1983-3

JAMES A. BURNS, C.S.C.: MOLDER OF MEN

Second Annual Conference
on
The History of the Congregations
of Holy Cross in the U.S.A.
at
Moreau Seminary
Notre Dame, Indiana

Anne Kearney, Ph.D.
University Libraries
University of Notre Dame
19 March 1983

OUTLINE

I. Background on the Indiana Province in the 1890's

   A. Community structure
   B. Educational levels of priests and brothers
   C. Changes in direction with the House of Studies and Holy Cross College

II. Burns as President of Holy Cross College

   A. General administration
   B. Specific examples of Burns' influence - six priests

III. Burns as Provincial

   A. Changes in brothers' education
   B. Specific examples of Burns' influence - eight priests

IV. Burns as role model

   A. Study of Catholic education - dissertation and histories
   B. Involvement in the CEA
   C. Presidency of Notre Dame and continuing interest in Catholic education

V. Evaluation of Burns and concluding remarks

JAMES A. BURNS, C.S.C.: MOLDER OF MEN

Burns, through his involvement in congregational affairs, his presidency of Holy Cross College, and his years as Provincial, exerted a crucial influence on the educational formation of the priests and brothers. He did so by supporting the faction within the Congregation who favored more and better education for its members; by providing sound guidance to those in his charge; and by being a role model for the younger members of the Congregation.

I propose to support this thesis by concentrating on three aspects of Burns' life: 1) his involvement in the intra-congregational debate over education of the brothers and priests; 2) his influence on the younger members of the Congregation while president of Holy Cross College and Provincial of the Indiana Province; 3) his contribution to Catholic education both by his histories and his involvement in the Catholic Educational Association.

I. Background on the Indiana Province in the 1890's.

We know and understand anyone or anything better if we know its history. This is as true of James A. Burns as it is of the Congregations of Holy Cross. And, in order to understand the inter-action between Burns and the Congregation, we need to know something of the history of each.

James A. Burns came to Notre Dame at the age of thirteen to enroll in the Manual Labor School. In 1884 at the age of seventeen, Burns entered the Collegiate Department where he enrolled in the classical course, the field of study chosen by those considering a priestly vocation. Immediately after his graduation in 1888, Burns entered the Congregation of Holy Cross to begin his studies for the priesthood. Ordained in 1893, Burns was assigned to Notre Dame as a chemistry instructor working in the Science Department with Father John A. Zahm.[1]

Burns had become a protege of Zahm during his years as a student at Notre Dame, and this relationship was formative for many of the ideas that Burns put into effect later in his life. Zahm's specialty was science, and Father Edward Sorin, the founder of Notre Dame, had encouraged him to pursue this interest --- a somewhat unusual thing for Sorin to do since he envisioned Notre Dame as a producer of good Catholics rather than good scholars.[2]

Zahm, however, was a scholar who was interested in producing other scholars. The national reputation that the University had gained by the time Burns joined the faculty was due in large part to the work of men like Zahm. The articles and books

that Zahm wrote gave scholarly prestige to the University and brought Zahm an honorary Doctor of Philosophy degree from the Vatican.[3]

Because the religious congregation to which Zahm and Burns belonged furnished the crucial context and vehicle for their activities, a brief description of its structure and functioning is called for. In 1893 the Congregation of Holy Cross included both priests and brothers and was divided administratively into houses each of which had its own superior. If the house was also the site of one of the Holy Cross colleges, the president of the college was automatically the local superior of the religious community. Over the local superiors was the Provincial, whose term of office was six years. The Indiana Province, which included the United States and the Bengal missions, was one of the three provinces of the Congregation. At the top of this pyramid was the Superior-General who held office for life. Every year representatives from the various houses met in a Provincial Chapter to decide the obediences or assignments for the members of the province. Every six years, the Provincial Chapter recommended a candidate for the office of Provincial to the Superior-General who made the appointment. There was no canonical limit to the number of terms that a provincial could serve. Every six years, a General Chapter was held, composed of delegates from the provincial chapters. By coincidence, the convening of the General Chapters and the terms of the Provincials of the Indiana Province were on the same six year cycle. At the General Chapter any affairs could be brought to the floor for

discussion and legislation. The General Chapter was the body that elected the Superior-General and at times recommended the provincials. Although the structure is very clear on paper, affairs from Sorin's tenure until the publication of canon law in 1918 were in a state of flux, where the personality of the Superior-General was the determining factor in how things were done.[4]

Crucial personnel changes in the Congregation began on July 27, 1893 with the death of Father Thomas Walsh, President of Notre Dame. Father Andrew Morrissey, who had replaced Zahm as vice-president in 1892, became the eighth president and superior of the University community. When Sorin, the Superior-General died on October 31, 1893, Father Gilbert Francais became the new Superior-General. Although the Superior-General usually had his headquarters in France, Francais, like Sorin, divided his time between France and the United States.[5]

With these changes in leadership at the University and in the Congregation, the stage was set for conflict over the question of education for the various members of the Indiana Province. There were serious divisions within the Province: the brothers were divided over the need for baccalaureate education; the priests were divided over the need for graduate education. Morrissey and Father William Corby, the Provincial of the Indiana Province, were the leaders of the faction within the Province who opposed extensive education for either priests or brothers. Neither Morrissey nor his allies could see any practical value in specialization.[6]

The other side in the dispute, Zahm, Burns and Father John W. Cavanaugh, then vice-president of the University, wanted both the priests and brothers to receive additional training. Francais, who was then at Notre Dame, favored the educational views of the Zahm faction. In March, 1895 Francais created a five-member commission to decide on educational policy for the Province; four of the commissioners supported the position of the Zahm faction. The Commission's first act was to send young priests like Burns to secular universities such as Harvard for summer school; some seminarians were likewise sent to Europe for their training. This chance for additional work at the Harvard Summer School came at an ideal time for Burns since he was just finishing two years of work on a master's degree in chemistry which was awarded at the June 1895 commencement.[7]

The disagreements over educational policy became sharper when, in May of 1895, Francais sent Corby a Circular on Education which stated that there was to be a house of studies for the brothers at Notre Dame and one for the seminarians near the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. Francais named Zahm the superior of the Washington house where the seminarians would study for the priesthood and also be able to take specialized work in various disciplines at Catholic University. Corby, Morrissey and the older members of the Province opposed the establishment of such houses of studies. Morrissey's main objection was that the education was unnecessary for the type of teaching that the brothers and priests were doing. Moreover, a Johns Hopkins man had told him that he would not advise anyone

to go to Catholic University, presumably because of qualitative deficiencies. So convinced was Corby that the plan was misguided that he withheld Francais' Circular from publication and advised Francais of that action by mail. However, the plans for the establishment of the houses soon became common knowledge because Father Frederick Linneborn, the head of the seminary, gave the news to his classes.[8]

When Francais learned that his Circular had never been published, he was furious. Francais quickly aired his rage in a letter to Morrissey. Realizing his tactical error, Morrissey changed his stand. Next Francais ordered Corby to make the Circular public. This explicit command had the desired effect, but the Morrissey-Corby forces were far from quiescent.[9]

Since Zahm was to be the superior of the Washington House of Studies, anything that delayed his departure from Notre Dame might also postpone the opening of the Washington House. If Zahm remained at Notre Dame, and the Washington House was thereby held up for a year, Francais would be back in France and Corby, as Provincial, could see to it that the Washington House never opened. An excuse to keep Zahm at Notre Dame came when the rumor spread on campus that Professor Maurice Egan was planning to leave Notre Dame for Catholic University. Both Morrissey and Cavanaugh thought that Zahm was behind the rumored move. Therefore, they reasoned, if Zahm stayed at Notre Dame, so would Egan. Since it was Mrs. Egan, not Zahm, who was pushing for the move to Catholic University, Zahm's whereabouts had no influence on Egan's decision to move. The strategem worked anyhow: Egan

departed for Washington, but Zahm tarried another year at Notre Dame. Plans for the House of Studies went forward, too, as Francais named Father Peter Franciscus to replace Zahm as director of the project.[10]

Staying at Notre Dame actually augmented Zahm's influence since Francais soon appointed him Prefect of Studies and put him in charge of education for the Congregation. Working within the scope of his new duties, Zahm pushed the plans for the Washington House. During the first week of August of 1895, Zahm and Corby went to Washington to find a suitable location for the seminarians. Finally Zahm rented two houses just east of Catholic University. The last group of seminarians left for Washington on August 30, 1895. Despite the opposition of Morrissey and Corby, the House of Studies with Franciscus as superior was established in Washington before Francais returned to France.[11]

