-based CISCA federation did so regularly: Secondary student Betty Lapp’s 1931 chairmanship of a special Movie Committee, which included Loyola University men, is only a single example of female leadership over a coeducational unit.²³ Female Catholic high school and college students also appeared to dominate CISCA business and publicity to a greater extent than their Protestant counterparts--debating with men, writing organizational histories, and “feminizing” CISCA’s image in the minds of many male observers. CISCA females’ level of coeducational leadership, then, appears to have been higher than that of other pious Christian college females of the period, perhaps in part reflecting the influence of assertive Catholic nuns in Chicago-area colleges and high schools.²⁴

²² Lori Witt, “More Than a ‘Slaving Wife,’” 104, 118-121, 151.

²³ “Ciscora Meets at Providence,” *Skyscraper* (27 February 1931) p.4; “CISCORA,” *Loyola News* (31 March 1931) p.3; Ciscora Conference Held at Mundelein,” *Skyscraper* (29 May 1931): 1, 4; 1.

²⁴ Lori Witt, “More Than a ‘Slaving Wife,’” 104, 118-121, 151.

To counteract the perceived femininity of CISCA and its federated groups, Loyola and De Paul publications seemed anxious to reconstruct religious participation as a “manly activity” equal in clout to athletic skill and physical prowess. For instance, in 1928 Loyola’s Dean of Men enthused to *Loyola News* reporters that “Loyola University has a spirit all its own; it is a manly sort of spirit shown on the campus.... It is a real man’s college... I have never before seen such interest in sodality activities as is manifested by the officers in the sodality at Loyola.”²⁵ In May 1938, the “He-Man” issue of *De Paulia* also described a sodalist’s Marian devotion in terms of masculinity. “Man’s love for his mother is something he prefers to hold silent in his heart, but something, nevertheless, which he rises to defend with all of the virility that is in him when any mortal casts a shadow on her name,” the editorial stated. “. . . If it is deeply natural for a man to love and revere his own mother, then nothing is more *manly* than a sincere devotion to the mother of God.”²⁶

Meanwhile, female students of Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein contended with unflattering assumptions and images that belittled their motives and intellectual potential. When in 1937 two male *Loyola News* writers presented dueling views of coeducation, for example, each article interpreted female students as a scenic distraction that diluted a campus’s intellectual atmosphere. “In schools where coeducation has been introduced the poor embattled male has invariably fallen into a pitfall—he spends so much time looking at the blonde across the aisle that he flunks out in Greek lit,” argued the anti-coeducation column. Without disputing this notion of women as scenery, even the article

²⁵ “The Inquiring Reporter,” *Loyola News*, (3 October 1928): 4.

²⁶ “A Man and His Mother,” *De Paulia* (3 May 1938): 2.

allegedly in *support* of coeducation began by arguing that the Loyola Arts college already included a large number of academic underachievers, for whom some “dainty bits of femininity cluttering up the campus” would make life “infinitely more idyllic” without inducing any major change for the worse.²⁷ Significantly, neither article credited female students with serious academic interests or potential. Indeed, the anonymous author of a 1930 letter to the *Loyola News* openly, if humorously, described himself as a “misogynist,” an admission implying a degree of social acceptance for this viewpoint.²⁸

At coeducational De Paul, negative female imagery, though lighthearted, was still more prominent. Annual “He-Man” and “Coed” issues regularly satirized the campus war between the sexes, exaggerating stereotypes of both genders but focusing particularly on the coed—a nontraditional, problematic figure, often associated with the social and sexual freedoms of the archetypal New Woman. With a condescension no doubt meant to be infuriating, for example, a 1936 “He-Man” poem associated De Paul coeds with the New Woman’s predictable efforts at sex appeal. “Blessings on thee, little dear, / Bareback lass with knees the same, / With thy turned down silken hose, / And thy cheeks red like the rose / With thy red lips reddened more / With the lipstick from the store . . .,” it cooed.²⁹ In that same 1936 issue, a ditty entitled “A Coed Speaks” depicted female students as catty, superficial, and—predictably—obsessed with fashion: “Such happiness I’ve never known, / Today has been red-letter. / A friend showed me her new spring hat, /

²⁷ Charles Strubbe and Rip Reuter, “Battle Front: Must We Choose Between Coeds and Culture? Read This and Stay in Doubt,” *Loyola News* (9 March 1937): 3. To be fair, Strubbe did conclude by arguing that it would be “selfish” to deprive “poor beknighted females” of the opportunity to receive a classical education.

²⁸ King, “Student Comment,” *Loyola News* (7 October 1930): 2.

²⁹ E.M., “To a Coed,” *De Paulia* (5 May 1936): 2.

And I liked my own much better.”³⁰ In the 1938 He-Man issue, De Paul student James Shannon’s effort, entitled “I Hate Betty Coeds,” provocatively charged “You may say what you will, they [female students] are the dumbest people in the world.”³¹

Perhaps the popular imagery contained elements of wishful thinking. Polled on the attributes of their “ideal coed,” De Paul’s Uptown men concurred that she should be pretty, amiable, and smart—but not threateningly so. “All agree that she must have intelligence without being an ‘intellectual,’” reported *De Paulia*. “She must be reasonably good looking, neat and well poised. Cheerfulness and personality complete the recipe.” Conservative in their tastes, 49 percent told pollsters that they “disapprove outright” of women who drank or smoked, since these activities detracted from a woman’s femininity.³² Hinting at a similar rationale, in 1938 an Uptown Arts student related smoking to airs of “intellectuality... and sophistication” appropriate only to the “less attractive” female.³³

According to De Paul coed Delphine Swider, this sort of advice was a merely product of the male ego. “Just when I was feeling perfectly contented with the world... I picked up a stray newspaper,” she wrote. “What did I find? Another one of those columns with full instructions to the erring female in the subtle art of fascination!” Going on, Swider observed that the male insecurity served as stereotypical femininity’s

³⁰ E.M., “A Coed Speaks,” *De Paulia* (5 May 1936): 2.

³¹ James Shannon, “I Hate Betty Coeds,” *De Paulia* (5 May 1938): 2.

³² Interestingly, De Paul’s downtown commerce and medical students were less critical of women who smoked and drank, a tendency that perhaps reflected the downtown campus’ greater diversity of class and religion. “He-Men Wrangle on Attributes of Their Ideal Coed in Extensive Survey,” *De Paulia* (26 March 1936): 3.

³³ Shane, “Trivia,” *De Paulia* (24 March 1938): 2.

main point of reference. “Be intelligent, but be sure you don’t know all the answers...,” she satirically advised the husband-hunter. “Be sure you can cook, but find some way of satisfying his ravenous hunger without instilling in him that deep dark dread that by some foul means he is about to be ‘hooked.’ (We boys have such a hard time these days. The girls simply won’t let us alone.)”³⁴

In response to college men’s replication of female stereotypes, De Paul women themselves satirized the popular image of the empty-headed coed, often exaggerating it into expressions of female domination. Playing upon the college man’s fears of female intrusion into “male” spaces, for example, in 1936 a *De Paulia* “Coed” editor described a revamped newspaper office wherein respectable masculine griminess had given way to feminine frivolity. “Sneak with me my friend into the sacred portals of the once masculine *De Paulia* office,” an editorial invited. “What’s up! Why beautiful polka-dot curtains adorn the windows which once boasted only a coat of mud. . . . The walls whereon once hung the picturesque impersonations of our masculine brethren are now bedecked with ribbons, lipstick marks, and picture[s] of Mother Nature. That horrid barrel is replaced by a mirror... The tobacco aroma is replaced by Woolworth perfume...” Even worse, teased the editor, feminine giddiness had overtaken the office’s formerly serious journalistic atmosphere. “Five girls are huddled in a corner discussing whether the Assistant editor [sic] dyes her hair, while in the other corner the girls are hoping for a war so they can show off their new knickers,” she mocked. “Upon distributing the various assignments to the coeds the Editor finds herself surrounded by

³⁴ Delphine Swide, “Stag Line,” *De Paulia* (18 March 1937): 2.

screaming females.” While preparing newspaper copy “our industrious future housewives” also managed to clean the office light fixtures, the editor further satirized.³⁵

To similarly taunt territorial male students, in 1937 the female guest editors of *De Paulia*'s Coed issue playfully asserted women's supremacy on campus through an exaggerated use of feminine symbols. Dubbing this week's paper “The Powder Puff Edition,” they caused the student newspaper to be printed on pale blue paper with delicate script headlines, thereby stamping female ownership on this traditionally male journalistic production. On the editorial page, “The Coed's Indispensable!” captioned a drawing of a fashionable female powdering her nose with a perfectly round puff, raised as solemnly as the Eucharist and surrounded by beatific clouds of talcum that completed the sacramental effect. Amid the swirls of face powder, scenes of campus life—the Arts building, the football field, the University dance—were arranged as if blessed by feminine grace.³⁶ The message was clear: Female power (or powder) was an all-pervasive, almost supernatural force on campus.

More than a power play or humorous pose, however, female students' replication of feminine stereotypes could involve a degree of self-criticism, a suggestion that the Catholic women perceived themselves—to some extent—guilty as charged. For example, in “Confessions of a Coed” De Paul CISCA prefect Amy Johnson satirized the stereotypical female's preoccupations with men and personal vanity in a column that critiqued rather than debunked the “New Woman” image. “In these excerpts from the

³⁵ “Femininity Rules De Paul; Dainty Frills Mark Regime,” *De Paulia* (26 March 1936): 5.

³⁶ “We Offer You—‘The Powder Puff Edition,’” *De Paulia* (18 March 1937): 2; “The Coed's Indispensable!,” *De Paulia* (18 March 1937): 2.

diary of any freshman coed, fictitious names are used throughout. If they should bear any similarity to those of persons attending De Paul—well!,” she wrote in disclaimer to a humorous narrative of clothes, gossip, and late-night dates with several college men, which included hints of possible drunkenness and sexual accessibility. For example, “[w]hile I was dancing with Tap Lethawl, the floor slipped—or sloped—or something, and there I was—on the floor!” gasped Johnson’s typical coed. “Hardly anyone noticed, though. . . .” Also, “[t]he evening spent with the What a Ghi’s was uneventful, except that, dressing in semi-darkness I happened to fasten on the wrong fraternity pin, (*A minuit tous les chats son gris*)...” she complained, a possibly innocent line that nevertheless implied sexual accessibility. Johnson’s “any freshman coed” furthermore objected to parental criticisms of her behavior, dismissing them with “Mother just doesn’t understand us moderns, that’s all” and citing her own early morning Mass attendance--“before going home” from an all-night party--as evidence of ongoing virtue. Rather than simply mock the negative stereotypes, Johnson pushed her female readers to consider if the satirized attitudes and situations might contain a hint of truth.³⁷ Were female Catholic students merely “New Women” who hypocritically went to Mass on Sunday?

Like De Paul coeds, Mundelein College women also assigned stereotypical female traits to incoming freshmen, although avoiding immoral connotations. Writing for her female peers, for example, a Mundelein student’s lighthearted “Definition. Of the Freshman. By a Freshman. For the Freshmen” depicted a breezy, amiable lightweight. “I am a lowly college freshman and I love it,” she wrote. “Perhaps because I am surprised to have come this far in my quest for knowledge; perhaps because Loyola is right next

³⁷ Amy Johnson, “Confessions of a Coed,” *De Paulia* (18 March 1937): 2.

door. Who knows! I like swing music but hate jitterbugging; fall asleep at operas and love Strauss waltzes; use Revlon Savoy nail polish and talk to myself and to everyone else, and at present long for three things in life—good grades at the quarterlies, a victrola, and a black velvet formal.”³⁸ Combining the usual freshman put-downs with the image of the giddy young female, the *Skyscraper* sketch suggested that female students did perceive some truth in the popular stereotyping of college women as frivolous, fashionable, and in endless pursuit of men.

Still, there was that hint of seriousness in the freshman’s allusion to a “quest for knowledge.” Unlike De Paul coeds, Mundelein students usually used the stereotypical college female as the starting point to a narrative of female intellectual and spiritual maturation that correlated a young woman’s experience of Catholic campus life with a dramatic shift in her priorities. *Skyscraper* editorials cast the Mundelein College experience as a journey of formation in “Catholic womanhood” ideals that prioritized character over outward image. “Last summer when we, as prospective freshmen, visited the smart college shops in downtown department stores, we received a more or less definite impression that our college life would not be worthwhile unless we had a new outfit for every occasion...” began a typical editorial. “Now, however, being three-quarters of a year older and wiser, we... have learned that the fashion of leadership depends on things more important than ensembles.” Rather, the collegiate “aristocracy” consisted, not of the most fashionable, but of “those students who combine the qualities of academic leadership and religious sincerity, initiative, generosity, and tolerance—the

³⁸ “The Skyline,” *Skyscraper* (20 October 1939): 2.

indispensible attributes of the well-poised Catholic college girl.”³⁹ Similarly, a 1935 editorial warned freshmen that “[p]rejudice and petty gossip must give way to open-mindedness and a practical spirit of charity, if you are to be happy” at Mundelein College.⁴⁰ A proper Catholic higher education, suggested *Skyscraper*’s editors, transformed the fluffy freshman student—the product of secular images and interests—into an informed, confident, and kind-hearted woman who was fit for social leadership.

Mundelein students constructed this ideal end product, this vision of true “Catholic womanhood,” as both timeless and indisputably “modern,” uniting traditional feminine moral virtues and domestic obligations with a progressive social outlook and encouragement of female intelligence, achievement, and initiative. In some ways this vision resembled the feminine ideal of the conservative Protestant college women of Witt’s study, which argues that during the interwar period Protestant female students stretched the meaning of Victorian womanhood ideals to accommodate—within limits—the social freedoms of the New Woman.⁴¹ Like their contemporary Protestant collegians, Mundelein’s Depression-era female students reinterpreted religious gender roles to allow for limited forms of female leadership, constructing identities that embraced modernity even as they remained rooted in Catholic tradition.

The well-formed Mundelein college graduate was a leader—a “Valiant Woman,” in the phrase of Mundelein student and CISCA member Mary Agnes Tynan (Class of 1935), whose praise of B.V.M. founder Mother Mary Isabella recurred in Mundelein

³⁹ “Quality Street on the Campus,” *Skyscraper* (27 April 1939): 2.

⁴⁰ “A Welcome and a Challenge to Our Freshmen,” *Skyscraper* (8 October 1935): 2.

⁴¹ Lori Witt, “More Than a ‘Slaving Wife,’” 272.

ceremonials of the late 1930s as the ideal and “standard for each Mundelein student.” Interpreting “Valiant” womanhood for Mundelein students in 1937, outgoing Student Activities Council president Jean McKreever pointed to Catholic women in non-traditional careers such as medicine, aviation, politics, as well as to women confronting problems of war and repression in Europe and Mexico. “What constitutes valor, it seems, is one part intelligence and one part courage,” she explained. “The intelligence aids us in recognizing that there are challenges in present-day civilization. The courage forces us to do something about them.” Following the intelligent and courageous example of the B.V.M. order, Mundelein graduates “should be the first to participate actively in Catholic reform movements, in study clubs, in alumnae associations, in Catholic action of all kinds,” McKreever stated.⁴² Consistent with this ideal of active participation, in 1936 *Skyscraper* editors hailed ’32 graduate Vera Carson as an inspiration for “Christian womanhood,” noting her yearbook entry, which listed her activities as President of the Class of ’32; President of Student Activities Council; Treasurer of the Stylus Club; member of the *Clepsydra* staff; and member of the Laetare Players, the Press Club, and the Catholic Action Society.⁴³ Far from passive, clearly Mundelein College’s ideal Catholic woman was a busy social and intellectual leader with varied interests, a commitment to enriching “campus life,” and an observable investment in collegiate Catholic Action.