The intra-congregational politics took a new turn when Zahm was sent to Rome as Procurator-General, the equivalent of a lobbyist who both represented and presented the interests of the Congregation of Holy Cross before all of the Sacred Congregations of the Vatican in Rome.[12]

With Zahm in Rome, Francais returned in 1897 to Notre Dame where he became aware of the continued opposition of Corby and Morrissey to his educational plans. Corby and Morrissey planned to propose the closing of the Holy Cross College at the General Chapter of the Congregation scheduled for the summer of 1898. In the interim they were busy lining up votes for their proposal.[13]

Francais sought to combat their proselytizing by moving his residence at Notre Dame from the Presbytery, which had only a few occupants, to the Community House where he could exert more influence on more members of the Province. He soon became the idol of the brothers whose votes he needed to defeat the Corby-Morrissey proposal. Francais also decided to call Zahm back from Rome in the early spring of 1898 so that he would be available during the crucial pre-chapter period.[14]

When Father Corby died December 28, 1897, Francais appointed Zahm to complete the last few months of Corby's term as Provincial. Burns regarded it as a great blessing for Notre Dame that Zahm would be Provincial until the question of higher education was settled at the General Chapter in 1898. "The actors in this drama are dropping off one by one," he mused in his diary, "but they are actors whose part has been played, and with every replacement a new impetus must be given the great onward movement toward higher and better things."[15]

On January 23, 1898 Zahm arrived in South Bend and was met at the train by a delegation from Notre Dame. Francais had insisted that a reception be held for Zahm. Morrissey, who saw his foremost opponent on the educational question elevated to be his superior, opposed the reception and considered resigning as president of Notre Dame. Further thought caused him to discard this idea and to join in the reception. While he seemed to be cordial, Burns thought that his facial expressions were very revealing: "the Rev. President looked a good deal as though he were attending a funeral. . . ."[16]

Father Zahm, while conciliatory, was determined to be the provincial even if he was not elected to the post at the General Chapter. He was very confident that Holy Cross College would be continued, improved upon and even amplified. Part of the reason for his optimism was that he had requested Bishop Keane to write to Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland and others about Holy Cross College. Keane in turn asked these prelates to write to Zahm and Francais emphasizing that any severing of the connection between Holy Cross College and the Catholic University would be regarded as an unfriendly move, injurious to Catholic University and prejudicial to the Congregation of Holy Cross. Both Ireland and Gibbons complied in letters to Zahm in February of 1898.[17]

In addition to the question of higher education there was considerable speculation over whether Zahm would be elected to a six year term by the General Chapter that summer. His biggest bloc of opponents were the brothers who felt that he had discriminated against them when he was acting president in 1888 during Father Walsh's trip to Europe. To combat this, Burns suggested to Zahm that the teaching brotherhood be rehabilitated by opening a four year course in pedagogy at Notre Dame. The brothers would not be permitted to teach unless they graduated from college. Burns thought that this would slow the closing of so many of the brothers' schools. Zahm recognized the wisdom of the suggestions and enlarged it by proposing that some brothers might even be sent to Catholic University for advanced work.[18]

As the time for the General Chapter neared, Zahm seemed to be gaining the necessary votes. Brother Englebert, Director of

the Brother's House of Studies in Mount St. Vincent, was pro-Zahm as were more and more of the brothers. Francais was also having success and wrote Burns that Zahm could count on unanimous support from Canada. The Canadian votes plus the votes from France and the Indiana Provinces would guarantee Zahm's election.[19]

Immediately before the General Chapter was held in August, Zahm engineered a clever coup in regard to Holy Cross College. Zahm called a meeting of the Provincial Council, an advisory body, and asked them to vote for the continuation of Holy Cross College. Since the majority of the members of the Council opposed the motion, they refused to vote for it. When Zahm informed them that the General Chapter would pass it over their heads, the Council voted to let things remain status quo, to leave things in the hands of the provincial. Since this was exactly what Zahm had wanted, Burns saw it as evidence of how well Zahm's years in Rome had acquainted him with Italian diplomacy.[20]

The results of the General Chapter, which was held in Canada in early August, were very gratifying to the pro-education members of the Congregation. As expected Zahm was elected provincial by a huge majority, and Holy Cross College was permanently established. The question of the education of the brothers did not fare as well. Rather than the four year baccalaureate education urged by Burns, the brothers were to receive a good three year course equal to a college preparatory course. Obediences were also given at the Chapter and Burns was

the Brother's House of Studies in Mount St. Vincent, was pro-Zahm as were more and more of the brothers. Francais was also having success and wrote Burns that Zahm could count on unanimous support from Canada. The Canadian votes plus the votes from France and the Indiana Provinces would guarantee Zahm's election.[19]

Immediately before the General Chapter was held in August, Zahm engineered a clever coup in regard to Holy Cross College. Zahm called a meeting of the Provincial Council, an advisory body, and asked them to vote for the continuation of Holy Cross College. Since the majority of the members of the Council opposed the motion, they refused to vote for it. When Zahm informed them that the General Chapter would pass it over their heads, the Council voted to let things remain status quo, to leave things in the hands of the provincial. Since this was exactly what Zahm had wanted, Burns saw it as evidence of how well Zahm's years in Rome had acquainted him with Italian diplomacy.[20]

The results of the General Chapter, which was held in Canada in early August, were very gratifying to the pro-education members of the Congregation. As expected Zahm was elected provincial by a huge majority, and Holy Cross College was permanently established. The question of the education of the brothers did not fare as well. Rather than the four year baccalaureate education urged by Burns, the brothers were to receive a good three year course equal to a college preparatory course. Obediences were also given at the Chapter and Burns was

thought that Zahm was right to act quickly when the chance came to further the development of the Congregation and Catholic education.[24]

The purchase of the Thayer estate and the improvements to the physical plant at Notre Dame had resulted in large debts for the Indiana Province. Some priests and brothers feared that Zahm was "swamping" the community with debts. The financial status of the Province in September of 1900 seemed to justify their concern. As more and more bills came due, even Zahm began to wish that he had never heard of improvements.[25]

Financial problems were not Zahm's only worry over the next five years. During this period Zahm saw his plans for an undergraduate college at Catholic University defeated when Catholic University decided to admit undergraduates in 1905. He also became disillusioned with Morrissey when he realized that Morrissey was one of the chief opponents to his educational plans. The friction between Zahm and Morrissey reached the point in 1905 that Morrissey concluded that he must resign as President of Notre Dame or face being dismissed by Zahm. He left for Europe, ostensibly for a year's rest, but with every intention of continuing his campaign against Zahm. Since Morrissey did not know how Francais would react to criticism of Zahm, he moved cautiously. While Morrissey was seeking to undermine Zahm with Francais, he advised his allies at Notre Dame to continue to agitate about Zahm's treatment of the Brothers.[26]

From the available records it seems that Francais' disenchantment with Zahm's methods began in March of 1904 when Zahm

requested permission to accept the Catholic University's invitation to establish a lay undergraduate college. Although Francais had cabled permission, it was with reluctance as a later letter shows. He felt that Zahm was moving too fast and accepting too many responsibilities.[27]

Francais was annoyed by Zahm's tendency to carry on normal business in rush fashion. Routine affairs such as dismissal letters, approvals for professions and so forth were sent by cable rather than through the regular mail. Francais also was displeased that Zahm asked for the letters of subdiaconate, diaconate and priesthood all at the same time. Knowing Zahm's haste and impatience, Francais was ready to believe the stories that Morrissey told him. In general, Francais seemed to regard Zahm as a sloppy administrator who did not pay enough attention to details. His failure to make his plans explicit engendered confusion and made Zahm appear to be acting on his own authority when he evidently thought Francais had already approved what he was doing. Even though Zahm was able to answer all of Francais' questions, it seems doubtful if these answers disabused Francais of the above impressions.[28]

And, of course, Morrissey was in a position to reinforce these negative impressions since he was now traveling with Francais as his socius, or companion. Francais thought that Providence had given him Morrissey for the 1906 trip to America for the General Chapter. The situation of 1897 was reversed: then Zahm rose in Francais' estimation as Corby and Morrissey fell; now Morrissey's star was ascending and Zahm's was sinking

rapidly.[29]

The Morrissey forces at Notre Dame were also successful. They circulated anew the old charge that Zahm was unsympathetic to the Brothers and was gradually strangling them by refusing to accept new postulants and closing down their schools. These charges were patently false. Zahm had sent recruiters to Germany and Ireland to find vocations to the Holy Cross Brothers. He admonished the recruiters, however, to bring back only those interested in the religious and teaching life. They were to beware of those who simply desired passage to the United States.[30]

The Brothers' schools were closing down, but this was no new phenomenon. Burns had noted this tendency as early as January of 1898, and he correctly analyzed the problem as the Brothers' lack of education. Because of the cost factor, sisters were replacing the Brothers in the elementary schools. The Brothers, who were now displaced upward, were unprepared to teach at the secondary level. This was not Zahm's fault. At the 1898 General Chapter he had favored baccalaureate training for the Brothers, and it had been defeated. Despite the provable falseness of these charges, the Brothers joined the anti-Zahm forces.[31]

With the lack of support from the Brothers and Francais, Zahm had no chance for re-election. Morrissey became the next provincial by a vote of eighteen to two. With Zahm's departure for Holy Cross College, a crucial period in the history of the Indiana Province ended. But even though Zahm was gone, his plans, like Holy Cross College, were so firmly established that

the Morrissey forces could not eliminate them. Father Burns must have been disappointed, but he could not have been altogether surprised by the turn of events. Several years earlier, he had perceived that Zahm's colleagues were unable to appreciate his efforts. "He is too far in advance of the men among whom he is living," Burns confided to his diary. "He is a man of the 20th century, and we are still, I believe, living in the 19th."[32]

II. Burns as President of Holy Cross College.

Father Zahm's decision to appoint Burns as president of Holy Cross College in 1900 was a wise move for he thereby placed one of his most fervent supporters in a strategic place. Since the establishment of Holy Cross had been the focus of conflicting views in the province, it was of the utmost importance that its superior be not only a supporter, but a wise administrator and a conscientious mentor for the seminarians and priests under his control. Burns met all of these criteria. And, it is largely thanks to Burns and his capable administration that Holy Cross College was so firmly established that the Morrissey forces could not eliminate it after Zahm was no longer Provincial. Despite their differences in philosophies, Burns was quite capable of working with Morrissey. Upon Morrissey's election, Burns sent him a letter of congratulations:

> I have felt that, inasmuch as there was to be a change of Provincial, no one in the Community was so well fitted to assume the duties of the office as yourself. I feel sure that the Province will prosper and make steady progress under your direction and hope that I may have the merit, in common with the other members of the Community, of helping to contribute to this result.

Burns continued with an inquiry concerning the number of seminarians to be sent to Holy Cross from Notre Dame. He also expressed the hope that Morrissey might visit the college in order to talk to the seminarians to determine questions related to their studies, ordinations, and so on. In lieu of this, Burns proposed to write detailed reports, especially about the young men proposed for ordination. These accounts provide us with a

clear picture of Burns' administration of Holy Cross College.[33]

Although Burns was to work well with Morrissey, this does not indicate a change in philosophy.

> I know that the colleges outside are clamoring for more men, and that the need is very great. But if they could only manage to get along in some way till next June, we would be able to have nine good men ready for ordination, and this would enable you to supply their wants from then on.

Another example of the way in which Burns planned to work with Morrissey was contained in Burns' 1906 Saint Andrew's Day greeting to Morrissey:

> My experience here as Superior has been sufficient to make me realize that a responsibility such as you bear must be a terrible burden, and that it is the duty of all good religious to lighten it by zealous cooperation and earnest prayer. You will be glad to know that, so far as I can see, the young men here have, in general, a good, devoted, religious spirit, and that you can count on them in planning for the needs of the various establishments. I am sure the community is destined to make great progress during the coming years, and our sincere wish and prayer on St. Andrew's Day shall be that God may give you the strength and grace to direct the community to this end.[34]

Much of Burns' time was taken up by the mundane details of community life: intentions, masses which people had requested for various reasons and for which a stipend was given, physical facilities, ordinations, and so forth. But he never let down in his persistent drive to see that the seminarians and priests received the best education possible. Because of his crucial position, he was able to influence many of the most promising members of the Congregation. During the nineteen years that he was at Holy Cross College, he has been credited

with turning out a generation of "zealous, saintly, and well-educated priests, men who came back to Notre Dame and served as a leaven for a new intellectualism."[35]

Burns was well equipped to do this work because he was interested in the students as individuals, and he understood the importance of the discipline necessary for community life. When a seminarian arrived at Holy Cross, Burns tried to discover his aptitudes. For example, he wrote of one young man: "Mr. Foik strikes me as a man who will make a good librarian. I shall give him charge of our library this year." In this case, Burns' judgment was quite accurate: Paul J. Foik became librarian at the University of Notre Dame in 1915. During the nine years that he held this position, Foik made great strides in building the library collection, adding to the archives and assembling a professional staff. Foik was the founder and chairman of the Library Section of the National Catholic Educational Association. Later when the Library Section separated to become the Catholic Library Association, Foik was elected its first vice-president. He also founded and was editor of the Catholic Periodical Index. Here indeed was a man who would make a good librarian.[36]

Once Burns had identified the student's aptitude, he outlined an appropriate course of study. If he was unfamiliar with the area himself, he sent the student for academic counseling to the proper professor at Catholic University. He constantly pled the cause of students who needed more time at Holy Cross in order to complete their graduate studies at Catholic University. Nor was he hesitant to recommend that the students be sent to

the great secular universities if their preparation required it.

A few examples of the problems Burns dealt with will illustrate the character of his administration. One student, Mr. Charles O'Donnell, complained of a professor in the English Department at Catholic University and wished to drop his course. Other seminarians had the same opinion of the professor since the course consisted of a study of the authors and their works rather than the literary movements and problems. The students thought that this was an undergraduate approach. Burns believed that all of the students could benefit from the class despite the way it was conducted. Since all of the seminarians were preparing to teach literature at Notre Dame, a greater familiarity with the authors and their works would be to their benefit. As in all cases, Burns was guided by what would benefit the students and the Community.[38]

Two years later O'Donnell was still at Holy Cross and had received notice that he was to remain there for the following year. With this in mind, Burns recommended that he go on for the doctorate in English at Catholic University. Whether he benefited from the above mentioned course, two years later he was to talk to the same professor about a subject for a thesis! While O'Donnell was disappointed that he could not pursue his graduate work at Harvard, Burns did secure permission for him to attend summer school there. In doing this Burns took into consideration not only the courses he needed for his degree but also the courses which would aid him in his teaching. This same Mr. O'Donnell was ordained as Father Charles O'Donnell; he served

for six years as Provincial of the Indiana Province and later as the twelfth president of the University of Notre Dame.[39]

Two other future presidents of Notre Dame were trained at Holy Cross under Burns. In 1905 Matthew Walsh, later to be the eleventh president, came to Holy Cross for his theological training. While there he enrolled in the History Department at Catholic University finishing his doctoral dissertation in 1907. That same year he went to Columbia University in New York to take three economics courses which Burns felt would help him in his work at Notre Dame. In September of 1907 he left Holy Cross for a year's study of economics at Johns Hopkins before returning to Notre Dame to teach.[40]

The third president was John F. O'Hara who began his work at Holy Cross College in 1912. He made an excellent record in his theological studies while also studying Latin American history at Catholic University at Burns' suggestion. O'Hara was ordained in 1916 and the following year studied foreign trade methods at some New York banks before beginning course work in commerce at the University of Pennsylvania. The friendship formed during these years between O'Hara and Burns became more intimate and was continuous until Burns' death. His influence on O'Hara during these formative years cannot be overemphasized.[41]

When Morrissey became Provincial, five first-year seminarians at Holy Cross had begun graduate work at Catholic University. In many cases Morrissey felt that the three years allotted for the seminarians' theological training was as long as the Province could spare them. Burns, however, was anxious that young

seminarians like these be permitted to finish their graduate work. He touched on this matter frequently in his correspondence with Morrissey. For example:

> I trust it will be possible for you to allow Mr. Donohue to return here next year, to study the higher mathematics. He has a special aptitude in this line, . . . It would be too bad if no one of the crowd we are sending out this year came back for higher studies.[42]