Consistent with the “Valiant Woman” ideal exemplified by the B.V.M. sisters, Mundelein women also reinterpreted the Blessed Virgin Mary—a traditional model of

⁴²Jean McKreever, “Farewell Address,” *Skyscraper* (31 May 1937): 2.

⁴³ “Triumphant Finis,” *Skyscraper* (14 February 1936): 2.

female meekness and acquiescence--in modern terms of confidence, intelligence, and renewal. For example, a 1936 editorial spoke of Mary's "slow, warm strength" and "clear, forward-looking eyes," attributes suggesting wisdom, confidence, and an innovative spirit. In this view Mary's character was neither stuffy nor passive, but contemporary, vital, continually renewing: "Hers is the courage that can be drawn from the full, new-stirring earth, from freshly awakened waters..."⁴⁴ Similarly, a 1945 editorial would insist on Mary's contemporary relevance as the "Ideal Woman," reminding readers that true femininity, "today, as in Our Lady's day," was marked by unselfishness, kindness, cheerfulness, and trust in God. The Ideal Woman "gives, not for the sake of recompense, but because she thinks of others rather than of herself... She makes allowances for human frailties, and she sees the image of God in everyone she meets, respecting each one accordingly..." the editorial continued, reflecting Catholic Action values of service and personalism. Today "[l]et us think especially... of the qualities which Our Lady manifested in her human relationships," it urged, "and let us remember that she faced many of the same problems and difficulties that confront women today."⁴⁵

At Mundelein, annual May coronation ceremonies re-inforced Mary's role as a model for Catholic college women. Indeed, in May 1931 Mundelein College's inaugural May crowning explicitly aimed to encourage imitation of Mary by replacing the usual statue with a college student carefully selected for her Marian character. "We have for our model our Blessed Mother, and we adopt her ideals as our own," explained

⁴⁴ "Saluting Our Beautiful Lady in Blue," *Skyscraper* (15 May 1936): 2.

⁴⁵ "Ideal Woman Looks to Model," *Skyscraper* (19 November 1945): 2.

Skyscraper. “. . . . Is it not logical that we recognize and honor that student among us who, in her daily life, lives up most closely to that ideal which is the end of all our years of training?” Clarifying the criteria, *Skyscraper* explained that “[w]e are not choosing our most beautiful girl, necessarily. We are not having a popularity contest.” Rather, “[w]e are paying tribute to the girl whose sweetness of character, whose sense of responsibility and civic interest, in short, whose devotion to duty and Catholic womanliness set her apart as being the girl who seems best to have realized in herself the characteristics of our *Mater admirabilis*.”⁴⁶ As subsequent May coronations involved the usual Marian statue as opposed to a college woman draped in blue and white, the innovation did not stick—but the very experiment demonstrated an intention of inspiring Mundelein students toward a modern Mary-likeness that added a broader “sense of responsibility and civic interest” to the more passive “sweetness of character.”

Mundelein extracurricular groups’ replication of the May coronation ceremony further connected female leadership with Marian ideology. The popular ritual occurred on the Mundelein campus several times each May, as, in addition to the all-College coronation, organizations such as Sodality and the Classical Club staged their own, individual tableaux, in which club presidents crowned a statue of Mary while members served as ladies-in-waiting.⁴⁷ In May 1935 even the science club members planned a traditional coronation in the College’s Stella Maris chapel, where “each of the white-veiled science students will kneel at the shrine, leaving a rose and a spiritual gift for Our

⁴⁶ “Our May Coronation,” *Skyscraper* (30 April 1931) p.2. Student Irene O’Connell represented Mary in the 1931 May coronation, where Vera Carson placed a wreath of flowers on her head. “Combine Coronation & Mother’s Program,” *Skyscraper* (29 May 1931): 1.

⁴⁷ Margaret Grace, “College Chronicle,” *Clepsydra* v. II no. 4 (Spring 1932): 79.

Lady.” *Skyscraper* articles often celebrated Mundelein science majors for challenging academic gender stereotypes and expanding women’s professional opportunities—but student editors observed nothing surprising or contradictory in this anticipated scene of modern, unconventional women, demurely veiled for devotion to a Biblical housewife.⁴⁸ After all, to Mundelein students, leadership, innovation, and “valiance” were Marian qualities.

Re-interpreting and establishing continuity with traditional figures enabled Mundelein women to assert a place in the modern world while maintaining their Catholic identity. Indeed, the female Catholic students understood themselves and their college as modern, even cutting edge. Mundelein is a “twentieth-century institution in the heart of one of the finest sections of Chicago, and thereby calls for a twentieth-century spirit,” declared *Skyscraper* in 1931.⁴⁹ Later that year, student Evelyn Lincoln exclaimed “We are modern young women! We are twentieth century to our finger-tips.”⁵⁰ Throughout the 1930s Mundelein students often referenced their Catholic college’s urban location and skyscraper architecture as evidence of a bold, forward-looking intellectual atmosphere. This attitude would continue throughout the Second World War, as evidenced by a Mundelein student’s interesting argument that the stability and “certainty” of Catholic doctrine enabled contemporary Catholics to “build in starkly modern

⁴⁸ “Science Department Holds May Crowning,” *Skyscraper* (6 May 1935): 3.

⁴⁹ “School Spirit,” *Skyscraper* (30 January 1931): 2.

⁵⁰ Evelyn Lincoln, “New Things or Old?,” *Skyscraper* (20 November 1931): 2.

designs,” confident in the knowledge that they shared a “secure heritage of joy” with Mary and the saints.⁵¹

However, Mundelein students often interpreted their own modernity, not as an embracing of popular culture, but as evidence of their own cultural leadership: American women had finally rediscovered Catholic women’s timeless values! For instance, a 1931 *Skyscraper* editorial argued that that many of New Woman’s athletic “physical freedoms”—competitive games, horsemanship, archery, etc.—had been practiced, often in a “superior way,” by the Catholic women of ancient and medieval times.⁵² Progress in this sense was less an innovation than a secular recovery of a lost religious culture. Likewise, when a 1936 Louisiana State University study proclaimed character, not clothes, to be the key to collegiate popularity, *Skyscraper* editors gloated: “I told you so.” “This is the doctrine that has been at the heart of the ‘Mary-likeness’ movement,” they wrote; “this is the fact that Catholic teachers have been impressing, or trying to impress, upon their students for centuries—that external adornments are not all-important, that true charm and loveliness lie in the building up of our inner selves.”⁵³ Similarly, in 1939 *Skyscraper* exulted in the obsolescence of the flapper and a subsequent trend toward the ladylike appearance and conduct that characterized “Catholic womanhood” ideals. “It is pleasant to realize that the little things we’ve always done instinctively are once more in vogue,” mused the editor. “Deference to age and dignity

⁵¹ Mary Louise Hector, “In the Manner of Mary,” *Mundelein College Review* v. 15 no.3 (May 1945): 200-206.

⁵² Evelyn Lincoln, “New Things or Old?,” *Skyscraper* (20 November 1931): 2.

⁵³ “Note to Personalities: Take Heart!,” *Skyscraper* (31 March 1936): 2.

and authority, consideration for the feelings of others, in fact all of the little social graces... are no longer quaintly suggestive only of the convent-school girl.” Indeed, “the gay young thing of yesterday, whose greatest sport, theoretically, was treading on other people’s toes, is, figuratively and literally, as passé as a raccoon coat,” while “[t]he girl of tomorrow is preeminently feminine, preeminently intent on being ‘queenly’ ...”⁵⁴

Interestingly, this timeless, “queenly,” Marian aspect of Catholic womanhood, however, evoked a chivalric model of gender relations that could seem to undermine the concept of a pioneering “Valiant Woman.” In the chivalric model so often referenced in Jesuit Sodality culture, the Queen of Heaven did not herself perform deeds of courage, but rather nurtured, inspired, and extended moral protection to her male knights.⁵⁵ Likewise, *Skyscraper* articles sometimes argued or implied that the good behavior of Catholic men depended on the merits of deserving women. For example, in the 1936 editorial “Model Wives Make Model Husbands,” *Skyscraper* placed female virtue at the unequivocal heart of male character formation. If a Catholic woman truly “seeks a modern Joseph—sincere, dependable, generous, considerate—to pilot her through life,” argued the editorial, she should first concentrate on the formation of her own character, which would set the tone of her future husband’s. “Is she cognizant that the traits which she demands in him must be nourished on similar characteristics which he will seek in her?,” the editorial asked. “...[I]s she fully aware that Joseph was the

⁵⁴ “In the Modern... Manners,” *Skyscraper* (20 October 1939): 2.

⁵⁵ For examples, see Daniel A. Lord, S.J., *The New Sodality Manual* (St. Louis, MO: Queen’s Work, 1945) pp. 5-6; and *Pageant of Youth, A Musical Masque by the Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S.J., Presented by The Catholics of Chicago in the Loyola University Alumni Gym*, (Chicago: Loyola University, 1923).

ideal husband because Mary, HER model, was the ideal wife?”⁵⁶ Similarly, a 1939 editorial urged Catholic women to be worthy of male courtesy. “We must confess that our generation has demanded from its escorts attentions which it hasn’t always earned,” the article stated. “We have enjoyed the regal feeling of sweeping through gallantly held doors, of wearing orchids or gardenias or violets.” Fortunately, now “we are realizing that the duties of ‘being royalty’ are quite as pleasurable as its privileges”—these royal “duties” including self-forgetfulness, kindness, and the cultivation of a sweet temperament.⁵⁷

In the context of traditional Christian female submission to male authority, such arguments could be empowering: While a good Catholic woman deferred to her husband’s authority, she also exerted a crucial moral influence over his character and his actions. Emphasis on this influence affirmed female readers’ power within the marital relationship without endangering the structure of Catholic gender roles. In a similar manner, the Protestant women of Witt’s study reinterpreted traditional wifely submission to accommodate a woman’s voice in argument and a more companionate sharing of decisions, thereby raising women’s status without toppling the household construct.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, while Catholic female “queenliness” could imply female leadership—the attribute of the “Valiant Woman”—it still limited a Catholic wife’s role to inspiration rather than initiative or accomplishment.

⁵⁶ “Model Wives Make Model Husbands,” *Skyscraper* (13 March 1936): 2.

⁵⁷ “In the Modern... Manners,” *Skyscraper* (20 October 1939): 2.

⁵⁸ Lori Witt, “More Than a ‘Slaving Wife,’” 272.

Indeed, Catholic Action did not promote a radical shift in “woman’s sphere”; rather, like Protestant Progressivism, it enlarged women’s Victorian domestic “motherhood” role to include academic and civic participation.⁵⁹ As with Witt’s conservative Protestant women, however, the household remained the focus of a Catholic laywoman’s responsibilities.⁶⁰ Stopping to speak at Mundelein College en route to Rome, in April 1931 Mexican Catholic Action organizer Dr. Miquel Dario Miranda referenced Pope Pius XI in declaring that “the center of women’s activities is in the family, and therefore all educational work for women should be centered around the preparation, development, and defense of the Catholic home.”⁶¹ Echoing this theme, a 1936 *Skyscraper* photo essay evoked domestic femininity in its title “Can She Bake A Cherry Pie?” while captions tied women’s academic progress to this kitchen accomplishment. “... Yes, and she can understand the principle that keeps it fresh,” captioned a photograph of science students learning about refrigeration. As botany students used the solarium, editors chirped “Yes, and she can even grow the cherries.” Additional captions included “Yes... and she can discover its vitamin content in the chemistry laboratory”; and “... Yes, and she can estimate its nutritive effect upon skeletal structure.”⁶² While celebrating female students’ intellectual achievements, the essay

⁵⁹ Barbara Miller Solomon, *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 109-111, 123-124; Linda K. Kerber and Jane Sherron De Hart, eds, *Women’s America: Refocusing the Past* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 229-230.

⁶⁰ Lori Witt, “More Than a ‘Slaving Wife,’” 282-283.

⁶¹ “Leader of Catholic Action in Mexico Visits Mundelein,” *Skyscraper* (30 April 1931): 1, 4; 1.

⁶² “Can She Bake a Cherry Pie?,” *Skyscraper* (6 November 1936): 4.

nevertheless interpreted them as extending or supporting that central role of homemaker. Female scholars were not necessary excused from baking that cherry pie.

In 1935 a humorous note in *Skyscraper's* gossip column likewise reinforced that homemaking was a woman's expected role. "We heartily commend the literary aspirations of our various students, but we feel the need of a gentle warning against too great absorption in the Muse," it began. "During house cleaning last week, Loretta Brady, editor-in-chief of the *Clepsydra* [literary quarterly], decided to set the table between intervals of verse writing. Imagine her chagrin when she discovered, after half finishing the task, that the table had just been varnished!"⁶³ Brady's fault had been "too great absorption in the Muse," and, while the joke was gentle, it nevertheless suggested that a Mundelein student could not allow her intellectual ambitions to overshadow her domestic duties.

Even when debating "the problem of the woman in business as a detriment to the home and to society" in March 1937, Mundelein Home Economics students never contested the assumption that the home was a Catholic woman's focal point.

Approaching career mainly as an extension of home interests, CISCA member Catherine Heerey argued that women's professional experience complemented the domestic sphere, since a career developed financial and administrative skills that improved women's household management and enabled them to support the family if the need arose.

Moreover, as "homemaking today is not a full-time position," Heerey argued that married women had a right to personal enrichment and a duty to improve society through the application of their particular talents. Opposing Heerey's position, Agnes Keeley

⁶³ "A.M. to P.M.," *Skyscraper* (13 December 1935): 3.

countered that career women were inept and reluctant housekeepers who contributed even less time to the parish and community than they did to the family. Furthermore, married women should not hold onto jobs that single women sorely needed. According to *Skyscraper*, Keeley wound up her argument by stating simply that “a woman’s place is in the home.” Unfortunately the newspaper did not state what, if any, consensus was reached in the ensuing discussion.⁶⁴ Since many Mundelein graduates did become professionals—and since, in 1931 the Mundelein debate team successfully argued that women should take their place in public life, against Loyola’s friendly opposition—one might speculate that many Mundelein women agreed with Heerey’s position. However, that by 1940 many Mundelein alumnae had reportedly “abandoned business careers for marriage” also suggested considerable support for Keeley’s assessment of marriage as a full-time career.⁶⁵ Both Heerey’s and Keeley’s arguments nevertheless justified women’s outside interests through reference to the home, thereby identifying it as an educated Catholic woman’s primary responsibility.

Despite these limits to their “valiance,” when discussing or demonstrating personal spirituality Mundelein women of the 1930s still strongly identified with the military metaphor so popular in Jesuit Catholic Action rhetoric. In promoting the College’s annual retreat in 1931, for example, students compared a battlefield opportunity “to construct new plans or re-construct old ones, to obtain more ammunition, to heal the wounded, and to bury the dead” to retreat goals of reinforcing spiritual

⁶⁴ “Home Economics Group Discusses Views on Careers,” *Skyscraper* (19 March 1937): 3.

⁶⁵ “Alumnae Survey Proves Value of College Years,” *Skyscraper* (27 September 1940): 1.; “Recent Graduates Are Finding Careers in Religious, Married, Business Life,” *Skyscraper* (27 September 1940): 3.

strength, healing hearts, and burying sins.⁶⁶ The Sodality expressed its program of Eucharistic Adoration in terms of a military “Guard of Honor,” in which pairs of Sodalists stationed themselves before the Blessed Sacrament for a required period.⁶⁷ In 1934, Army reservists drilled Mundelein women to march in military formation in the Legion of Decency parade.⁶⁸ While Mundelein women’s acceptance of domestic roots might seem inconsistent with the drama and conflict of spiritual warfare, they nevertheless perceived themselves as standing alongside men in the earthly Church Militant.

By contrast to De Paul coeds’ satirical replication of negative feminine stereotypes, then, Depression-era Mundelein College students articulated a positive, affirming construction of “Catholic womanhood” that both rooted them in religious tradition and accommodated new academic, professional, and social interests. Mundelein women’s feminine ideology combined “valiance” in social leadership and intellectual achievement with a selflessness, courtesy, modesty, and “queenly” dignity which they viewed as eternally “modern” by virtue of their timelessness. Conveying this “modern” feminine ideal through reference to traditional role models, such as female religious and the Virgin Mary, as well as an idealized ancient and medieval Catholic past, Mundelein women constructed an identity that was both cutting-edge and traditionally Catholic—thereby hinting at a remarkable flexibility in the symbols and rhetoric of Catholic culture. In this stretching of religious “womanhood” ideals to include limited forms of female

⁶⁶ “Retreat and Re-inforcement,” *Skyscraper* (30 January 1931): 2.

⁶⁷ “Sodality Committees in Action,” *Skyscraper* (30 January 1931): 3.

⁶⁸ “70,000 Students March in Parade,” *Skyscraper* (11 October 1934): 4.

freedom and leadership, Depression-era Mundelein students resembled their contemporary Protestant peers at Wheaton College, Baylor University, and Calvin College. However, Mundelein women's ongoing participation in Catholic Action federation's rhetoric of spiritual warfare posed a tension with the "queenly" domesticity of Catholic womanhood that would shape their expectations and experience of the war to follow.

In war

Given CISCA's heavy use of military metaphors, when the United States entered World War II in December 1941, it was easy for Loyola and CISCA ideologues to create a rhetorical continuity between the Catholic Action movement and wartime military service, as well as between Catholic higher education and military training. While labeling the enemy as "pagan" was an obvious response to the bombing of Pearl Harbor, clergy at Loyola tended to speak in more general terms, attributing the war's cause to a broader cultural paganism that linked the everyday experience of civilians to the leadership of governments, militaries, and religious systems. No one, from this perspective, was exempt from responsibility for the war. Addressing Loyola students in December 1942, for instance, Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S.J., attributed "the pathetic plight of the world today" to "the forsaking of Christ and Christian duty."⁶⁹ Speaking to the Loyola woman's sodality that same month, Rev. Thomas A. Egan, S.J., Dean of Loyola's night college, explained that World War II was the result of mankind's hedonism and

⁶⁹ "From Pessimism to Optimism," *Loyola News* (9 December 1942) 2.

arrogance over the course of centuries.⁷⁰ In CISCA publications, Catholic students interpreted the war as a result of their own failure to mobilize effective resistance to paganism worldwide: “If we of the Church Militant had been doing any real fighting, this country wouldn’t be at war now.”⁷¹

As teachers of Catholic Action ideology and liberal arts, educators at Loyola interpreted their curricula and campus life as preparing soldiers for the supreme sacrifice. According to the *Loyola News*, at Loyola’s all-student retreat in October 1942 Arts Dean Joseph Egan declared that the Loyola soldiers who “are living and fighting and dying on distant battlefields of this war... are putting into practice the principles learned here at Loyola. ‘They have reduced to the reality of active deeds the theories absorbed here,’” he told civilian students. “ ‘Not only are they fortified with the answers to the vexing problems of a wartorn world, but they are living out the answer in a personal dynamic way.’ ”⁷² Likewise, a student editorial cited Loyola servicemen’s loyalty to Catholic principles learned at Loyola as a motivating factor. “They were given very definitely a set of values and they knew how to think clearly,” it stated. “They saw their set of values placed against those of the enemy and were willing to lay down their lives that at least their fellow countrymen might continue to enjoy those values.”⁷³ To further enhance students’ intellectual and moral preparation for service, in 1943 the Arts campus conducted an essay contest on the theme of “The Ideals of a Catholic Soldier.” “If the

⁷⁰ “Dean of U.C. Addresses Sodalists,” *Loyola News* (15 December 1942): 1.

⁷¹ *CISCA News* (9 May 1942): 1, in CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 22.

⁷² “‘Use Advantages, Time to the Full,’ Says Father Egan,” *Loyola News* (13 October 1942): 1.

⁷³ “The Colleges Can Give??,” *Loyola News* (6 October 1942): 2.

student will spend the time and effort to write an essay.... he will have some idea of what he is doing, together with providing himself with a standard of conduct which will serve him through the war and the years following,” argued William Finnegan, S.J., Dean of the College.⁷⁴

The continuum worked both ways, however. Not only did educators interpret military service as an extension or enlargement of civilian cultural projects, but—building on the proverb “There are no atheists in foxholes”—they also constructed military and especially combat experience as a sort of spiritual Pentecost that would convince servicemen, once and for all, that the teachings of the Catholic Church were true and required widespread application. These servicemen would then return to Loyola and energize civilian students through their faith and leadership qualities. Loyola students themselves articulated expectations of “foxhole Christianity” when writing of the “eternal truths” learned in combat—truths which, they insisted, one could “find out beforehand” by participating in religious activities on campus. “The phrase that ‘there are no atheists in foxholes’ is a powerful and true one,” declared student editors in November 1942, from the safety of the *Loyola News* office in Chicago.⁷⁵ In retrospect, a 1946 CISCA article observed that during the war “...there were many who spoke as if the baptism of fire would do in an instant what the churches and the men of God had failed to do.”⁷⁶

⁷⁴ “Religion Essay Contest Open to Students,” *Loyola News* (12 January 1943) 1; “Riley Delano Gives Medal in Essay Test,” *Loyola News* (19 January 1943): 7.

⁷⁵ “Fourth War Class—But No Let-Up,” *Loyola News* (17 November 1942): 4.

⁷⁶ “Religion in Foxholes,” *Today* (May 1946): 14.

Published letters from draftees already in service often supported the idea that religious and military training re-inforced one another. For instance, in 1941 Father Carrabine shared with CISCA members a letter from Leon Lukaszewski, a CISCA Alumni member serving with the U.S. Army Medical Corps at Fort Eustis, Virginia. Consciously written for publication, Lukaszewski's letter assured CISCA Catholics that their religious education would ease their adjustment to the structure and stresses of military life. First of all, he explained, Catholics' respect for moral authority would transfer to the military's hierarchical structure. "The average CISCA Alumnite has the right attitude for a good soldier," wrote Lukaszewski. "He believes his duty to the state a moral one, and the army, for him, is the voice of God in every demand that is not immoral. He has, therefore, a strong motive for obedience. He has, also, from Catholic training, a better habit of discipline than fellow soldiers..." Secondly, the devotional tradition of mortification, or offering personal suffering as a form of prayer, would enable Catholics to maintain their morale by interpreting the hardships of military life as cosmically important and meaningful. Finally, Lukaszewski argued that the religious focus on "eternals" or timeless values promoted emotional stability in the face of change. "The godless man leaves his morale behind when he leaves the things he knows. But a man of Christian education will keep his sanity." Overall, he insisted that "...[T]here'll be comfort in finding yourself, as you should be, better equipped to 'take it' than most men with you."⁷⁷

⁷⁷ Leon Lukaszewski to CISCA Alumni, "In Case of a Draft," [n.d.], in "CISCA Letters from Its Servicemen," CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 17, Loyola University Archives (Chicago, IL), 18; also printed in *Colyum* (November 1941): 1-3, CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 16.

As more and more students entered active military service, other published letters from military installations seemed to confirm civilian interpretations of war as a conversion experience, suggesting that Catholic soldiers interpreted military life in light of religious principles. “My religion has assumed a new, deeper meaning since I have joined the ranks of Uncle Sam,” serviceman Andrew L. Michuda wrote in the Jesuit journal *America*. “It is more than regular attendance at Sunday Mass. You feel it, understand it and live it every day. . .”⁷⁸ From his post near Warrenton, Virginia, CISCA member Corporal Thomas Buckley fervently presented wartime service as God’s plan for American Catholics’ spiritual maturation, for their learning to connect received religious convictions with social action. “Do you suppose that God didn’t mind too much letting us have this war so as to transform at one stroke all us young ‘talkers’ into adult apostles?” he asked in a letter quoted by Carrabine in July 1943. At Camp Robinson, Arkansas, Private Andy Murphy agreed. “. . .I regard the Army as the perfect place to practice all of the things that I have learned in CISCA,” he wrote to Carrabine. “Here, as no place else, you have the daily opportunity to practice the corporal and spiritual works of mercy as well as the cardinal virtues. . .” Like Catholic civilians, Corporal Paul Kalinauskas perceived the Army as teaching through experience the religious concepts that Catholic educators had tried to drive home on campus. “Our system of Catholic education could learn much from the Army,” he wrote. “I wonder if there is better place to learn the lesson on the brother-hood of man than in then in the Army. And where else

⁷⁸ Andrew L. Michuda, “An American Soldier, A Soldier of Christ,” *America* (27 December 1941): 321.

could one learn to evaluate properly and appreciate the sanctity and blessings of family life?”⁷⁹

Another soldier praised camp life as “almost monastic” and speculated that “it may well be fine training for such a life after the war...”⁸⁰ Re-inforcing the idea that Catholic collegians made superior American service men and women, WAC Captain Margery Chapman of neighboring Mundelein College claimed that “...I must credit my Catholic education for providing the background that helped to make me a ‘good soldier.’ Most helpful of all was the discipline, both self and imposed, that I learned at Mundelein...” In 1945 Loyola alumnus Major James F. Quinn, Jr., Loyola alumnus, wrote the following from Paris to his sister, sophomore Mary Catherine Quinn, who submitted it to *Skyscraper*: “I have seen things over here that have left a pretty deep print on my mind... lessons in tolerance and kindness and human suffering.”⁸¹ Letters such as these, distributed to civilians and fellow service people through student newspapers, Carrabine’s CISCA publications and service bulletins, and CISCA meetings, must have strengthened the popular image of military service as an extension or intensive version of the Catholic campus’s religious programming.

Letters of servicemen and women also participated in the creation of their devout image by portraying the common experience of the Catholic sacraments in ways that reaffirmed their emotional and ideological connections with friends back home. For

⁷⁹ “Paul” to Martin Carrabine, 31 May 1943, “CISCA Letters from Its Servicemen,” CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 17; for probable identification of Paul, see Martin Carrabine to CISCA members, 30 July 1943, CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 4.

⁸⁰ “John” to Joe Golden, 27 January 1942, CISCA Records, Box 6 Folder 9.

⁸¹ “Passed by Censor...,” *Skyscraper* (16 April 1945): 4.

instance, while in training at Scott Field in Belleville, IL, Corporal John Cogley wrote of the emotional resonance of Mass in unfamiliar surroundings. “This morning I was on a police detail, picking up cigarettes and matches,” he wrote. “When I got near the chapel I heard a faint tinkle echoing and knew that Mass was being offered in the chapel. It was a wonderful knowledge. Don’t know why it affected me the way it did; but I was never so happy before to know that Mass was being offered nor so anxious to attend, to be in there with the priest. Somehow every ideal I ever fell in love with... was in that tinkle. It brought back every Mass I ever attended...”⁸² Later, in 1943, Loyola graduate Lieutenant Frank Knoll, USMC, described religious services in Guadalcanal in a letter to Loyola professors that the *News* subsequently quoted. “I have been attending Sunday Mass at the bomber strip on Henderson Air Field,” he reported. “The Altar, which is made up of a few boards resting upon two empty oil drums, is barely covered by a canvas fly... But I imagine despite the surroundings Our Lord gets quite a kick out of paying us a visit. It is quite an experience to attend Mass amid the roar of our gigantic bombers taking off on the runway.”⁸³ His letter’s combination of familiar, shared rituals with details of strange, incongruous surroundings encouraged his readers to identify with him, to enter into his experience. Other letters, written both in boot camps and overseas, spoke of enthusiasm in attending Mass and the overcoming of distance and hardship in order to attend it. Some CISCA members reported introducing fellow soldiers to the liturgical innovations they had practiced at Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein, such as the Dialogue

⁸² John Cogley to Carrabine, 1 September 1942, “CISCA Letters from Its Servicemen,” CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 17, 44.

⁸³ “Religion is Solace for U.S. Marine,” *Loyola News* (6 April 1943): 1.

Mass, which emphasized community participation.⁸⁴ Back in Chicago, Rev. William Finnegan, Dean of the Arts College at Loyola, quickly perceived the element of homesickness in soldiers' religiosity. While announcing in the *Loyola News* "...another report on the way our Loyolans attend Mass and Communion," he observed that "It is good to hear how, no matter where the boys end up, they all wish they were back at Loyola and seem to appreciate it all the more for having to be away."⁸⁵

Catholic Action's military and Passion metaphors, however, left little room for the college women who, through theoretically "trained" for Catholic Action leadership and engaging in spiritual warfare, were prevented by gender from literally realizing the ideal of the Christian soldier. Meanwhile, their higher education *could* seem frivolous at a time of national emergency. Pressures from outside the Catholic campus encouraged women to assist their male friends and relations in service by supporting the economic mobilization that supplied men with equipment; working to financially assist parents or relatives in the absence of men; volunteering for the Red Cross; serving as WACs or WAVES; and so forth. Thus "September is... a time of decision," to borrow the words of a May 1943 editorial in *Skyscraper*. "Many a freshman, sophomore, and junior will decide either to continue her education and complete it, or to carry on in her summer defense work..."⁸⁶

⁸⁴ "Passed by Censor," *Skyscraper* (18 February 1944): 4; Al Belanger to Carrabine, [n.d.], "CISCA Letters from Its Servicemen," CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 17: 35. For identification of the writer as Belanger, see Carrabine's general letter to CISCA members, 30 July 1943, CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 4: 2.

⁸⁵ Rev. William Finnegan, S.J., "Loyolans in Service," *Loyola News* (November 1943) 5.

⁸⁶ "Win Your Service Stripes on the College Front," *Skyscraper* (24 May 1943): 2.