There are some cases of students at Holy Cross which involved both academic problems and discipline. One such case involved two young priests who asserted that they had the right to hear each other's confessions without authorization from Burns. Their desire to confess to each other stemmed from the "particular friendship" they had formed in violation of the rules of the Congregation.[43]

Burns felt that he was in part to blame for the laxness of the older of the two since he had been too indulgent to him in the past. When he presented his dissertation to Dr. John Damen Maguire of Catholic University, Dr. Maguire discovered that much of it had been plagiarized from another work. Burns tried to intercede and sought Maguire's permission for the priest to do another dissertation. When Maguire refused, the young priest was sent to Notre Dame. Although Burns was very disappointed in his action, he sought to keep the reasons for his return confidential.[44]

A similar case involved a young priest who had served on the Holy Cross Faculty while doing his graduate work at Catholic University. While at Holy Cross, he had been indiscreet in his relationships with women. Burns had become concerned about this

problem and was relieved when the priest was reassigned to St. Edward's in Texas.[45]

When the ex-faculty member returned to Holy Cross to complete lost notes for a chapter that was already written, Burns realized that this was a ruse to renew his contact with the young woman and immediately wrote Morrissey to ask for his recall. Burns was further disturbed by a letter he had intercepted which indicated that the priest in question was seriously considering leaving the Congregation.[46]

Burns felt that the ex-faculty member had behaved badly, but he showed his usual concern for the feelings of others in the way in which he handled his return to Notre Dame. To spare him potential embarrassment, Burns advised him to spend a day in Philadelphia, some time with his sisters and New Year's Day with his mother. Burns' actions seem to have been successful since the priest remained with the Congregation and became a faculty member at the University of Notre Dame.[47]

The human concern for his charges shown so clearly in the above cases is evident elsewhere, too. In a matter as mundane as the length of time the seminarians stayed at a vacation camp in the summer, Burns let them have a voice in the decision. "This is the 7th week. I proposed to have them come home at /sic/ the end of this week, as some of them were anxious to come, but a secret ballot showed that the great majority wanted to stay a while longer, so I allowed them to stay till Friday of next week."[48]

Burns also exhibited great concern over the illness of Mr.

Joseph Quinlan, a seminarian at Holy Cross in 1914. Mr. Quinlan, a "splendid student" and one of the most promising men in the house, became ill in October with what was thought to be a bilious attack, but which turned out to be a diabetic condition. At first Quinlan responded to treatment, but within a month, he was losing weight again. Burns decreased his class load and eventually permitted him to withdraw from all classes. In view of his health, the faculty recommended that Quinlan be ordained before Christmas as they felt this would remove a worry from his mind and aid in his recuperation.[49]

Unfortunately his condition continued to deteriorate. Plans were still continuing for the ordination although his brother, Father Michael Quinlan, was notified of his condition on December 8, 1914. A week later he was dead. Although Burns considered Quinlan's calm acceptance of impending death very edifying for the young men, he was stricken by the loss. ". . . I do not think we ever had a brighter or more promising man in this house. He would have made a great man for philosophy."[50]

During Burns' tenure at Holy Cross he was also in contact with other senior members of the Community. One was Father Julius Nieuwland who often visited Holy Cross and consulted Burns for his advice. Nieuwland had come to Holy Cross in 1899 and had finished his doctorate in chemistry at the Catholic University under Professor John J. Griffin. When the time came to publish the dissertation in magazines, Nieuwland had a crucial question: Should Professor Griffin's name be listed along with his own? Shortly before Nieuwland proposed this question to

Burns, Griffin had told Burns that he had had Nieuwland admitted to the Deutsche Chemische Gesellschaft, a German chemical society founded in 1867 as an alliance of theorists and industrial chemists. Burns' advice to Nieuwland was very practical.

> If you left it to me, I would say waiving the question of right for the time being, put Dr. Griffin's name along with your own. If this were to be the only thing you would ever publish, it might make a difference; but since it is - as I feel sure - only the first of a long series of fruitful researches, all to be published, what difference does it make? . . . your afterwork / sic / along the same lines will show where the credit chiefly lies . . . publish it and put his name in, and send him a copy.[51]

When Nieuwland visited Holy Cross, he often made suggestions to Burns about the students. On one stop, he suggested that Mr. Ernest Davis study pharmacy to enable him to take charge of that course at Notre Dame. Burns thought this was an excellent suggestion and followed through with letters to Morrissey and Cavanaugh. Evidently this suggestion was not followed. Davis finished his advanced degree in chemistry and taught at Notre Dame, but there is no evidence that he studied or taught pharmacy.[52]

While it is impossible to detail Burns' influence on all the seminarians who completed their training at Holy Cross, there is ample documentation to justify the statement of the centennial historians of Notre Dame that "Whatever prestige was attained by men like Father Matthew Walsh, Father Frank Wenniger, Father Charles O'Donnell, Father J. Leonard Carrico, Father Ernest Davis, and many others, must be shared, in large part, with Father Burns."[53]

III. Burns as Provincial.

In the summer of 1927 Burns received another honor in recognition of his talents when the Superior-General of the Congregation appointed him to complete Father George J. Finnigan's term as Provincial of the Indiana Province. In 1932 the General Chapter of the Congregation ratified the Superior-General's choice by electing Burns to a full six year term. Burns now held a very responsible position since the Indiana Province included all the Holy Cross priests and brothers serving in the United States and in several dependent missions in Asia. Because the provincial acted for the Provincial Chapter between meetings and was the official who decided which men to educate and how much education they should receive, Burns was now in a position to see that his educational plans for the brothers and priests were put into effect. His new position also gave him more influence over the University since he now became the religious superior of the president and chairman of the university's board of trustees.[54]

As early as 1898 Burns had been concerned about the educational background of the Brothers of Holy Cross. He had tried with Father Zahm to see that the brothers' education was upgraded in order to prepare them to move into high school level work. His suggestion for a four-year course in pedagogy at Notre Dame was backed by Zahm, but was not approved by the General Chapter of 1898. Instead the brothers were guaranteed a good three-year course which was equivalent to a college preparatory program. By 1927 when Burns became provincial, the brothers'

education had been increased to include the first three years of college level work. The general rule was for brothers to complete a B.A. degree at Notre Dame before going out to teach. This did not, however, mean that all brothers were college graduates before becoming teachers; nor did it mean that all brothers who graduated could qualify for a first class teaching license. It was to alleviate this condition that Burns required the brothers at Dujarie Institute on the Notre Dame campus - a house of spiritual formation for teaching brothers as well as an educational institute - to obtain a baccalaureate degree from Notre Dame and to complete the specialized courses in education required for high school level teaching. Since many of the brothers were already teaching at the high school level either in Holy Cross or diocesan schools, this improvement in their preparation was long overdue.[55]

Burns' influence on the training of the Holy Cross priests is easier to uncover since their schooling was done away from Notre Dame. Many priests were sent abroad to study or to some of the great secular universities in the United States. As the centennial historial of Notre Dame recorded: "To all who wished to engage in higher studies, he lent a sympathetic ear, and was most generous in granting opportunities for graduate work." An examination of Burns' influence on Fathers Peter P. Forrestal, Philip Moore, Leo L. Ward, John T. Cavanaugh, Leo R. Ward, Charles C. Miltner, Stanislaus F. Lisewski and Thomas T. McAvoy will serve as examples of how he worked to upgrade the education of his priests.[56]

Peter P. Forrestal, who went on to translate "The Solis Diary of 1767" and to write "The Venerable Padre Fray Antonio Margel de Jesus," both of which are still primary sources for the development of the Catholic Church in Texas, was one of the priests whom Burns sent abroad for further study. Forrestal had completed his master's degree in Spanish at St. Edward's University where he had taught for 14 years. Burns, who was a great believer in study and travel abroad, decided to send Forrestal to Spain to study Spanish literature at the University of Madrid and other leading Spanish universities. After spending a year in Spain, Forrestal returned to teach Spanish at St. Edward's College for five years and later at Notre Dame.[57]

Another priest sent abroad by Burns was Philip S. Moore, who had already completed his master's degree at the Catholic University. Moore went to Paris in 1929 to study as a Penfield Scholar at the Ecole Nationale des Chartes. When Moore passed his examination there, Burns shared in his joy:

> I was glad you wrote at once and under the elation of the moment. This made your letter all the more interesting and enabled me to visualize your satisfaction more readily. I share your joy and offer my sincere congratulations. It is indeed an honor for the Community . . . You have permission to visit any place in France that you may have the opportunity to get to.[58]

When Moore returned to Notre Dame in 1933, he had completed the requirements for the Archiviste Paleography degree, He soon put his studies to good use as founder of Notre Dame's Mediaeval Institute. While still teaching at Notre Dame, he finished his doctorate at Catholic University in 1936. It is not surprising

that such a scholar would later lobby for the establishment of a graduate school at Notre Dame and was appointed its first dean.[59]

At about the same time Burns sent Father Leo L. Ward, a Notre Dame Ph.D. of 1920, to Oxford. As he explained:

> I have thought that a year at Oxford would afford opportunity for him to do a lot of reading, make literary acquaintances, and hear some worthwhile lectures, and in general profit by the atmosphere of the University and its traditions.