In order to encourage Catholic women to remain in college, beginning in 1941 Mundelein College students and administrators constructed the Catholic college campus as a “Prayer-and-Study Front” that provided crucial support and motivation for both the military effort abroad and economic mobilization at home. The phrase originated in a Fall 1942 *Skyscraper* illustration that depicted a letter “V” for Victory dividing the background into three scenes, arranged roughly in the form of an arch: “The Battle Front” on the far left, the “Industrial Front” on the far right, and in the center—at the crux of the “V”—“The Prayer and Study Front,” which depicted young college women doing just those things. The illustration’s message was that the full complement of “fronts” was necessary for the achievement of ultimate victory, along with an implication that prayer and study were specially privileged as the keystone supporting the full “victory” structure.⁸⁷ As a result, proclaimed a 1942 article, “Academic Robes Are Uniforms of Service.” An accompanying illustration juxtaposed a woman in academic garb with a man in military uniform, placing between them the symbols of cross and American flag.⁸⁸ Elaborating on this theme, “... academic robes are as important a service uniform as those worn by a Red Cross volunteer in North Africa or a WAAC jeep-driver in New Guinea....,” *Skyscraper* assured its Mundelein readers in 1943. “[A] college degree is as potent a weapon in total war as is a riveting or welding tool and is, moreover, precious in Uncle Sam’s eyes...”⁸⁹

⁸⁷ “The Battle Front—The Prayer and Study Front—The Industrial Front,” *Skyscraper* (9 October 1942): 2; “Study, Service, Plus Prayer Makes Winning Combination,” *Skyscraper* (8 October 1943): 2.

⁸⁸ “Academic Robes Are Uniforms of Service,” *Skyscraper* (23 October 1942): 2.

⁸⁹ “Win Your Service Stripes on College Front...” *Skyscraper* (24 May 1943): 2.

In the pages of *Skyscraper*, “study” served the war effort both for practical and ideological reasons. Practically speaking, the war offered new professional opportunities for educated women, and *Mundelein*’s newspaper consistently encouraged college women to consider serving their country as (most often) dietitians, laboratory chemists, nurses, accountants, teachers, social workers, and low-level administrators.⁹⁰ Marriage, usually approached as a complete career that most *Mundelein* graduates would choose sooner or later, was also addressed in the college curriculum: While continuing to promote careers in restaurant management, nutrition, and fashion, the Home Economics Department also offered *Mundelein* students practical lessons in meal planning, sewing, and budgeting that prioritized wartime consumer responsibilities.⁹¹ A supplementary “Victory” curriculum also offered extracurricular courses in map-reading, first aid, stenography, and other practical, morale-boosting skills.⁹² A 1942 course in marksmanship combined concerns of physical fitness and civil defense.⁹³

Ideologically, however, *Mundelein*’s promotion of wartime study largely elaborated upon interwar American Catholic Action movement’s mission to save the nation from the modern decay of its Christian principles.⁹⁴ For the purposes of World

⁹⁰ “Cite Importance of College Degree for Women in Wartime,” *Skyscraper* (20 November 1942): 1; “Scholarship Candidates hear of Alumnae Success in Fields Open to Women,” *Skyscraper* (2 April 1943): 3; “Degree Is Key to Victory,” *Skyscraper* (7 May 1943): 3; “No Idle Chatter Is Civil Service Need,” *Skyscraper* (7 May 1943): 3; “1943 Dietitians Join U.S. Army,” *Skyscraper* (17 March 1944): .3.

⁹¹ “Is Rationing Worrying You? Home Economics Will Help,” *Skyscraper* (5 March 1943): 3.

⁹² “Victory Program Tunes College to Vital War Needs,” *Skyscraper* (22 January 1943): 1.

⁹³ “Ready! Aim! Fire!,” *Skyscraper* (22 May 1942): 8.

⁹⁴ Arnold Sparr, *To Promote, Defend, and Redeem: The Catholic Literary Revival and the Cultural Transformation of America Catholicism, 1920-1960*, (New York: Greenwood Press.); William M. Halsey,

War II, however, Mundelein students largely suspended their critique of American secularism and materialism in order to closely identify “Catholic” values with “American” values, allocating the cultural evils to America’s enemies. The rhetoric of president Franklin D. Roosevelt helped in this effort, as his public references to the “brotherhood of man” formed an analogy to the Catholic Action emphasis on the Church as “Mystical Body of Christ.” Consequently, the phrase “brotherhood of man” became somewhat of a rhetorical rallying point for Catholic patriotism at Mundelein College, where students described Nazi and Japanese aggression as threats to the Catholic/American “brotherhood” concept.

Even before America’s entry into the war, a 1941 editorial suggested that the United States’ unique international mission would be to serve as a repository for the Christian values that were imperiled in Europe: “In the west, nations clash while the future of Christian ideologies hangs in the balance. We [Americans] exist in the midst of the turmoil.... Shall we say that we exist to keep alive the last semblance of sanity and Christian thought in the midst of insanity and bloodshed?”⁹⁵ In 1942 another editorial proclaimed that “Now, more than ever before, ours is the duty of keeping alive, in a civilization where it is slowly losing its meaning, Christian living and the brotherhood of those who love and respect one another. . . .” Further, linking spiritual and physical triumph, the it argued that “...in order to save life, to preserve civilization, we must stamp out the evil sweeping over the world, we must win the war, and then continue to

The Survival of American Innocence: Catholicism in an Era of Disillusionment, 1920-1940, (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980).

⁹⁵ “Forty Days for Liberty,” *Skyscraper* (14 March 1941): 2.

work and pray for the brotherhood of man under the wise and guiding Fatherhood of God.”⁹⁶

In this context, Catholic college women studied in order to preserve and promote the American Catholic “brotherhood” values for which American soldiers presumably were fighting. Tellingly, a 1944 Mundelein student symposium on “Education for a Better World” included such topics as “the disintegrating effect of the secularization of education”; “moral law and dogmatic truth as the chief weapons with which to combat materialistic egoism”; “the need for developing social mindedness, the foundation of Catholic citizenship, as a basic attitude”; “Building World Wide Brotherhood”; and “the contribution that a liberal arts education can make to the problem of creating harmonious relationships among all men.”⁹⁷ In all of these concerns, the emphasis was on Catholic education’s moral role in building social unity, in minimizing human conflict and directing the individual toward the common good.

Drawing upon “Catholic womanhood” ideals, Mundelein students interpreted the development of a peacemaking, pleasing social character as a form of political influence. As the 1942-43 academic year opened in September, students listened to a sermon defining “Christian culture” as “the happy, harmonious combination of all the qualities of a Christian lady.” According to the homilist, Fr. J.J. Dussman, these feminine qualities consisted of taste, character, and imagination—all hallmarks of the “truly educated

⁹⁶ “The Greatest of These,” *Skyscraper* (6 March 1942): 2.

⁹⁷ “Education Students Appear in Symposium,” *Skyscraper* (3 November 1944): 1.

woman.”⁹⁸ At the end of that term, in May 1943, a graduation editorial echoed Dussman’s ideas, stating that “[a] Mundelein graduate will uphold always the ideals of Catholic womanhood. Her personality will reflect the graciousness, charm, and courtesy for her associates cultivated during her college years.”⁹⁹ In Fall 1944 the Mundelein student Sodality promoted this female social ideal through a “Courtesy Week” that included posters, editorials, and even a poll to identify the “most courteous” Mundelein woman.¹⁰⁰ According to the week’s editorials, everyday courtesy, defined as “consideration for others,” was an important way in which Catholic women could contribute to world peace. Linking feminine socialization to international diplomacy, the editorial offered Catholic college women a means of global influence and service that did not disrupt traditional gender roles. This interpretation of feminine power recalled Depression-era arguments concerning a Catholic wife’s moral influence on her husband within the bounds of gender hierarchy.¹⁰¹

A related aim of cultivating the female character became the transmission of Catholic and American values through the home—a goal that seemed to echo the “Republican Motherhood” ideology of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.¹⁰² Again, the rhetoric merged religion and patriotism. “[O]nly educated women with high ideals and standards can mother a new, strong generation and infuse

⁹⁸ “Speakers Laud Foundress; Define Christian Culture,” *Skyscraper* (9 October 1942): 3.

⁹⁹ “As a Graduate, I Pledge Myself,” *Skyscraper* (24 May 1943): 2.

¹⁰⁰ “Sodality Honors Courtesy Winner,” *Skyscraper* (20 November 1944): 3.

¹⁰¹ “The Greater the Man, the Greater His Courtesy,” *Skyscraper* (23 October 1944): 2.

¹⁰² See Linda K. Kerber, “The Republican Mother,” in Linda K. Kerber and Jane Sherron De Hart, eds, *Women’s America: Refocusing the Past* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 89-95.

into it democratic and Christian ideals in the trying times following demobilization...” declared a 1943 editorial, which attributed this view to President Roosevelt himself.¹⁰³ In 1944, a similar article argued that “[b]y enriching our religious and cultural backgrounds we can learn to mold the lives of others in patterns of beauty and integrity. Because of our Catholic college education, we should be outstanding Catholic homemakers...” Continuing, it linked a mother’s vocation to a planned postwar revival in Christian civilization: “We can, in other words, co-operate constructively with post-war plan makers by resolving to do what we can to rebuild the world under Christian banners and by beginning ‘at home’ and radiating our philosophy therefrom...”¹⁰⁴ While other student journalists added that, beyond the home, educated Catholic women “as militant guardians of the family unit” also had a civic duty to “do battle with the ballot”--for example, a *Skyscraper* illustration depicted a stylish female student casting her vote while, above her, Pope Pius XII gave his blessing--overall *Mundelein* students appeared to interpret civic virtue as domesticity more often than political participation.¹⁰⁵ A well-regulated Catholic home, the message went, was an educated woman’s main contribution to Catholicizing America and, through it, the entire world. That this domestic ideal fit the overall cultural pattern of the United States in the war and postwar period serves to further emphasize Catholic college women’s integration of religion with national values.

In the pages of the *Mundelein College Review*, promotion of Catholic female domesticity hardened into warnings against wartime abandonment of homemaking

¹⁰³ “Win Your Service Stripes on the College Front,” *Skyscraper* (24 May 1943): 2.

¹⁰⁴ “There’s a New World A’Coming,” *Skyscraper* (5 May 1944): 2.

¹⁰⁵ “Holy Father Gives Commission to Women Voters,” *Skyscraper* (5 November 1945): 2.

responsibilities. “In directing and building the home, woman’s talents can best find their expression. This is the career for which she is physically and psychologically designed,” argued Mundelein student Ellen Foran in 1943. “The Church, acting in conformity with the nature of things, has insisted... that the true dignity of woman lies in wifedom and motherhood.” Connecting this religious ideal with national preservation, Foran went on to interpret the family as the “basic unit of democratic society.” “If our armed forces were to achieve military success only to return to a country in which the sanctity of the home was no longer recognized, there would be no victory,” she asserted.¹⁰⁶

Conceivably, Catholic college women could lose the Prayer-and-Study Front if they directed their studies toward personal ends rather than the formation of American Catholic homes.

Certainly Mundelein women were not permitted to become complacent regarding their national service. Through frequent recollection of male sacrifice, *Skyscraper* editorials sought to motivate female students to live up to the idealized example of men on the battle front. In 1942, for example, an editorial entitled “Letter from a Bombadier” juxtaposed idealized scenes of military discipline and zeal with a female student’s guilty reflections on her own home-front laziness and laxity. “Too often I don’t even collect my thoughts until my first class is almost over... And I find it hard to remember assignments, to get required reading done...” fretted the editor. “Perhaps if I can

¹⁰⁶ E.F. [Ellen Foran], “Enter the WINS,” *Mundelein College Review* v. 13 no.2 (Spring 1943): 174-175.

remember that he [the soldier] is at attention and under inspection all day every day, I'll be a little more consistent..."¹⁰⁷

Reinforcing this theme of female unworthiness with religious allusions, a typical 1944 editorial--pointedly entitled "Do You Deserve Holy Week?"--contrasted the serene experience of the Easter Triduum at home with the imagined situation of servicemen in Italy and the Pacific. "Good Friday [in Chicago]... sad solemnity of the Mass of the Presanctified... the Way of the Cross in a still, hushed Cathedral," it contrasted with "Good Friday on an obscure island lost in the South Pacific... scream of bombs overhead... absolution for a dying soldier... grim faces watching a sky as dark as that of Jerusalem..."¹⁰⁸ Implied in the description of the servicemen's Good Friday suffering and death was yet another identification of the American soldier with Christ Himself. Applying the title—"Do You Deserve Holy Week?"—to such a contrast, connected women's relationship to American men with women's pre-existing sense of unworthiness before a God Who had suffered and died that they might live. Driving this point home, "Are you worth dying for?... Are we worth dying for?" another 1944 editorial asked Mundelein students. "The boys on Bataan thought so; the boys in China, Italy, and Africa think so. But why? What have we done to deserve such an honor?" Just as humans did not deserve eternal salvation, it implied, women could not deserve the sacrifices that men made to defend them (though purchasing War Bonds might help).¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ "Letter from a Bombadier," *Skyscraper* (20 November 1942): 2.

¹⁰⁸ "Do You Deserve Holy Week?" *Skyscraper* (31 March 1944): 2.

¹⁰⁹ "The \$64 Question..." *Skyscraper* (21 January 1944): 2.

Nevertheless, prayer became a means of spiritually accompanying American servicemen into combat on the Battle Front, thereby fulfilling CISCA's call for "Catholic Militants." "Women cannot shoulder guns, however much they want to. But they can pray..." insisted a 1942 editorial. "... Our boys are employing their most powerful weapons to defeat the enemy. Now is the time for us to join them in their battle by bombarding heaven with our most powerful weapon—prayer."¹¹⁰ Similarly, during the 1944 invasion of Europe, "[o]ur armies... will continue to advance at the same rate as the Christians of the nation entreat the King of Peace for aid," wrote *Skyscraper* editors. "One minute of prayer at 10:00 a.m. every morning from every Mundelein student will bring triumph a few hours closer."¹¹¹ In these depictions, prayer was combat; it had dramatic, even explosive, possibilities; and it allowed women to join men in actively influencing the outcome of battles.

Spirituality also offered women small ways of sharing in the personal suffering of American soldiers, transcending spatial and temporal boundaries in order to join and assist their absent men. Lenten fasting, sacrifice, and prayer allowed women to participate in servicemen's experience of harsh training and deprivation—their "long, long Lent of war." The devotional Way of the Cross, for example, enabled women to join and "lighten the marine's journey along a swampy, Jap-infested jungle."¹¹² Another 1944 editorial recommended that each Mundelein student pause each day at lunchtime to visualize what a soldier in Italy or the Pacific might be suffering at that moment, and to

¹¹⁰ "Say Them for Uncle Sam," *Skyscraper* (1 May 1942): 2.

¹¹¹ "They're Talking About..." *Skyscraper* (6 October 1944): 2.

¹¹² "Your Sacrifice Will Lessen His," *Skyscraper* (17 March 1944): 2.

offer a ten-minute rosary for him.¹¹³ Posing the question “What can I do to help while my son or my brother, my husband or sweetheart is out on the battlefield?” an undated CISCA skit similarly urged Catholic women to offer up the spiritual graces received through Mass and Communion for a male soldier’s welfare: “Let him share the benefits that will help him in the work of defending you and yours.”¹¹⁴ Published letters from Catholic servicemen further attested to the power of women’s prayers in combat. In 1943, for instance, former Mundelein College employee Joseph Ferrante thanked students for their prayers for him, stating that “...[n]ot long ago they did me special good, when one of my buddies was killed, and I was in danger myself.”¹¹⁵

Interpreting religious practice as militaristic, *Skyscraper* articles urged Mundelein students to participate in formal “spiritual victory” and “spiritual defense” programs, consisting of commitment to certain combinations of daily or weekly rosaries, Masses, Communion, or visit to the Blessed Sacrament.¹¹⁶ Perhaps the most structured of these programs was the “Prayer Militia” or “Living Cross,” a student confraternity involving three different levels of devotional commitment--the “Victory Legion,” the “Defense Legion,” and the “Auxiliary Corps.” Reportedly 150 Mundelein students pledged this program in December 1942.¹¹⁷ Also in 1942, a less formal campaign, the “Rosary-a-Day for Victory and Peace” led Mundelein Sodality members to schedule two public

¹¹³ “Time on Your Hands?,” *Skyscraper* (18 February 1944): 1.

¹¹⁴ “Remember?” [n.d.], CISCA Records, Box 4 Folder 5.

¹¹⁵ Joseph Ferrante, “Passed by Censor,” *Skyscraper* (22 October 1943): 4.

¹¹⁶ “A Thousand Times YES,” *Skyscraper* (20 February 1942): 2.

¹¹⁷ “Prayer Militia Enrolls Members,” *Skyscraper* (14 December 1942): 3.

recitations of the Rosary each weekday in the student chapel, theoretically giving every student an opportunity to attend.¹¹⁸

Relating prayer and sacrifice to the “Industrial Front,” Mundelein students also endeavored to speak of religion in economic terms, casting spiritual and material support as complementary. A 1943 article, for example, encouraged students to approach prayer in terms of War Stamps and Bonds, equating one Hail Mary to a 10-cent “Prayer Stamp”; a five-decade Rosary to a one-dollar stamp; and a fifteen decade Rosary to a “Prayer Bond.” “A Rosary a day will add up to four Prayer Bonds a month,” the author pragmatically observed. “Couple this with our usual number of War Stamps and Bonds, and we’ll be doing our part to keep [American pilots]... Coming in on a Wing and a Prayer.”¹¹⁹ Another editorial pointed out that giving up one’s 10-cent Coca Cola for Lent could benefit servicemen in both spiritual and material ways. Even as “[t]he sacrifice of one coke offered up for a fighting marine may be the means of giving him the extra strength to go on,” it explained, “[t]he dime invested in a War Stamp may give him the extra bullet he needs to save his life... Your sacrifice may give him the extra strength, material and spiritual, that he needs to carry on the long fight.”¹²⁰

It might also, *Skyscraper* suggested, help Catholic women in their program of moral and spiritual self-improvement in the interest of Christian civilization. A 1942 Lenten editorial encouraged students to build up their personal “spiritual reserve” by performing “at least one constructive act of religion each day,” whether that act be a

¹¹⁸ “Offer Daily Rosaries for Armed Forces,” *Skyscraper* (9 October 1942): 3.

¹¹⁹ “Coming In On A Wing And A Prayer,” *Skyscraper* (7 May 1943): 2.

¹²⁰ “Your Sacrifice Will Lessen His,” *Skyscraper* (17 March 1944): 2.

Rosary, daily Mass, a visit to the Blessed Sacrament, etc. Since “the war was stimulated by hatred and merciless violation of Christian charity,” the editorial argued, the spiritual strength gained through Catholic prayer represented a real contribution to victory and peace.¹²¹

However, even in the area of spiritual maturity female students had to cope with an image of male superiority. “The men of our armed services have recourse to prayer constantly while they are fighting the enemy,” claimed a Mundelein student editorial, imagining soldiers’ “tense moments of meditation while they await the signal to attack, through long hours in the muddy foxholes while enemy planes roar overhead.” The editor concluded that Catholic men in combat “are building a faith, and a hope, and a love of God which will change their entire lives.” Mundelein women only hoped that they could match it.¹²²

Meanwhile, CISCA’s male draftees, led to expect an intense spiritual experience, were disappointed if they did not respond emotionally to military life. Sergeant Tom Sullivan, for example, agreed that Catholic Action ideology *could* serve as a lens through which to view Army training, but felt let down by his own lackluster reactions. “I almost acquired the peak of poverty that the Catholic Worker has been striving for. Also following the back to the land movement,” he wrote wryly to Carrabine. “A tent, and a flapping one, serves as my new home.... There are no lights, no screens, no pillows, no heat...” However, despite his Catholic education, he felt no sense of spiritual uplift. “It

¹²¹ “A Thousand Times YES,” *Skyscraper* (20 February 1942): 2.

¹²² “Retreat in Prayer... Advance in Fortitude,” *Skyscraper* (21 January 1944): 2.

breaks my heart to see all of this mortification going to waste and no one seeing the opportunity for gaining spiritual benefit. Even I (with my background),” he wrote. “Of course I don’t even go to the daily Mass. And it wouldn’t be inconvenient for me... I guess a fellow needs a lot of spiritual props around and there are none in this lumber camp atmosphere, unless, as I heard a song the other night say, ‘Make those mountains your altar and that sky your chapel.’ Of course, I could never go for that sort of corn.”¹²³ Similarly, in 1945 Sullivan confided to Carrabine that, while under fire in the Pacific, “[a]ll he could remember was an imperfect act of contrition... and a sense of failure in [not] doing much with his life.”¹²⁴ His reported reactions departed from Catholic civilians’ interpretations of combat as confirming, purifying, and strengthening religious faith.

At Fort Eustis Leon Lukaszewski found that his standards of obedience and morality, rather than easing his adjustment, prevented him from escaping or relieving the stresses of military training. “The men around me have some comforts....,” he wrote. “They can get drunk and ease the pressure... They can take out their ill feeling in gossip and grumbling against the powers that be.” Moreover, he reflected, “[t]hey aren’t bothered by the complete ideal of a home and children and grandchildren,” noting that “some of them got Christmas greetings from the local professional ladies they have patronized...” Observing an *Esquire* magazine pin-up on the wall, Lukaszewski railed against the allure and contamination of popular culture, but also expressed envy for those

¹²³ Tom Sullivan to Carrabine, n.d., “CISCA Letters from Its Servicemen,” CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 17: 29.

¹²⁴ Carrabine to Joe Golden, 14 February 1945, CISCA Records, Box 6 Folder 11: 2.

who could succumb to it without any pangs of conscience. "...[F]or me there must be sanity and cleanliness and obedience," he wrote. "This naturally makes me feel sorry for myself..."¹²⁵ His long letters to Carrabine—one deploring the almost "unanimous intoxication" in his barracks that night—suggested loneliness and isolation from his non-religious peers.

Both Sullivan and Lukaszewski's letters attempted some resolution to their spiritual struggles. Sullivan, for example, reluctantly conceded that "...I must start reading my dusty copy of the *Imitation of Christ*," while Lukaszewski reported consoling himself with the thought that illicit pleasures brought no real or lasting happiness to the men who indulged in them. Along the same lines, he reflected on the Blessed Virgin Mary's superiority to any pin-up girl.¹²⁶ Still, such letters suggested that Catholic education and CISCA's Catholic Action training, rather than easing soldiers' adaptation to military culture, could clash with that culture in ways that resulted in isolation, anxiety, and self-doubt.

While Carrabine apparently took pain to counsel struggling servicemen by mail, as the war continued he began to admonish them for publicizing negative thoughts that could affect military and civilian morale. "... I want to say now that I'm becoming a little bit disturbed by a mild note of discouragement that peeps out above the normal chatter of service letters....," he wrote privately to CISCA members in January 1944. "I don't think that each of you realizes how good God has been to him (or her) and what a

¹²⁵ Leon Lukaszewski to Carrabine, 25 December 1941, "CISCA Letters from Its Servicemen," 22-23.

¹²⁶ Tom Sullivan to Carrabine, [n.d.], "CISCA Letters from Its Servicemen," 29; Leon Lukaszewski to Carrabine, 25 December 1941, "CISCA Letters from Its Servicemen," 22-23.

tremendous influence you have on others. So if any of you moan or grow disheartened, you become a very real scandal to those around you.” Moreover, Carrabine suggested that servicemen’s depression might result from sin or lack of perseverance in prayer. “I know that whenever I’m down,” he wrote, “I haven’t been praying enough or I have been more than ordinarily sinful, particularly in my words and especially in my thoughts about others.” In sum, “[t]he next one that starts ‘moaning low’ is going to get a prompt letter back from me with a mild suggestion to shut up...”¹²⁷ While no doubt Carrabine meant only to shake soldiers out of their negativity and push them to take responsibility for morale, the letter could not help but convey the message that Catholic civilians did not want to hear what soldiers really thought and felt—and moreover, that negative feelings were due to some inadequacy on the part of the individual soldier.

In turn, some Catholic servicemen began to argue that civilians’ expectations for military and wartime service were unrealistic and self-serving. “There are a great number of people nowadays talking about how holy the Army is, and they’re wrong...,” wrote a soldier identified only as Seamus, lately from Fort McCoy, in 1944. “I know there are the stories about the men on the raft, reading the Bible and praying for help, but the Bible *can* be an anaesthetic [sic] as well as a guide-book; there may be no atheists in foxholes, but that does not mean that only Christians are there.... And yet people seem to think their boys are going to return to them as Christians, when they went away pagans.” In Seamus’s opinion, religious conversions under fire tended to be temporary, merely a psychological means of coping with intense stress in order to fulfill the soldier’s ultimate

¹²⁷ Martin Carrabine to CISCA service members [form letter], January 1944, CISCA Records, Box 6, Folder 11.

function--fighting. "The Army is not a missionary society," he emphasized. "It is a weapon, and that is all it is."¹²⁸ John Cogley's impressions were similar, although he more strongly felt that the military's character as "weapon" rendered it inherently non-Catholic. "Race-hatred is a weapon of warfare in the war with Japan and is being used," he wrote. "...I guess it can be summed up this way: war can be justified or even blessed by the Church... but it is pretty hard to harmonize the attitude necessary—at least today—for its successful conclusion with the normal Christian attitude toward men and life and the world."¹²⁹

Furthermore, Seamus accused Catholic civilians of expecting wartime service to compensate for their own failures to promote religious faith and moral values at home. Propaganda concerning wartime religious conversions was, according to Seamus, "a way of shelving responsibility, both for the past and the future"—for the past, in that the military was relieving Catholic society of its duty to provide thorough faith education; and for the future, in that any postwar moral laxity could be blamed on shortcomings in military rather than Catholic culture.¹³⁰ Along these lines, letters suggest that CISCA servicemen increasingly perceived the home front's Catholic civilians as hypocritically succumbing to the cultural "paganism" that they expected servicemen to fight, both in society and in themselves. Responding to a 1944 Frank Sinatra broadcast, for example, Loyola CISCA leader John Cogley wrote from his Air Corps base in Fresno, California that "...the exhibition of teenage girls exhibiting their physical reactions to the sight of A

¹²⁸ Seamus to Carrabine, 14 April 1944, "CISCA Letters from Its Servicemen," 37.

¹²⁹ John Cogley to Martin Carrabine, 24 September 1942, "CISCA Letters from Its Servicemen," 40.

¹³⁰ Seamus to Carrabine, 14 April 1944, "CISCA Letters from Its Servicemen," 37.

Pale Young Man who, according to one, makes young girls ‘Burst Inside’ by his singing.... shows that something is wrong” with American culture.¹³¹ Reported schoolgirl infatuations with Sinatra and other home-front entertainers irritated Catholic servicemen, not only as offenses against patriotism and the masculine ego, but also as betrayals of the Catholic moral values that servicemen were expected to uphold.¹³²

For Catholic women on the “Prayer-and-Study Front,” the war also strained personal and spiritual pre-conceptions, leading feelings of moral failure that later would re-inforce American women’s postwar retreat into domesticity.¹³³ Ideals of Catholic womanhood included a uniform sweetness, patience, and self-effacement—difficult requirements throughout a long period of emotional stress. In 1944 Chicago-based columnist Maureen Daly (a graduate of Rosary College) sympathetically described young women’s burden of emotional restraint in the Chicago Catholic magazine *Voice of St. Jude*.¹³⁴ “Not complaining, not questioning, not crying out—just waiting,” she wrote. “From their faces, from their voices, from the way their hair shines in the sunlight, the black-and-white neatness of the letters they type each day, the sharp, precise click of their heels as they walk and from the bright, well-manicured competence of their hands, you

¹³¹ John Cogley to Martin Carrabine, 5 February 1944, “CISCA Letters from Its Servicemen,” CISCA Records, Box 3 Folder 17.

¹³² More generally, the figure of Sinatra became a lightning rod for American servicemen’s fears of female infidelity and independence. See Lewis A. Erenberg, *Swinging the Dream: Big Band Jazz and the Rebirth of American Culture* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), 96-198.

¹³³ See Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (Basic Books: 1988) especially 63-79.

¹³⁴ Historian Beth L. Bailey describes Maureen Daly as “perhaps the best-known adviser of youth in the 1940s and 1950s.” See Bailey, *From Front Porch to Back Seat: Courtship in Twentieth-Century America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 126.

would never know.” Patriotism and social duty checked women’s expression of anxiety, so that they talked “lightly, without speaking their real thoughts” to friends while deliberately maintaining “an alert, smiling enthusiasm for their jobs and their homes....” wrote Daly. “...It is not always easy, this acid test of keeping up the well-groomed front in college, business, and at home and to come up smiling on a Sunday morning after a Saturday night crammed with memories and emptiness.” Overall, she observed, “[e]motional honesty has hit a new rock bottom.”¹³⁵

Communication with friends and loved ones in service did not always offer relief. “Service men know that compared with them civilians have a very easy time and they do not like to hear complaints from the home front,” warned the *Voice of St. Jude* in 1944. “...[I]n the main, letters should be gay, rollicking, and happy—the kind that cheer up a fellow instead of depressing him. The gloomy incidents should largely be left out.”¹³⁶ Advice such as this would have left gaps in what women could write and what emotions they could regard as just and legitimate. Meanwhile, exhortations to write at least one letter each day—“if you don’t write, you’re wrong”—would have maintained pressures to produce such edited narratives of home-front life for the consumption of male soldiers abroad.¹³⁷

Reflecting these inner restraints, Mundelein students’ war and immediate post-war poetry stressed themes of female silence, self-effacement, and unspoken feeling. In

¹³⁵ Maureen Daly, “Strictly Solid,” *Voice of St. Jude* (May 1944): 5.

¹³⁶ Henry H. Graham, “Service Men Want Cheery Letters,” *Voice of St. Jude* (December 1944): 15.

¹³⁷ For examples, see “Sky Writings,” *Skyscraper* (17 March 1944): 4; Maureen Daly, “Strictly Solid,” *Voice of St. Jude* (March 1944): 5.

“Song Not Heard” (1945) for example, Irene Kennedy described love as something “wordless; graven deep within me” that defied verbal expression. “[W]as it strange,” she asked, that “...I could not speak aloud, but turned my head/ Hoping that you would read my heart instead?”¹³⁸ The grief of disrupted or disappointed love also demanded painful suppression. “But now I dwell in silent ways... For either I must sing of you/ Or weeping, weave no song at all,” wrote senior Geraldine Thorpe in “Reproach” (1946)¹³⁹

Mundelein student poetry also used Catholic imagery to interpret women’s silence as a form of spiritual protection or preparation for future crucibles of temptation and suffering. Surrounding the figure of Mary with signs of privacy and concealment, in 1946 Thorpe wrote of Mary as a “quiet mistress of quiet rooms,” a “keeper of curtains and lighter or lights” whose recessed silence would “prepare my heart” for “numbing, fear-stilled times.”¹⁴⁰ Similarly, during a religious retreat Thorpe hoped to “... learn the way of silence” that would “seal my heart’s young house from blows/ Of wanton winds.”¹⁴¹ More optimistically, “Although this night when stripped of sound... seems cruelly spare,/ The times of vigil have been ever thus,” wrote Ruth (Reynolds) Casey in 1946, reflecting on “the strength of silence” as spiritual preparation for future action.¹⁴²

For Mary Ann Anderson, however, the silence of suppressed feelings had resulted in emotional numbness. “In truth, my days are spare and useless here/ Among the fretful

¹³⁸ Irene Kennedy, “Song Not Heard,” *Mundelein College Review* v. XV no. 3 (Summer 1945): 226.