Burns was deeply interested in Ward's progress and reminded him that he was not to hesitate to spend money for travel.

> Remember that traveling of an instructive kind is part of your year's work; and do not hesitate to incur whatever expenses may be required in order to get the fullest benefit of your opportunities. For instance, go to Stratford-On-Avon when the time comes to see the Shakespearean Players.

After his year abroad Ward returned to Notre Dame where he taught English and soon became head of the department. He was an excellent model for his writing students: he authored a number of books and short stories and edited collections.[60]

Burns was always interested in finding the best places for his young priests to study. The case of John Cavanaugh is a good example. At first Burns considered sending him to Paris or to Louvain to study Church history. But before making a decision he asked Moore to investigate the program at Paris. Moore's advisor, Father Lacombe, suggested that Cavanaugh go to Oxford and study under the Regius Professor of History. Such advice mystified Burns who immediately wrote Leo L. Ward requesting him to check the information. Ward quickly responded that Oxford would

not be "very serviceable for that purpose." If Cavanaugh were to specialize in the history of the Church in England, Oxford would be worthwhile, but as preparation for teaching general Church history in the seminary, he should go elsewhere. Based on this information, Burns scuttled the plans for Cavanaugh's study of Church history and instead sent him to Rome in 1931 to study philosophy at the Gregorian University. When Cavanaugh returned to Notre Dame in 1933, he was made assistant prefect of religion. Later he became prefect of religion, assistant provincial, vice-president and then the fifteenth president of Notre Dame in 1946.[61]

Father Leo R. Ward, who later authored some seventy books and was head of the Notre Dame philosophy department, was given an opportunity to study at both Oxford and Louvain after completing his doctorate at Catholic University. During the fall semester of 1934 Ward was at Oxford studying Greek and Aristotle; the spring semester he studied philosophy at Louvain, concentrating on St. Thomas Aquinas. While Ward was still at Louvain writing a book on world politics, he was joined by Father Charles C. Miltner who was also to study philosophy and to prepare a book on ethics. When Miltner returned to Notre Dame, where he had been Dean of the College of Arts and Letters under Matthew Walsh, he again served as Dean of Arts and Letters and later as the Head of the Department of Religion.[62]

Another priest who was studying abroad was Stanislaus F. Lisewski at the University of Krakow. Lisewski had gone to Krakow in 1934 and both Burns and John F. O'Hara, the president

of the University, thought that he should stay an additional year to complete his work in Slavic studies. ". . . /y/ou ought to go on with your Polish work, as you outline it, and . . . you ought to get as much acquaintance with other Slovak languages and literature as you may be able to get." Lisewski was pleased with these plans for his additional study because he could easily get the course work at Krakow. While Lisewski was at Krakow, he taught at the School of Business Administration and Economics. When he returned to Notre Dame in 1936 he joined the Modern Language Department as an Assistant Professor of Polish and established a program of Slavic Studies. In 1940 he became president of St. Edward's College in Texas, later returning to Notre Dame in 1943 to teach in both the philosophy and modern language departments.[63]

Not all Holy Cross priests went abroad to study. Burns sent Thomas T. McAvoy to Columbia to pursue a doctorate in history. By May 8, 1937 McAvoy had passed his doctoral exams and was choosing the topic for his dissertation. At first McAvoy considered writing a history of Notre Dame. Further thought convinced McAvoy that this proposal had been too hasty since writing such a history would put him in the middle between Notre Dame and Columbia, each of which might seek to "direct" the dissertation. McAvoy suggested to Burns that a topic based on his archival experiences, such as a history of the Catholic Church in the Old Northwest Territory, would be more suitable. He realized that his contribution to historical knowledge would determine his reputation and this made the choice of a disserta-

tion topic crucial. Once McAvoy had his dissertation topic, he quickly researched it and had the rough draft finished one year later. McAvoy returned to Notre Dame as Archivist for the University and served for some twenty years as Head of the History Department. He became a noted expert on the history of the Catholic Church in America and was the author of many scholarly books.[64]

It is reasonable to presume that Burns had considerable influence on his old protege, Charles O'Donnell, whose presidency began in 1928, but there are no written records of their consultations. Our only indication is that O'Donnell as president took a lot more questions and problems to the Provincial Council of Burns than Burns had when he was president of the University and O'Donnell was Provincial, 1919-1922. Burns' real opportunity to see his plans in operation at Notre Dame came in 1933 when O'Donnell became ill and was unable to perform his duties as president. The vice-president, Father Michael Mulcaire, had not performed satisfactorily in office, and was deemed unsuitable to become acting president. Burns, acting in his capacity as Provincial, changed obediences and appointed Father John F. O'Hara as the new vice-president.[65]

Because Burns was living at Notre Dame, there are few records of O'Hara's conversations with Burns. We do, however, have O'Hara's closing remarks at the consecration banquet held in January of 1940 when he became a bishop with the Military Ordinariate:

> I could not close without a special word of

> thanks to Father Burns, here on my right. He is the last man who would ever want a word of thanks, but I feel that I should say that all the beautiful things that have been said about me during the administration of the last six years should be said of Father Burns, because all I tried to do was to carry out the plans Father Burns prepared during his administration, and he, in turn, carried out the plans of Father Zahm and other predecessors.

Later O'Hara commented further:

> He had a very kind heart, and in our close association of more than twenty-five years he very graciously overlooked my major faults and tried to see in me the virtues he failed to recognize in himself. At the consecration banquet I gave a rude shock to his modesty when I acknowledged publicly that any credit I had received for conducting the affairs of Notre Dame belonged properly to Father Burns because I simply tried to carry out his plans for the development of the University.[66]

These remarks of O'Hara show just how much a role model Burns was for the men who came under his influence.

IV. Burns as a Role Model.

One of the most important contributions Burns made to the Congregation of Holy Cross was the scholarly example he gave the younger members of the community. Despite the commitments of his office as President of Holy Cross College, Burns still found time to pursue his own advanced studies at the Catholic University where he received his doctorate in 1907 and to continue his interest and involvement with what became the Catholic Education Association. This life long interest continued despite the commitments he had as President and President-emeritus at Notre Dame.

But first, the story of Burns doctoral dissertation at the Catholic University. Burns chose to write on the history of the Catholic school system in the United States from the early mission schools of the Franciscans to the ending of the colonial period. The introduction and first four chapters were published in successive issues of The Catholic University Bulletin and in 1908, the above along with the fifth chapter of his dissertation formed the basis for Burns' first book, The Catholic School System in the United States: Its Principles, Origin, and Establishment, which carried the history up to 1840 including the conclusion of the Hughes controversy.[67]

As early as 1905 Burns wrote to his friend, Father Francis Howard: "There is lots of material, but it is hard to get at, so little has been done in that way up to the present." As the year wore on, Burns was making excellent progress. "I am getting deeply interested in my historical study of the parochial

schools. I am writing out some chapters on the prerevolutionary schools, and hope to get down as far as the period of the revolution by the end of the Summer /sic/." Later Burns planned to carry the history up to the modern era. He felt that additional study would take another year; in fact seven years were needed to complete the project.[68]

By 1907 Burns had a better grasp of his project. In requesting permission from Morrissey to publish his studies in book form, he noted: "It would include the 5 papers I published in the University Bulletin during the past two years, with about 5 additional chapters, the whole giving history of our parochial schools up to about the middle of the 19th century." If this work proved to be successful, Burns planned to finish the history in another volume. However, Burns now realized this would take several years, especially since he worked on it only in his "odd hours."[69]