¹³⁹ Geraldine Thorpe, “Reproach,” *Mundelein College Review* v. XV no. 2 (March 1945): 160.

¹⁴⁰ Geraldine Thorpe, “The Mysteries of the Rosary,” *Quest* v. XII (1946): 71.

¹⁴¹ Geraldine Thorpe, “Prayer to Christ (In Time of Retreat),” *Quest* v. XII (1946): 33.

¹⁴² Ruth Casey, “This Watch Returns the Strength of Silence,” *Quest* v. XII (1946): 3.

duties they impart,” she wrote. “My love, it is in hiding from my heart...” Her hope was not to suppress inner pain, but to feel and express it honestly:

Ah, soul, search out my love, go forth and find
 Again for me its brimming, bitter cup;
 Summon the tears and sighs—I’ll catch them up!
 Pile hurt on hurt, I promise not to mind.
 Come love, I bid you free, I vow to sing
 Your every fever and your every sting.¹⁴³

Possibly Anderson’s hopes were in vain. Short stories by Mundelein student writers further suggested that, as servicemen returned, consciousness of men’s wartime sacrifices and psychological readjustment led educated Catholic women in turn to further repress their voices and ambitions in the interest of partnering war-changed men. Mundelein women could acknowledge these motives with surprising frankness. In 1945, for example, Mundelein student Eileen Murphy’s short story “The Willow Tree” interpreted women’s postwar career aspirations as exploitation of men’s wartime service and, furthermore, cooption of the male interpretive voice. An aspiring novelist, during the war Murphy’s protagonist volunteered to work at a hospital in the hope of gathering material. There she met a particularly interesting wounded serviceman—a classical composer, no less—who, pleased with her interest, related to her his wartime experiences. Perceiving an opportunity to further her writing career, Murphy’s protagonist embarked upon a novel based on this wounded serviceman’s character and dramatic story. In the process, of course, she also fell in love with him—and their developing relationship soon led her to view her prospective career as shallow and vain in

¹⁴³ Mary Ann Anderson, “Summons,” *Quest* v. XII (1946): 83.

comparison to the richness of his self-sacrifice and the effort of his psychological adjustment to civilian life. Unaware of her novel's subject matter, he perceived her hospital work as an overflow of charity rather than a self-interested effort, and the contrast between image and reality inspired in her feelings of guilt. By the time of their engagement, "...I had made my mind up about the future," the protagonist explained. "I would give up my career; it was an artificial and unimportant existence I had been leading and one in which a man like John"—a man who had unselfishly risked his life for others—"could have no place."

Confirming this conclusion, when her fiancé finally discovered the topic of her novel, he broke their engagement and accused her of exploiting his wartime story for personal gain. Ultimately forced to choose between their relationship and her writing project, she destroyed her completed manuscript, thereby completing a process of career renouncement that had begun with their engagement. Apparently satisfied with this decision, the protagonist subsequently anticipated a lifetime of helping her future husband to carry his burdens, beginning with a simple picnic basket.¹⁴⁴

Murphy's narrative posed a number of gender-related points with remarkable frankness, contextualizing a Catholic women's viewpoint in a broader, postwar female retreat into the domestic sphere. Firstly, in interpreting female career ambitions as exploitation of male military service, it invoked postwar pressures on American women to give up their wartime employment gains in order that returning soldiers might find jobs. As historian Eileen Tyler May shows in *Homeward Bound*, American college

¹⁴⁴ Eileen Murphy, "The Willow Tree," *Mundelein College Review* v. 15 no.3. (Summer 1945) pp. 207-212.

women overwhelmingly responded to this social pressure, increasingly substituting early marriage to an educated, professional man for their own personal academic and professional goals.¹⁴⁵

In a second and related point, Murphy's work undermined Depression-era constructions of Catholic women as men's moral guide, instead locating moral superiority in the Christlike male character, wounded in service of his nation. While true, the Murphy's male character initially does find inspiration in his own idealization of female character, her story interpreted his vision of Catholic womanhood as an illusion, a reflection of what postwar Catholic women should be rather than what they were. Instead, Murphy's female protagonist reacted with guilt and awe to a full realization of superior *male* morality, finding in it new meaning and direction for her "artificial and unimportant existence." Catholic college women, Murphy implied, had failed in their wartime task of character development and now rated well behind men in terms of spiritual maturity.

Thirdly and significantly, Murphy located personal ambition and expression in the artistic, interpretive areas of music and creative writing, thereby inviting reflections on voice and silence in relation to gender. Murphy's story made clear that the protagonist's fiancé, a classical composer, had fallen in love because she allowed him to tell his combat story and freely express his subsequent survivor's guilt; yet, at a crucial moment when she half-heartedly attempts to explain her own perspective, he "smiled as if in dismissal of the topic" and returned to his music, his own means of self-expression. Over

¹⁴⁵ Eileen Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (Basic Books, 1988, Reprint 1999) pp. 67-72.

the span of the narrative he composed a new musical piece and dedicated it to her; yet she could not use him as inspiration for her own work. He interpreted her wartime story aloud, incorrectly crediting her with a dutiful and unselfish dedication to helping wounded soldiers; yet she had to suppress her interpretation of his wartime story. Murphy's underlying implication, then, was that men owned the narrative of the war; and that women best supported men in a role of silent inspiration, giving up their interpretive voice in recognition of men's moral leadership.

Similarly, in 1945 short story entitled "The Black Hat" Mundelein student June Tatge also told of female silence and renounced ambition in what she termed "a story for times like these." Tatge's female protagonist, Ann, had rebelled against the "drabness of existence" in her small hometown, which she soon left for the city and its "better and finer [material] things." There, through "sheer determination," Ann rose from a secretarial position to become fashion editor of a woman's magazine. However, at the height of her career, the death of her stepmother suddenly recalled her to her hometown to care for her younger half-siblings, in whose interest Ann sacrificed her hard-won editorial position and, in time, the urbane edge that distinguished her from small-town residents. Tatge symbolized Ann's renounced career and lifestyle in a stylish "black hat" which Ann relegated to the attic and subsequently regarded with regret: "When she saw it, something like a sigh and a shudder shook her body... Covered in dust, it was like a dead thing." However Tatge also made clear that these were sacrifices that women felt, but did not express. In reaction to the hat's rediscovery, "...neither of us said a word," Tatge wrote. "We had no right to bring it into the cold daylight." Indeed, Tatge had

begun the story with the curious statement that she had “no right to tell it,” re-enforcing the barrier of silence surrounding educated women’s thwarted aspirations.¹⁴⁶ Good Catholic women, implied Tatge, willingly sacrificed their personal ambitions to domestic ideals. Still, Tatge regarded her character’s sacrificed career with ambivalence, interpreting it as frivolous and materialistic--yet somehow too tragic, too dangerously evocative, to be unpacked.

These stories’ dichotomies of materialistic, self-interested career women and virtuous, silent domestics reflected a corresponding postwar Catholic male critique of “immature” college women who, in men’s absence, had given in to the materialism and secularism that their men had fought abroad. In the postwar years themes of feminine moral failure appeared frequently in John Cogley and James O Gara’s CISCA magazine, *Today*. As a striking example, in 1946 *Today* reprinted for Chicago’s Catholic student readers a Marquette student’s short story, “Stardusty Dreams,” which contrasted a (presumably Catholic) college woman’s superficiality and romantic escapism with a returning soldier’s maturity, seriousness, and desire for silent female understanding. While the male character had experienced an intensity of combat that rendered him both somber and needy, the female had frivolously spent the war in “dancing night after night with young men whom she had forgotten now, and seeing silly old movies.” Only her hair and makeup had changed—surface alterations that, as the author clarified, she mistook for genuine growth. Reunited after the war, the soldier attempted to tell her of his troubling wartime experiences, but grew frustrated when she showed greater interest in recalling their pre-war romance through the lyrics of “their” song. “If you... don’t

¹⁴⁶ June Tatge, “The Black Hat,” *Mundelein College Review* v. 15 no. 3 (May 1945): 231-235.

care to hear my stories, I wish you would just politely say so instead of singing worn-out songs in my face,” he stated, rejecting her.¹⁴⁷ Catholic men’s view of women as corrupted by a materialistic, secular pop culture—a manifestation of the “paganism” men had fought in Europe and the Pacific—helped to justify relegating women to the role of silent listener in response to returning soldiers’ needs.

This theme of a home-front secularist takeover was a religious interpretation of returning American soldiers’ more general frustration with sheltered American females, as described by historian Beth L. Bailey in *From Front Porch to Back Seat*. According to Bailey, returning servicemen complained that American women, unlike their European counterparts, demanded constant attention and whined over minor material shortages—such as the scarcity of nylon—instead of showing appreciation for the fundamental blessings of home, male protection, and sheer survival. For their part, American college women “attempted to erase the *experience* of war” through a return to prewar competitive dating conventions and an escapist immersion in romantic songs, films, and pop-culture heroes. Genuinely confused and upset by men’s refusal to play, American women wondered where they had failed.¹⁴⁸ Young Catholic women, however, could find in the Catholic Action press a religious rationale for male rejection: While men had won on the Battle Front, they—women—had lost on the Prayer-and-Study Front. Likely the resulting guilt reinforced nationwide pressures on women to renounce “materialistic” career ambitions in favor of early marriage and homemaking.

¹⁴⁷ Ed Kennebeck, “Stardusty Dreams,” *Today* (November 1946): 14.

¹⁴⁸ Beth L. Bailey, *From Front Porch to Back Seat: Courtship in Twentieth-Century America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989): 39-42.

Evidence suggests that at the end of World War II even CISCA's female Catholic Actionists accepted a transition from public to private sphere as an outcome of marriage. Of 12 women present at a 1945 CISCA Alumni meeting, for example, seven were unmarried research scientists, journalists, office workers, department store clerks, teachers, and machinists. Three were full-time housewives, of which two had given up careers in teaching in order to marry. ("My future husband didn't want me to become a bossy schoolteacher," quipped Margaret Mitchell Langdon.) Interestingly, two additional married women spoke of continued outside work in science research, teaching, and journalism. Both, however, were married to soldiers currently deployed elsewhere, inviting speculation concerning their post-war plans—as did five engagements among the seven single women. This snapshot suggests that, like their contemporaries from secular institutions, CISCA's Catholic college women worked until a husband was present, at which point they seemed willing to adopt marriage as a complete vocation. When a Bachelor of Arts in English humorously described her "latest accomplishment" as "making yeast rolls," however, one might speculate that she was not entirely at peace with the decision.¹⁴⁹

Even as the rhetoric of progressive Catholic domesticity continued, by the early 1950s Mundelein student writings already reflected the dissatisfaction with homemaking that Betty Friedan would resoundingly describe more than ten years later. For example, in 1950 student Eunice Shackelford's short story "What Distant Deeps" related a young

¹⁴⁹ Carrabine to CISCA members, 11 July 1945, CISCA Records, Box 2 Folder 4.

housewife's frustration with daily monotony to the pacing of a tiger in its cage.¹⁵⁰ In 1951 student Dorcel Spengler's "Just Like He Always Did" ended with the revelation that the story's protagonist, introduced as housewife awaiting a husband's return from work, was in reality a patient in a mental institution. "She couldn't understand why she always had that closed-in feeling lately, and in her own kitchen, too," the story began, foreshadowing the association of institutional confines with the "cream-colored kitchen with the bright red knick-knacks" of her delusion.¹⁵¹ All in all, Mundelein's Catholic college women articulated themes of domestic confinement remarkably early in the Cold War--possibly reflecting a sense of tension between Catholic Action's wartime image of the home as a locus of progressive cultural leadership, and their own observations or experience of the home.

In conclusion, military and home front experiences of World War II challenged Catholic collegians to embody religious gender ideals that gave meaning to their wartime activities, but demanded a great deal emotionally and psychologically. Nurtured on Catholic Action military metaphors and encouraged to seek spiritual growth in military service, Loyola and CISCA men often found that the Army—and themselves—failed to fit the civilian-imposed ideal. Disappointed in their own resilience and frustrated with news from the home front, they began to contradict the civilian Catholic narrative of military experience. Mundelein's Catholic women, on the other hand, tended to carry

¹⁵⁰ Eunice Shackelford, "What Distant Deeps," *Mundelein College Review* v. 20 no.4 (May 1950): 352-357.

¹⁵¹ Dorcel Spengler, "Just Like He Always Did," *Mundelein College Review* v. 21 no. 2 (January 1951): 115-122.

their Catholic gender obligations—heavy with the additional consciousness of male sacrifice—into the postwar years, where these gendered images led them to voluntarily suppress religious leadership aspirations. By 1950, Marian silence had superseded Marian valiance. On both sides of the gender equation, pressures against the Catholic Action narrative were building.

CONCLUSION

Throughout the 1920s and early 1930s, Catholic students at Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein interpreted extracurricular “campus life” as enhancing institutional prestige and, through it, the prestige of the Catholic Church and of Catholics in America. Meanwhile, in founding Chicago’s student Catholic Action federation, Jesuit educators sought to demonstrate the Catholicity of Loyola’s student life in response to Vatican-level questions concerning the order’s administration and orthodoxy. Founded in 1930, Mundelein College entered CISCA in reflection of their close relationship with neighboring Loyola, the faculty and administrators of which assisted the B.V.M. sisters in chartering and operating the college during its first decade. Reflecting their Vincentian tradition of cooperation with the local Archdiocese, De Paul educators mobilized their student community in support of organized Catholic Action after Chicago Auxiliary Bishop Bernard Sheil adopted CISCA as an Archdiocesan entity and indicated that he would measure a school’s Catholicity according to its CISCA participation. These clerical educators co-opted student “campus life” values in support of Catholic social theology imported from Europe; Benedictine Fr. Virgil Michel’s American incarnation of the Liturgical Movement; and Dorothy Day’s Catholic Worker movement.

The outcome was a hegemonic Chicago Catholic student culture that rejected class and racial boundaries; embraced an intellectual, participatory style of prayer; found

sanctity in the community; and (for a committed subset) sought to remake their social circles in the image of Catholic Action ideology. Not every student liked or agreed with the organized Catholic Actionists, but, at the height of CISCA's influence in the late 1930s and early 1940s, every student at Loyola, Mundelein, and De Paul had to consider its significance for themselves.

Over time, however, organized collegiate Catholic Action set up internal tensions and contradictions that, in time, would demand some resolution. For example, Depression-era Catholic Action organizations such as CISCA likely raised expectations of lay leadership to a point that the Catholic Action model could not accommodate. Often defined as the participation of the laity in the mission of the hierarchy, the Catholic Action concept called for increased lay initiative within boundaries prescribed by clergy. This limited initiative easily correlated to campus culture. During the 1920s and early 1930s, Catholic students and educators sacralized an ideology of American "campus life" that empowered students to raise the prestige of their campus community—and through it, personal and Catholic institutional prestige—but that also had potential to bring student initiative into conflict with broader administrative aims and relationships. While Catholic students exerted significant power over the image of the Catholic campus and were encouraged to take the lead in forming a united student community, their power had its necessary—and often hidden—limits, which students disconcertingly encountered time and time again.

The same was true within organized student Catholic Action. Uniting the "campus life" ideology of student empowerment with the concept of "lay apostolate,"

from 1927 until his death in 1934 Fr. Reiner endeavored to lead the CISCORA federation invisibly, using college students as mouthpieces for his desired course of action. When Loyola's Sodality invited the student religious organizations of local Catholic schools to Chicago's first citywide Catholic Action conference in 1927, Reiner ghostwrote the letter that student Robert Harnett signed. During CISCORA meetings, Reiner used notecards to communicate with select students, who introduced his points into discussion.

Although CISCORA based its entire structure on schema that Reiner developed in consultation with national Sodality director Fr. Lord, Reiner credited student leaders with initiating the federation and consistently gave them the spotlight. These strategies, designed to direct students' "campus life" leadership impulse into the area of religion, created a gap between the image and reality of student leadership in CISCORA: While both clergy and students exerted influence, clerical agency was greater than it appeared to be, no doubt even to the mass of students who participated in the programs.

After Bishop Sheil adopted the federation, now called CISCA, as a branch of the Archdiocesan Catholic Youth Organization (CYO), hierarchical authority became more frankly asserted as, under the moderation of Fr. Carrabine, the federation implemented a streamlined educational program authored by Sr. Himebaugh in consultation with renowned liturgical theologian Fr. Virgil Michel. This shift in focus from activity to education reasserted the teacher-student power relationship and, through it, the submission of laity to clergy. Reducing students' voice and influence in CISCA meetings, the program excited some opposition from students who resented the reduction in their agency and the imposition of Michel's Liturgical Movement ideology. Attrition

and peer pressure, however, soon resulted in student conformity, while on campus mandatory CISCA study clubs, Masses, and assemblies extended CISCA's ideological program to entire student bodies. While CISCA moderators envisioned the new program as training Catholic lay leaders for the parish, they intended lay leadership to implement a clerical agenda rather than laypersons' own preferences or strategies.

This is not to say that creativity, assertiveness, and brainstorming had no place in CISCA. These elements were encouraged, but within limits of clerical approval—and, keeping in mind that CISCA's approach was enacted in similar “Sodality unions” throughout the country, one might speculate that collegiate Catholic Action's tendency to encourage student initiative by downplaying or obscuring boundaries eventually heightened the laity's leadership expectations to a point of frustration. Today, the many prominent lay Catholics who openly disagree with the Vatican's position on issues such as abortion and birth control perhaps reflect, at least in part, the legacy of Catholic Action leadership training received on Catholic campuses.

Personalism's identification of the poor with Christ seemed to invert class hierarchies, placing CISCA's ideological anti-materialism in conflict with the social class aspiration of its “campus life” origins and methods. While in the late 1920s and early 1930s CISCA urged aspiring Catholic leaders to successfully “infiltrate” the economic and social system so as to change it, in the late 1930s and 40s CISCA—in seeming contradiction—celebrated poverty as spiritual superiority and interpreted class interaction as an almost sacramental experience of the divine. Some students expressed increasing ambivalence toward middle-class status, which they increasingly interpreted as

complicity with unjust economic and social structures. On campus, however, Catholic students continued to prepare for middle-class occupations and self-presentation, in various ways integrating upward mobility and Christian values into their future plans.

From 1928 to 1950 the elitism of CISCA's leadership training increasingly conflicted with the inclusiveness of the "Mystical Body" ideology that it promulgated. Although the archdiocesan federation strove to reach every Catholic student, structurally it comprised Sodality chapters with (in theory) exclusive membership standards and special spiritual privileges. While the theological unity of Catholics in the Mystical Body of Christ challenged CISCA students to overcome the class and racial divisions of American society, members committed to fomenting a "Catholic Revolution" presented themselves as superior to the "apathetic" mass of CISCA students, sometimes forming their own separate, structured organizations within the federation for purposes of intensive spiritual formation. CISCA ideologues also encouraged students to criticize and reform the differing religious ideas and practices of the older generation, establishing college-educated Catholic Actionists as spiritually elite. Ironically, the project of breaking down hierarchies of economic class and race involved setting up other forms of hierarchy and exclusion, these based on ideology and generation rather than occupation or skin color.

Strikingly, the ideology of personalism conflicted with the Church's triumphal stance by encouraging young Catholics to convert the public by initiating individual contacts across ideological boundaries. Instead of confronting the Communist Party as a group, CISCA students learned to approach young Communist peers individually,

persuade them that they and the Catholic Church had goals in common, and explain the concern for human dignity as members of Christ's Mystical Body that differentiated Catholic Action from the Marxism's materialistic interpretation of society. A brave few quietly distributed Catholic propaganda at Communist and anti-Catholic events. This policy of engagement with the opposition presented a marked contrast to triumphalist strategies of mass demonstration—for example, the 1926 Eucharistic Congress and Depression-era Legion of Decency parades—as well as Catholics' parochial separation from non-Catholic society. I would argue that this conflict of approach continues today, emerging recently, for example, in the controversy surrounding Barack Obama's appearance and recognition at the University of Notre Dame's 2009 commencement. While South Bend Bishop D'Arcy and scores of his peers in the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) condemned Notre Dame's invitation as a public endorsement of a pro-choice politician that muddled the Church's countercultural message on life issues (as well as episcopal authority), Notre Dame president Rev. John Jenkins and former president Rev. Theodore Hesburgh defended the decision as pragmatic, positive engagement in the interests of broader social change. They even went so far as to hint that personal experience of the Notre Dame community might effect Obama's conversion.¹

On campus, over the course of the 1930s and 40s the Church's policy of ethnic and racial separation within the Archdiocesan structure conflicted with the integrationist

¹ Aaron Steiner, "Jenkins Addresses Commencement Issues in Letter to Students," *Observer* (May 15, 2009); Aaron Steiner, "D'Arcy Disputes Jenkins' Argument," *Observer* (April 28, 2009); Manya A. Brachear, "In One Faith, Many Free Spirits—Debate over Obama at Notre Dame Highlights Catholic Tensions," *Chicago Tribune* (May 17, 2009): 6.

principles that CISCA increasingly promoted. As in ethnic parishes, ethnic and racial groups at Loyola, De Paul, and Mundelein sought inclusion in Catholic campus life by establishing ethnically exclusive social fraternities that structured their participation in the extracurriculum while also expressing members' sense of distinction and difference. Through fraternity organization, ethnic students gained student council representation, access to the entertainments and status rituals of "Greek" life, and a means of visibly contributing to the student community through, for example, organized intramural sports. In addition, they often used their campus social group to study their ethnic culture and establish relationships with other ethnic associations, such as the Polish National Alliance. Dissatisfied with the older generation's apparent reluctance to accommodate college student leadership, Polish-American student leaders in particular briefly attempted to construct a sense of nationwide ethnic student community based on their experience of Catholic community formation at Loyola University. However, as the 1930s progressed, Catholic Action pressures toward Americanization and integration along "Mystical Body" lines caused ethnic and racial fraternities to dissolve or remove their ethnic requirements.

The experience of World War II heightened tensions within CISCA's ideological constructions of gender. During the Depression, Mundelein College women in particular participated in a rhetoric of the Catholic "Valiant Woman" that supported their leadership role in Catholic Action as well as their unconventional academic achievements. At the same time, constructions of "queenly" Catholic womanhood continued a chivalric metaphor of female leadership that assigned women the more passive duties of moral

inspiration and unselfish people-pleasing, while men served as knights in spiritual battle. On the home front of World War II Catholic women's passive duties took precedence, as drafted college men fought Christianity's enemies as literal Catholic Action "militants," while college women struggled to justify continuing their studies in the midst of wartime industrial mobilization. To affirm their contributions, Mundelein women constructed the college as a "Prayer-and-Study Front" that asserted the bullet-stopping, civilization-building effects of their rosaries and homework. However, during and after the war constructions of male soldiers' Christlike sacrifices and superiority inhibited Mundelein women from publicly expressing negative feelings and from initiating the active careers they had previously envisioned. Meanwhile, male CISCA draftees found that Catholic civilians' vision of pious, Christlike soldiers purified in a sacramental "baptism of fire" did not correlate with their own experiences of loneliness and spiritual emptiness. Overall, both male and female students struggled with Catholic Action's imagery of ideal men and women in a period of dislocation and intense personal stress.

The emerging picture is of a middle-class religious culture in transition, fraught with internal tensions and fissures under what became the Eisenhower era's smooth gloss of conformity, solidarity, and triumphalism. Catholics' general tendency toward spiritual elitism had been challenged by an inclusive ideology of unity and interpersonal contact. Educated laity—particularly female laity—had gained expectations of Catholic social leadership that did not necessarily translate into reality. While educated men's leadership role had been affirmed, in some cases their spiritual self-confidence had been destabilized. Generations and educational levels were separated by differing

constructions of society, liturgy, and spirituality. This interpretation of student culture at three Chicago Catholic institutions of higher education helps to explain the watershed of change and experimentation that followed upon the Second Vatican Council, as the possibility of sweeping transformation unleashed the accumulated questions, frustrations, and discontents of an educated laity, now in their parish pews.

In tracing the popular dissemination of liberal ideology on three Chicago Catholic campuses decades before Vatican II, this study affirms recent interpretations of the Council's American implementation, not as a sudden break with preceding tradition, but as continuous with Catholic Action movements that originated in the nineteenth century and gathered momentum in the first half of the twentieth century. A number of scholars have emphasized the preconciliar roots of postconciliar changes. For example, historians such as Arnold Sparr, William Halsey, and John T. McGreevy demonstrate the interwar development of progressive Catholic ideologies that prefigured the postconciliar emphasis on Catholic community and mutuality, while Philip Gleason and William P. Leahy emphasize the role of changing religious ideology in the structural development of American Catholic universities in the first half of the twentieth century.² Stephen M. Avella shows that before Vatican II Chicago Archdiocesan leaders such as Auxiliary Bishop Bernard Sheil and Monsignor Reynold Hillenbrand embraced, implemented, and

² Arnold Sparr, *To Promote, Defend, and Redeem: The Catholic Literary Revival and the Cultural Transformation of American Catholicism, 1920-1960* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990); William M. Halsey, *The Survival of American Innocence: Catholicism in an Era of Disillusionment, 1920-1940* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980); John T. McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 2003); Philip Gleason, *Contending with Modernity: Catholic Higher Education in the 20th Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); William P. Leahy, *Adapting to America: Catholics, Jesuits, and Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1991).

taught ideology of liturgical reform and social justice in seminary and local Catholic programming.³ Showing that preconciliar Catholic progressivism had impact at parish level, Eileen McMahon and John T. McGreevy analyze conflicts between progressive clergy and more conservative parishioners over issues of race and neighborhood transition.⁴ Adding to these observations of change at intellectual, structural, and parish levels, this dissertation demonstrates that preconciliar emphasis on concepts of “lay apostolate,” “Mystical Body of Christ,” and liturgical reform also shaped the youth culture of Chicago’s Catholic campuses, where Catholic progressivism co-opted American “campus life” values and rhetoric to influence students’ interpretations of class, ethnicity, race, and gender. While in pews many Catholics did experience the Council’s implementation as a disjuncture with the past, this dissertation shows that Catholic liberalism pervaded Chicago’s Catholic college campuses well before the 1960s, where it shaped the religious attitudes of an educated Catholic middle class.

However, by pointing out the roles of clerical influence and peer pressure in suppressing dissent from the Catholic Action agenda, this study complicates recent popular and scholarly tendencies to uncritically celebrate twentieth-century Catholic liberal movements as initiating a popular “liberation” of lay voice and agency. While collegiate Catholic Action at Loyola, Mundelein, and De Paul accomplished and promoted much that was positive—for example, greater racial integration on campus and

³ Steven M. Avella, *This Confident Church: Catholic Leadership and Life in Chicago, 1940-1965* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992).

⁴ McMahon, Eileen M. *What Parish Are You From? A Chicago Irish Community and Race Relations*. (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995); John T. McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

new opportunities for female leadership--it also had its casualties and coercive pressures. While students ostensibly led CISCA and, indeed, experienced in it greater freedom to lead and shape religious discussions than had been possible in catechism class, nevertheless clergy, bishops, and religious sisters planned and coordinated CISCA's increasingly structured and educational programs. Moreover, with the tacit encouragement of educators, student leadership applied peer pressure to marginalize and exclude students with more traditional views of spirituality and the lay-clerical relationship. In service to the Church's political image, American society, and "Mystical Body" ideology, organized Catholic Action took praiseworthy steps toward racial integration, but in the process suppressed extracurricular ethnic association on campus. In sum, organized Catholic Action—like the "campus life" culture that it co-opted--encouraged and, where possible, enforced lay conformity to Church leadership. As in "campus life," Catholic clerical and religious educators sought both to encourage and contain student initiative. By highlighting the roles of authority and coercion in the organizing the "lay apostolate," this dissertation adds critical complexity to interpretations of the Catholic "social justice" movement, which, like any other ideological program, had its problems and inconsistencies.

Finally, in relating Catholicism to collegiate "campus life," this dissertation makes fresh contributions to scholarship of higher education and American popular culture. On Chicago's Catholic campuses, educators and college students collaboratively accommodated American cultural participation within flexible religious concepts and imagery, often co-opting campus youth culture in support of Catholic religious identity

and expression. Depression-era Polish-American college students likewise directed the structures and rhetoric of “campus life” toward constructions of second-generation ethnic identity. Analysis of these processes adds an extra dimension of student response to intellectual and administrative studies of higher education, while also relating religion to American popular culture in ways that evoke Colleen McDannell’s study of twentieth-century Christian material culture and Robert A. Orsi’s analysis of twentieth-century Catholic women’s fiction.⁵ In illuminating cultural accommodation among students at religious institutions of higher education, this dissertation in a way does for Catholic college life what Lori Witt’s study of fundamentalist Protestant college women does for other Christian institutions.⁶ Since the roles of religion in twentieth-century student life and popular culture are still understudied topics, I hope that this dissertation makes a real contribution to both areas.

⁵ Colleen McDannell, *Material Christianity: Religion and Popular Culture in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995) ; Robert A. Orsi, “Imagining Women,” in *Thank You, St. Jude: Women’s Devotion to the Patron Saint of Hopeless Causes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 70-95.

⁶ Lori Witt, “More Than a ‘Slaving Wife’: The Limits, Possibilities, and Meaning of Womanhood for Conservative Protestant College Women in the 1920s and 1930s,” (Dissertation, Loyola University Chicago, 2001).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Records and Papers

Academic Enrollment. De Paul University Archives. Chicago, IL.

Biographical Files. DeAndreis-Rosato Memorial Archives. De Paul University. Chicago, IL.

CISCA Records. Loyola University Archives. Chicago, IL.

Leonard Covello Papers. Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia, PA.

Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920. Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1920. T625, 2076 rolls. Accessed through <http://www.ancestry.com> [online database]. June-December 2008.

Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930. Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1930. T626, 2,667 rolls. Accessed through <http://www.ancestry.com> [online database]. June-December 2008.