When the book appeared in 1908, Burns devoted the introductory chapter to an overall view. Burns knew that neither the general public nor Catholics were aware of the contributions that the Catholic schools had made. Survey histories of education either completely ignored the parish school system or gave it scant attention. It was Burns' intention to rectify the omissions and thus do justice to the accomplishments of Catholic education.[70]

Burns noted that the history of the parish school system could not be separated from the history of the Church since the schools were an agency of the Church. He also saw a direct

connection between the Catholic school system here and in Europe. The European influence was a result of many factors. The first Catholic schools in the United States were modeled after the Catholic school system in various European countries. Reinforcement occurred through immigration and the development of religious orders. Burns considered the European influence a potent factor in the growth and shaping of the Catholic schools and colleges.[71]

Burns also noted in the Introduction some of the research problems inherent in writing such a history. Many records had been destroyed or lost, and Burns had been unable to search the continental archives of the various communities to see if any records were available there. The absence of secondary sources was also a problem. The history of local schools and diocesan histories had yet to be written. Without these Burns was handicapped. "Only after local and diocesan historians have done their work, can a history be written of the Catholic educational movement which will do justice to the subject in all its aspects." Despite these problems Burns' aim was to connect this movement with the growth of the Church and with the religious, educational, social and industrial movements in the country.[72]

There were few reviews of this first volume. An anonymous reviewer for the Catholic World credited it with being a very attractive and instructive historical study. The reviewer was particularly impressed with Burns' summation of the philosophy of Catholic education as exemplified in the school system, and his critique of religious instruction which was far behind

secular studies in terms of development. The reviewer expected Burns to make some practical suggestions on how to overcome this problem in the next volume to be published which would seem to indicate that the reviewer missed the fact that the volumes were to be histories.[73]

Immediately following the publication of The Catholic School System, Burns continued work on the second volume, The Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States, published in 1912. Burns' first volume was also reprinted in 1912 with a variant title, The Principles, Origin, and Establishment of the Catholic School System in the United States. As was true of the first volume, some chapters had been published as articles in magazines: chapters 1, 5 and 8 had been published in the Catholic Educational Review (1911, 1912) and chapter 11 in the American Ecclesiastical Review (1911).[74]

Burns' purpose in finishing the history was to enlist the good will and sympathy of all persons, Catholic and non-Catholic, who could appreciate the real purpose of the Catholic school system. "It is only through a better mutual understanding in this way that Catholics and non-Catholics can ever arrive at a settlement of the 'school question' that will be satisfactory to both.[75]

Burns ended this history with a chapter on current movements and problems. Since he was so intimately involved in these questions, as we will show below, Burns' discussion provides a good insight into some of his views on education.

In his treatment of the curriculum, Burns stressed the

influence of the parish, the diocese and the religious communities. Each religious community had its own curriculum. Because this hampered the diocesan policy of comparing schools, the movement to require uniformity of curriculum within each diocese was intensified. Burns opposed this move for he thought it would override the need for a flexible curriculum which could better meet the needs of each parish.[76]

Second, Burns considered why Catholic children were attending public schools. Using a study made by the Superintendent of the Catholic Schools of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia as his source, Burns listed thirteen reasons. In essence, students attended public schools because of the scarcity of Catholic schools and the desire on the part of some parents for the social prestige and advancement that they associated with the public schools.[77]

Burns concluded with a discussion of two movements in which he had been a central figure: the Catholic high school movement and the Catholic Education Association. Historically there had been academies at the secondary level since the Revolution. Most Catholic colleges also had high school departments. The movement which concerned Burns was the central high school designed to serve many parishes and which would link the parish schools to the colleges. The growth of central high schools had been given new impetus after the establishment of the Catholic High School in Philadelphia. By 1908 there were four to five hundred high schools nearly all conducted by religious communities. Unfortunately, only nineteen of these were of the central

variety. Burns recognized that the changing of the existing high schools into the central type was crucial for the development of Catholic education. Their growth, in Burns' view, seemed "destined to round out and complete the organization of Catholic education in the United States by furnishing an effective bond of union between the parish school and the college, which have hitherto stood practically apart."[78]

Burns' discussion of the Catholic Educational Association was connected with the high school movement since he credited it with impressing the clergy, teachers and laity with the necessity for central high schools. His historical sketch of the C.E.A. detailed how the Association of Catholic Colleges, the Conference of Catholic Seminaries and the Parish School Conference were united in 1904 to form the C.E.A. While Burns gave credit to the various persons involved in the C.E.A.'s formation, he omitted any mention of his own role which was quite significant, as we shall see.[79]

Two reviews of this volume are available. The reviewer for the Catholic World described it as well-written, scholarly and impartial. The second reviewer from the Ave Maria described it as scholarly, solid and clear. Both reviewers were accurate. With the completion of these two histories Burns' place in Catholic education would have been firmly established even if he had not made any other contributions.[80]

Burns' interest in the Catholic high school movement was a natural outgrowth of his interest in the collegiate educational development of the Congregation of Holy Cross. It is not sur-

prising that he would be intimately involved in the most crucial issue of his day: the Catholic high school movement. Before discussing Burns' role in the growth of the central Catholic high schools and the relationship between this movement and the founding of the Catholic Educational Association (CEA), a survey of the state of Catholic education at the turn of the nineteenth century is necessary.

Catholic educational institutions functioned at two separate and distinct levels - the parish elementary school and the college. The elementary schools provided a minimum of six years of education. Some had an additional two years. The Catholic colleges, which were divided into a minimum of two departments; the academic and collegiate, provided both secondary and post-secondary education. While it appears on the surface that the two levels would have dovetailed, this was not the case. Because of the location of the colleges and the cost of their secondary programs, many Catholic students attended the public high schools and continued their education in secular colleges. Another result was that those students who were not college bound often ended their formal education at the elementary level because no Catholic high school was available and their parents would not send them to the public schools. In addition to these concerns, the six years of elementary and six to eight years of college education structure was completely out of harmony with the 8-4-4 arrangement found in American secular education.

Because the majority of the students in Catholic colleges were enrolled in the academic or preparatory department, the

colleges opposed the seemingly simple and logical solution of establishing comprehensive central Catholic high schools which would provide both terminal and college preparatory courses. Burns spent the next seventeen years battling this opposition and attempting to create some unity in Catholic education. The main vehicle for this work was the CEA.

The story of the CEA begins in 1898. Monsignor Thomas T. Conaty, rector of the Catholic University, was interested in bringing the Catholic seminaries and colleges into closer touch with the Catholic University. His first venture in this area was the establishment of the Educational Conference of Seminary Faculties in 1898. In 1899 he extended the same approach to the colleges by the establishment of the Association of Catholic Colleges.[81]

Burns was a delegate to this first meeting of the colleges. He soon discovered that there were two groups among the assembled college men. Some members favored the views of John T. Murphy, C.S.Sp., President of Holy Ghost College in Pittsburgh, that the collegiate and academic departments be separated so that colleges would provide only college level work. His proposal, which would have worked a financial hardship on many colleges, met with opposition led by the Jesuits. James A. Davan, S.J. of St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia, expressed the basic Jesuit position which favored the status quo. Here then are the battle lines: on one side were the college men who favored separate high schools and colleges without preparatory departments. They believed that such a separation would strengthen the colleges.

Opposed to them were the Jesuits and others who feared the economic consequences if their colleges' preparatory departments had to compete with autonomous high schools. This group also contended that only the preparatory departments of the colleges could properly prepare the students for the classical type of curriculum that most Catholic colleges still followed.[82]

While the Catholic central high school movement was very important in the Association of Catholic Colleges and later in the CEA, it was not an issue at every meeting. Nothing was said about the high schools at the 1900 meeting, but when the Standing Committee of the Association met to plan the 1901 conference, they assigned Burns a paper on the high school movement.[83]

In preparation for this first report on the Catholic high schools, Burns conducted a survey of the three classes of secondary education available: 1) academies and high schools, 2) high schools attached to parochial schools, and 3) preparatory departments of the colleges. The statistics he gathered from the survey enabled him to compare the enrollment in each level of Catholic education with the enrollment in public schools and non-Catholic colleges and universities. The following table gives the comparisons:

TABLE I

ENROLLMENT FOR EACH 10,000 IN POPULATION

	Elementary	Secondary		Higher Education
		Male	Female	
Catholic	898	13	19	4
U.S.	2,143	39	49	8

From this table, Burns could see that over 96% of the students in Catholic elementary school received no Catholic secondary education of any kind.[84]

The answer to this problem, as Burns stressed in his address to the 1901 meeting of the college men, was the central Catholic high school. After beginning his paper with the assertion that the high school was the fulcrum of the whole educational system, Burns went on to discuss what educators call "articulation," i.e., the way in which various levels of education are related to each other and linked together. In the public school system, the elementary school fed directly into the high school, and the last year of high school led immediately to the first year of college. No such dovetailing existed in the Catholic schools because of the absence of high schools. Rather than a system within Catholic education, there was chaos. Some parish schools had six grades, some eight and a very few even taught the first two years of high school. A student graduating from a parochial school had two choices for his secondary education: the academic department of a Catholic college or a public high school. Attendance in the academic department of Catholic colleges was impossible for many due to the location of the colleges and their tuition fees. If the student opted for the public high school, he usually continued in his attendance at a secular college since the public high school rarely taught the courses Catholic colleges required for admittance. A smooth transition from the parish school to the Catholic college was almost impossible.[85]

Another result of the lack of central Catholic high schools was that many parents chose to end their children's education at the parish school level rather than send them to a public high school. Burns saw this as a tragedy for to "be deprived of opportunity for it /education/ is to be robbed of that which is, after religion, best and most ennobling in life."[86]

Burns' solution was the establishment of central Catholic high schools, high schools drawing students from all parish schools in the area and providing both terminal and college preparatory courses. These central high schools would insure the availability of a Catholic secondary education to all students. The central high schools would also benefit the parochial schools they served by strengthening and elevating their tone. Annual entrance examinations for the high schools would measure the standing of the various parish schools and act as a spur to their teachers to raise standards.[87]

Since so many benefits would accrue to the entire system by the establishment of high schools, Burns proceeded to examine why there was opposition to this proposal. For reasons that Burns did not explain, pastors disavowed the necessity and possibility of Catholic high schools. We can speculate that one reason pastors opposed such high schools was that they did not want any money leaving their parishes to support such schools. The most fervent opposition, however, came from the college men. As noted earlier, most of the students in the Catholic "colleges" were in fact secondary level students enrolled in the academic or preparatory departments of those colleges. Since these

departments constituted the bulk of the enrollment, they also constituted the bulk of the revenue. The college men feared that Catholic high schools would harm their preparatory departments. There was some justification for this fear although the high schools were proposed to serve those 96% of the elementary students who received no Catholic secondary education.[88]

In essence, Burns was calling on Catholic educators to do for Catholic schools what other educators were doing for the public school system: establish high schools and use them as instruments of policy to unite Catholic education. While Catholic educators were unwilling to so quickly change the direction of secondary education, they did pass two resolutions on the subject: one called for Conaty to draw the attention of the hierarchy to the importance of the high school movement and the other called upon all Catholics to recognize the imperative need for a more perfect organization of the educational system which the development of Catholic high schools would make complete.[89]

The desire that the Association of Colleges expressed in these resolutions for a systematization of Catholic education paralleling secular education also extended to the idea of forming an organization paralleling the National Education Association. In his address, "Educational Legislation in the United States," James P. Fagan, S.J. of Georgetown demonstrated the power that the National Education Association (NEA) wielded in having legislation suitable to their aims adopted. Burns thought that the strength exhibited by the NEA as a combination of various levels of public education would serve as a model for

Catholic education. He put this proposal into a motion that Conaty and the Standing Committee of the Association of Catholic Colleges work to see what could be done to establish affiliate conferences for secondary and parochial schools.[90]

Almost a year passed before Conaty contacted members of the hierarchy suggesting that diocesan directors of Catholic schools meet with the college people at their fourth conference in 1902. Rather than sending his diocesan director, Bishop Henry Moeller of Columbus wisely chose to send Father Francis W. Howard, Chairman of the Columbus Diocesan School Board. The delegation to the first Conference of Parochial School Superintendents recognized Howard's abilities and elected him secretary of their organization with Conaty as president.[91]

The hierarchy had given the two groups of educators, the college men and the school superintendents, the joint task of finding a solution to the problem of the high school. Specifically the hierarchy wanted a plan for high school development. The association of Catholic Colleges decided to handle the problem by appointing a committee which would work jointly with a committee of the school superintendents. The committees' task was to evaluate the state of secondary education and make recommendations to their respective organizations. The college men named Burns as the chairman of their committee.[92]

Although significant progress had been made toward unity in Catholic education with the organization of the Conference of Parochial School Superintendents, it soon became clear that a formal organization was needed rather than the two separate

conferences meeting at the same time and place. At the 1903 joint meeting in Philadelphia, the delegates from both groups voted to appoint a committee to recommend a plan of organization which would unite the two conferences. The committees made progress at various meetings held in 1904. Both Burns and Howard were present at the crucial meeting March 9, 1904 when the final draft of a proposed constitution for the Catholic Educational Association was formalized.[93]

Since it was the discussion of the high school problem that had focused the educators' attention on the desirability of unification, it was appropriate that Burns presented the report of the high school committee at the first CEA meeting in 1904. Burns, who had spent over sixteen months in the task of preparing this report, expressed the hope that it would accomplish several purposes. He proposed first to show the need for Catholic high schools; second to examine those high schools in existence and show their achievements; third to classify the problem areas; fourth to propose solutions for the problems.[94]

Burns began the committees' report by quoting President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard: "'The aims and fundamental methods at all stages of education should be essentially the same because the essential constituents of education are the same at all stages.'" In Burns' mind, Eliot's assertion formed the justification for the argument for Catholic high schools. If Catholic education was a necessity for the children in parochial schools and for young adults in college, then it was just as essential for those students of high school age.[95]

Basically the high school committee had identified four problem areas:

1. Availability: There were two hundred schools which were either coeducational or exclusively for boys. This meant that there were two Catholic high schools for every Catholic college; however, the ratio in the public sector was twelve high schools for every college. In addition to the problem of inadequate numbers, the geographic distribution was also poor.
2. Articulation with parochial or elementary schools: The majority of the secondary schools had no relation to the parochial or elementary schools. For this reason, the high schools, which were not a part of the diocese system, were often seen as rivals to the parochial schools rather than common schools.
3. Articulation with the colleges: Many of the secondary schools had no relation to the Catholic college system in that they did not offer courses that would prepare the students for the Catholic colleges. This injured the Catholic colleges since it encouraged them to retain their preparatory departments.
4. Women teaching boys: With the addition of secondary courses to the elementary curriculum, the problem emerged of women teaching high school aged boys, a practice which many Catholic educators opposed.[96]

The committee's recommendations covered each problem area. To correct the problem of availability the committee recommended that high schools be established for both boys and girls. These free high schools, of the central variety, would serve several parishes and would be included in the diocesan school system.

Burns considered this a key provision for inclusion of the high school within the diocesan system would help with the problem of articulation with the parochial schools since all parishes would have a common interest in its success. Burns' committee also favored a free high school which would be supported by parish assessments and mentioned the Catholic High School of Philadelphia as an example. In order to encourage each parish to send as many students as possible to the high school, he proposed that each parish be assessed according to the number of students attending the parish elementary school rather than the number from the parish attending the high school. Since the parishes had to pay whether or not their graduates attended, Burns' proposal would have acted as an economic incentive for large numbers of students to continue their education.[97]

The problem of the articulation with the colleges was dealt with in a resolution calling for the high schools to offer preparatory education. While it was generally recognized that the purpose of the high school was to prepare students for immediate entry into the world of work, i.e., to provide terminal education, the high school committee recommended that a preparatory curriculum equivalent to the entrance requirements of Catholic colleges be offered. This preparatory curriculum was a vital necessity if the Catholic colleges were ever to rid themselves of their preparatory departments, the "great lodestones" which were dragging them down. Burns was aware that the great secular universities such as Harvard and Yale had only gained their stature after eliminating their preparatory departments.[98]

In order to eliminate the problem of women teaching high school age boys, Burns recommended that religious orders of men enter the secondary teaching area. As detailed earlier this was a need that Burns had previously noted within the Congregation of Holy Cross and Catholic education in general.[99]

The high school question was discussed over and over again as each side sought to present arguments to justify their positions. Even when it was not the topic of discussion, the questions of the central high schools was never far from the forefront.