Daniel A. Lord, S.J. Papers. Georgetown University Archives. Washington, D.C.

Comerford J. O'Malley, C.M. Papers. De Paul University Archives. Chicago, IL.

Saint Vincent De Paul Church. De Paul University Archives. Chicago, IL.

Bernard J. Sheil Papers. Archdiocese of Chicago Archives. Chicago, IL.

University Council Minutes. De Paul University Archives. Chicago, IL.

Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J. Papers. Loyola University Archives. Chicago, IL.

Works Progress Administration. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey. Chicago: Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, 1942.

Newspapers and Serials

Action Now, 1947-1956.

America, 1920-1950.

Catholic Action, 1932-1953.

Chicago Catholic Worker, 1938-1941.

Chicago Defender, 1920-1950.

Chicago Tribune, 1920-1950.

Clepsydra, 1931-1936.

Commonweal, 1930-1950.

De Paul Quarterly, 1929-1930.

DePaulia, 1923-1960.

DePaulian [yearbook], 1927-1940

Loyola News, 1923-1960.

Loyolan [yearbook], 1924-1950

Loyola Quarterly, 1941-1949

Mundelein College Review, 1942-1962.

National Catholic Welfare Conference Bulletin, 1921-1930

New American [Polish-American student publication], 1934-1939

New World, 1926-1945.

Orate Fratres , 1930-1940.

Poetry, A Magazine of Verse, 1929-1937.

Polish Student, 1929-1934.

Queen's Work [bulletin of the Sodality], 1926-1940.

Quest [Mundelein student poetry annual], 1933-1946.

Saint Anthony Messenger, 1941.

Skyscraper, 1930-1950.

Spirit: A Magazine of Verse, 1934.

Today, 1945-1955.

Voice of St. Jude, 1930-1945.

Books and Pamphlets

Bauer, Sister Mary Roberta, S.S.N.D. "CISCA: An Educational Plan for Training Catholic Actionists." M.A. Thesis, DePaul University, 1945.

Bernard, Raymond E., S.J. *Ignatius Loyola: The Saint Who Understood People*. St. Louis, MO: The Queen's Work, 1956.

The Book of the Miraculous Medal. St. Louis, MO: B. Herder Book Company, 1941.+

Carrabine, Martin S.J. and Sister M. Cecilia, O.S.B., *The Parish Turns Red*. St. Louis, MO: The Queen's Work, 1943.

Cyr, George E. "The Sodality of Our Lady as an Extra-Curricular Activity." M.A. Thesis, Catholic University of America, 1929.

Day, Dorothy. *The Long Loneliness*. New York: Harper & Row, 1952. Reprint, 1997.

The Eucharistic Congress as Reported in the Chicago Tribune. Chicago: Chicago Tribune, 1926.

Fitzsimons, John and Paul McGuire. *Restoring All Things: A Guide to Catholic Action*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1938.

Garesche, Edward F., S.J., *The Sodality Manual*. St. Louis: Queen's Work Press, 1926)

Lord, Daniel A., S.J. *I Saw Soviet Russia: An Interview with Frederic Siedenburg, S.J.* St. Louis, MO: The Queen's Work, 1937.

- Lord, Daniel A., S.J., *The New Sodality Manual*. St. Louis, MO: Queen's Work, 1945
- Lord, Daniel A., S.J. *Our Part in the Mystical Body*. St. Louis, MO: The Queen's Work, 1946.
- Lord, Daniel A., S.J. *Pageant of Peace: A Christmas Masque*. Chicago: Loyola University, 1924.
- [Lord, Daniel A., S.J.] *Pageant of Youth, A Musical Masque by the Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S.J., Presented by The Catholics of Chicago in the Loyola University Alumni Gym*. Chicago: Loyola University, 1923.
- Lord, Daniel A., S.J., *Played By Ear* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1955).
- Morgan, Kieran P., C.M. *Miraculous Medal Novena Sermons*. Philadelphia: Jeffries and Manz Press, 1945.
- Noyes, Alfred, ed. *The Golden Book of Catholic Poetry*. Philadelphia and New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1946.
- Power, Robert J., C.M. and Joseph A. Finney, eds. *The Almanac of the Miraculous Medal*. Perryville, MO: Association of the Miraculous Medal, 1934.
- Powers, Thomas C., C.M. *The Fundamental Principles of Morality: An Introduction to the Study of Catholic Morals*. Chicago: De Paul University, 1939.
- Reiner, Joseph, S.J. *Mass Prayers and Hymns for Congregational Use*. St. Louis, MO: The Queen's Work, n.d.
- Reiner, Joseph, S.J. *A Program for Catholic Social Action*. St. Louis, MO: The Queen's Work, 1935.
- Report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities Pursuant to House Resolution 282, January 3, 1939*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1939.
- Shuster, George N., ed. *Catholicism in America: A Series of Articles from The Commonweal*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1954.
- The Story of the Twenty-Eighth International Eucharistic Congress* Chicago: 1927.
- Wolf, Bernice (Sister Mary Florence, S.L.). *The Sodality Movement in the United States, 1926-1936*. St. Louis, MO: The Queen's Work, 1939.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Avella, Steven M. *This Confident Church: Catholic Leadership and Life in Chicago, 1940-1965*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.
- Badger, Anthony. *The New Deal: Depression Years, 1933-1940*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1989.
- Bailey, Beth L. *From Front Porch to Back Seat: Courtship in Twentieth-Century America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Blatnica, Dorothy Ann. *At the Altar of Their God: African American Catholics in Cleveland, 1922-1961*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1995.
- Boyer, Paul. *Urban Masses and the Moral Order in America, 1820-1920*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Chinnici, Joseph C. *Living Stones: The History and Structure of Catholic Spiritual Life in the United States*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1996.
- Coffman, Edward M. *The War to End All Wars: The American Military Experience in World War I*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1998.
- Cohen, Lizabeth. *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Cohen, Robert. *When the Old Left Was Young: Student Radicals and America's First Mass Student Movement, 1929-1941*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- D'Agostino, Peter R. *Rome in America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Demming, Michael. *Mechanic Accents: Dime Novels and Working Class Culture in America*. London: Verso, 1987.
- Diggins, John P. "American Catholics and Italian Fascism," *Journal of Contemporary History* v. II no. 4 (October 1967), 51-68.
- Dolan, Jay P. *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.
- Dolan, Jay P, ed. *The American Catholic Parish: A History from 1850 to the Present*. New York: 1987.

- Dolan, Jay P. *The Immigrant Church: New York's Irish and German Catholics, 1815-1865*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.
- Enstad, Nan. *Ladies of Labor, Girls of Adventure: Working Women, Popular Culture, and Labor Politics at the Turn of the Twentieth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Erenberg, Lewis A. *Swinging the Dream: Big Band Jazz and the Rebirth of American Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Fass, Paula. *The Damned and the Beautiful*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Fisher, James Terence. *The Catholic Counterculture in America, 1933-1962*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1989.
- Fortman, Edmund J., S.J. *A Biographical History of the Chicago Province*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1987.
- Gallin, Alice, O.S.U. *Negotiating Identity: Catholic Higher Education Since 1960*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000.
- Galush, William. "American Poles and the New Poland: An Example of Change in Ethnic Orientation." *Ethnicity* 1 (1974) 209-221.
- Galush, William J. *For More Than Bread: Community and Identity in American Polonia, 1880-1940*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 2006.
- Gavin, Thomas F., S.J. *Champion of Youth: A Dynamic Story of a Dynamic Man, Daniel A Lord, S.J.* Daughters of St. Paul, 1977.
- Glassberg, David. *American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.
- Gleason, Philip. "Immigration and American Catholic Higher Education," in *American Education and the European Immigrant, 1840-1940*. Bernard J. Weiss, ed. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1982.
- Gleason, Philip, ed. *Catholicism in America*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Gleason, Philip. *Contending with Modernity: Catholic Higher Education in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

- Gleason, Philip. "Pluralism, Democracy, and Catholicism in the Era of World War II." *The Review of Politics* v.49 no. 2 (Spring 1987) 208-230.
- Goodchild, Lester F. "The Mission of the Catholic University in the Midwest, 1842-1890: A Comparative Case Study of the Effects of Strategic Policy Decisions upon the Mission of the University of Notre Dame, Loyola University of Chicago, and DePaul University." Ph.D. dissertation. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1986.
- Greeley, Andrew M. *From Backwater to Mainstream: A Profile of Catholic Higher Education*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1969.
- Greene, Victor. *For God and Country: The Rise of Polish and Lithuanian Ethnic Consciousness in America, 1860-1910*. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1975.
- Halsey, William H. *The Survival of American Innocence: Catholicism in an Age of Disillusionment, 1920-1940*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980.
- Harrington, Ann M. *Creating Community: Mary Frances Clarke and Her Companions*. Dubuque, IA: Mount Carmel Press, 2004.
- Harrington, Ann and Prudence Moylan, eds. *Mundelein Voices: The Women's College Experience, 1930-1991* (Chicago: Gannon Center for Women and Leadership, 2001).
- Hitcho, Thomas G. "A Descriptive and Exploratory Case Study of the Evolution of Intercollegiate Athletics and Education at Loyola University Chicago." Ph.D. Dissertation, Loyola University Chicago, 1996.
- Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz. *Alma Mater: Design and Experience in the Women's Colleges from Their Nineteenth-Century Beginnings to the 1930s*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984.
- Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz. *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present*. New York: A.A. Knopf, 1987.
- Kantowicz, Edward R. *Corporation Sole: Cardinal Mundelein and Chicago Catholicism*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983.
- Kerber, Linda K. and Jane Sherron De Hart, eds. *Women's America: Refocusing the Past*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

- Koenig, Harry C., S.T.D. ed., *A History of the Parishes of the Archdiocese of Chicago*. Chicago: The Archdiocese of Chicago, 1980.
- Leahy, William P., S.J. *Adapting to America: Catholics, Jesuits, and Higher Education in the Twentieth Century*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1991.
- Lears, T. Jackson. *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981)
- Liptak, Dolores. *Immigrants and Their Church*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1989.
- Lissak, Rivka Shpak. *Pluralism and Progressives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Lord, Daniel A., S.J. *Played By Ear*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1955.
- Loss, Christopher P. "The Most Wonderful Thing Has Happened to Me in the Army: Psychology, Citizenship, and American Higher Education in World War II." *Journal of American History* (December 2005), 864-891.
- Manier, Edward and John W. Houck, eds. *American Freedom and the Catholic University*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967.
- Marsden, George M. *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Marx, Paul B., O.S.B. *Virgil Michel and the Liturgical Movement*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1957.
- May, Eileen Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. Basic Books, 1988. Reprint 1999.
- McClusky, Neil G. *Catholic Education in America: A Documentary History*. New York, 1964.
- McDannell, Colleen. *Material Christianity: Religion and Popular Culture in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- McDonough, Peter. *Men Astutely Trained: A History of the Jesuits in the American Century*. New York: Macmillan, Inc., 1992.

- McElvaine, Robert S. *The Great Depression: America, 1929-1941*. New York: Times Books, 1983.
- McGreevy, John T. *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2003.
- McGreevy, John T. *Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- McMahon, Eileen M. *What Parish Are You From? A Chicago Irish Community and Race Relations*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1995.
- McShane, Joseph M. *Sufficiently Radical: Catholicism, Progressivism and the Bishops' Program of 1919*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1986.
- Melito, Jack M. et al. *Society of St. Vincent De Paul: 150 Years of Service in the United States*. St. Louis, MO: Society of St. Vincent De Paul, 1995.
- Mertz, James, S.J. *Madonna Della Strada Chapel, Loyola University: An Apostolate of Love*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1975.
- Neary, Timothy B. "Crossing Parochial Boundaries: African Americans and Interracial Social Action in Chicago, 1914-1954." Ph.D. Dissertation, Loyola University Chicago, 2004.
- O'Brien, David J. *American Catholics and Social Reform: The New Deal Years*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Orsi, Robert A. *The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem, 1880-1980*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- O'Toole, James ed. *Habits of Devotion: Catholic Religious Practice in Twentieth-Century America*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Parot, John Jacob. *Polish Catholics in Chicago, 1850-1920*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1981.
- Pecklers, Keith F. *The Unread Vision: The Liturgical Movement in the United States of America, 1926-1955*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Piehl, Mel. *Breaking Bread: The Catholic Worker and the Origin of Modern Catholic Radicalism in America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982.

- Power, Edward J. *Catholic Higher Education in America*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972.
- Reinert, Paul C. S.J. *The Urban Catholic University*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1970.
- Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University: A History*. New York: A Knopf, 1962.
- Ruff, Mark Edward. *The Wayward Flock: Catholic Youth in Postwar West Germany*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.
- Rury, John L. and Charles S. Suchar, eds. *DePaul University: Centennial Essays and Images*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1998.
- Rybolt, John E. *The American Vincentians: A Popular History of the Congregation of the Mission in the United States*. Brooklyn, NY: New City Press, 1988.
- Samors, Neal et al. *Chicago's Far North Side: An Illustrated History of Rogers Park and West Ridge*. Chicago: Rogers Park/West Ridge Historical Society, 2000.
- Sanders, James. *The Education of an Urban Minority: Catholics in Chicago, 1833-1965*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Schier, Tracy, and Cynthia Russett, eds. *Catholic Women's Colleges in America*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Schultz, Rima Lunin and Adele Hast, eds. *Women Building Chicago: A Biographical Dictionary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001.
- Shanabruch, Charles. *Chicago's Catholics*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.
- Skerrett, Ellen. *Born in Chicago: A History of Chicago's Jesuit University*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 2008.
- Skinner, James M. *The Cross and the Cinema: The Legion of Decency and the National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures, 1933-1970*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1993.
- Solomon, Barbara Miller. *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Sparr, Arnold. *To Promote, Defend, and Redeem: The Catholic Literary Revival and the Cultural Transformation of American Catholicism, 1920-1960*. Westport: 1990.

- Spencer, Thomas M. *The St. Louis Veiled Prophet Celebration: Power on Parade, 1877-1995*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2000.
- Tarvardian, Pauline Margaret Abraham. "An Uncompromising Commitment to Mission: Mundelein College and the Advancement of Women's Higher Education." Ph.D. Dissertation, Loyola University Chicago, 1990.
- Taves, Ann. *The Household of Faith: Roman Catholicism in Mid-Nineteenth Century America*. Notre Dame, IL: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986.
- Treat, Roger L. *Bishop Sheil and the CYO*. New York: Julian Messner, Inc., 1951.
- Walker, Lawrence D. *Hitler Youth and Catholic Youth, 1933-1936: A Study In Totalitarian Conquest*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1970.
- Lori Witt. "More Than a 'Slaving Wife': The Limits, Possibilities, and Meaning of Womanhood for Conservative Protestant College Women in the 1920s and 1930s." Dissertation. Loyola University Chicago, 2001.
- Woolner, David B. and Richard G. Kurial. *FDR, the Vatican, and the Roman Catholic Church in America, 1933-1945*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.
- Zotti, Mary Irene Zotti. *A Time of Awakening: The Young Christian Worker Story in the United States, 1938-1970*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1991.

VITA

Raised in Strongsville, OH, Rae Bielakowski earned her B.A. in English and History from the University of Notre Dame in 1998 and her M.A. in History from Northwestern University in 1999. She currently lives in Leavenworth, KS with her husband and two dogs.