In 1905, Father Hugh T. Henry from the Catholic High School of Philadelphia presented a paper on "The Catholic High School as a Factor in Our Catholic Educational System" in which he used his own school which was the first real central Catholic high school as the prime example. This was unfortunate since the Philadelphia school provided only terminal education. The college men used this address as a convenient wedge to block progress on Catholic high schools which would provide college preparatory education.[100]

Burns' opening address at the 1906 convention brought the high school question back into focus. Discussing the need for articulation under the title of "Coordination and Cooperation in Catholic Education Work," Burns devoted a substantial portion of this short and general talk to the question of the central high school, showing how it would encourage coordination among the parish schools. The problem of the high schools also pointed up the need for articulation and cooperation within the Association

itself.[101]

The discussion following Burns' paper indicated that there was no unity on the subject. Neither the representatives of the parish schools nor the spokesmen for the colleges supported Burns' vision of a comprehensive, tuition-free high school, staffed by religious orders under diocesan control and offering both terminal and college preparatory education.[102]

One positive result of the meeting was that Burns was elected vice-president of the CEA in recognition of his work in promoting coordination and cooperation in Catholic education.[103]

Although the discussion at the 1908 convention centered on the elementary school curriculum, this was a subject allied to the question of Catholic high schools. College educators, such as William F. Poland, S.J. of St. Louis University, who wished to maintain the traditional sequence of six to eight years of education in the Catholic colleges, were using the contemporary secular arguments proposing an elementary curriculum of six years to bolster their position. Poland proposed a return to the six year elementary program previously the standard in the parish schools. Students who wanted further education would go to a Catholic "college" after finishing the sixth grade. Thus colleges would combine grammar school, high school and college in a six to eight year program. Burns was entirely out of sympathy with the "third rate colleges" proposed by Poland. While Burns conceded that they were doing good, he was certain that they would never replace the high schools. Burns correctly realized that if Catholics did not establish high schools of their own,

connected directly to the parish schools, the Catholic students would attend the public schools and be lost to the Catholic colleges.[104]

Burns' opportunity to express his views in a more definitive manner came in 1910 when he presented a paper, "The Elementary School Curriculum - Its Origin and Development" at a meeting of the Executive Board. Burns pointed out that historically the high school had become wedged between the elementary school and the college, each of which had evolved independently. While the college had been able to push some of its work on the high school, the high school was unable to transfer any of its work to the elementary school because of the fixed American idea that the curriculum of the elementary school should be considered on its own merits since the majority of the students would not continue on to high school. The answer to this problem was a restructuring of the academic divisions to a 6-2-4 basis. The seventh and eighth grades or intermediate course would include work of the elementary and high school divisions. This would mean that the high school work (which previously took four years) could be shortened thus enabling the high schools to take on some course work that had previously been considered college level. Burns saw this development as one which Catholic educators should study as a possibility for their elementary schools.[105]

While the issue of the elementary curriculum was still being discussed, some progress had been made in regard to high schools. As a result of the discussion at the 1908 convention, a committee, which included both Burns and Howard, was appointed

to study the feasibility of forming a separate high school department of the CEA.[106]

The committee was to have a report prepared for the 1911 convention. In the interim, the question of a separate high school department for the CEA was scheduled for discussion at the 1909 meeting. The purpose of the discussion was to show what work a separate department would do. Burns realized that the major issues - curriculum and articulation with the elementary schools - were of such a broad nature that they would require months of discussion. Rather than just touch on these issues and immediately call for the formation of a high school department, Burns suggested to Howard that the issues be discussed more thoroughly and with more preparation in 1910. After a couple of years of discussion in this way, the question of a high school department "could be led up to in a natural and healthy way." Burns' strategy worked well: the question of a separate high school department was left open; the high school movement had become strong enough that it would be impossible to stop it or sidetrack it.[107]

In presenting the high school report of 1911, Burns saw the growth of Catholic high schools as a natural consequence of the upward mobility of the second generation Irish and German immigrants into the middle class. The concept of a middle class education expresses quite accurately Burns' idea of what a Catholic high school should be. In discussing the curriculum, Burns recommended that the Catholic high school exclude any courses in industrial training since the high school was mainly

for the education of the children of the middle class. This would seem to imply that only the children of the lower classes would be interested in industrial training. Burns did see some use for courses of this nature but only in the larger and stronger high schools in the cities or in high schools devoted exclusively to manual training.[108]

Burns' concept of the high schools as the vehicle for educating the middle classes was not the only reason he favored exclusion of industrial education. Public high schools were receiving much criticism which claimed that they offered too many courses and thereby provided only a superficial education rather than teaching what we today term "problem solving techniques." In Burns' mind the Catholic high school had a golden opportunity to avoid the weaknesses of the public system by offering only the academic and commercial courses. They could then concentrate on teaching these few subjects well. Burns also recommended that the Catholic high school include Greek in its curriculum. This would be a great help to those students desiring to enter a college or seminary course where the classical education still was the only education deemed acceptable.[109]

While the growth of the high schools and their curriculum presented a bright picture, Burns found that the number of teachers was a definite deficiency. Using the figures from the responses, Burns concluded that there was an average of about two teachers to every three grades. He was also disturbed that the majority of the teachers were women since many thought they would encourage effeminacy in the boys. While Burns preferred

Brothers, there were simply not enough of them. He recognized that if the boys chose to go to a public high school, the majority of their teachers would be women. And certainly sisters were preferable to lay women.[110]

A more or less annual question which Burns discussed in some detail was the articulation of the high schools with the parish schools and colleges. As in 1904, Burns argued that the bishops should adopt the high schools and place them under diocesan control. This provision was to eliminate the negative effects of the jealousy that sometimes existed between parishes. If the high school was under the control of the bishop, the various parishes would be more likely to send their students to it than if the high school was connected to one of the parish schools. By 1911 there were fifteen high schools of the type that Burns favored.[111]

The crucial point, however, was the articulation with the colleges. Burns' statistics showed that there were fifty-six Catholic high schools which had some type of affiliation with non-Catholic institutions. By this agreement graduates of the high schools were admitted to the college without an entrance examination. Only nineteen high schools were affiliated with Catholic colleges. In order to overcome this trend, Burns proposed that the Catholic colleges affiliate with the stronger Catholic secondary schools, so that the diploma of the high school would admit a student without examination to the college. He also urged the colleges to establish scholarships in each of the high schools and to cultivate close and friendly relation-

ships with the administrators of the high schools.[112]

In discussing the academic standing of the high schools, Burns' main concern was whether the high schools could replace the preparatory departments of the colleges. Greek was a problem here for many of the colleges still required proficiency in Greek as a requirement for entrance, but few high schools taught Greek. To simplify matters, Burns arbitrarily chose the requirements used by two of Notre Dame's departments, which did not require Greek, as his standard. He found that 101 or one-half of the high schools were able to prepare their students for collegiate departments which required only Latin.[113]

Burns was also interested in determining the total cost of a Catholic high school. In 1911 this averaged between three and four thousand dollars for a high school of two hundred and ten students. This was about one-third the cost for a public high school of the same size. Though the cost of three to four thousand dollars per school was not prohibitive, it did point up the necessity for high schools of the central variety which would receive monies from many parishes.[114]

Burns concluded his paper by stating that the Catholic high school had proven itself an important factor in the Catholic educational system. He again stressed the necessity of the bishops defining and establishing the relationship of the high school to the parish schools and for the college educators to do the same in relation to the colleges. Finally, Burns saw the high schools as the keystone of the educational system which could then provide a thorough Catholic education for "Every

child, under Catholic auspices, from the most primary class work, up to and through the university."[115]

In 1915 Burns presented his third and last report on the high schools. Burns proposed a reorganization generally known as the Six and Six High School Plan which the Board of Regents of the University of Michigan had adopted as a recommendation for school authorities. The Six and Six Plan called for the seventh and eighth grades to be joined with the ninth to form a three year junior high school; the other three grades would then become the senior high school. Thus students would receive six years of elementary training and six years of high school. This plan also provided students with an opportunity to begin their preparation for a specific occupation two years earlier.[116]

Burns also saw the institution of junior high schools as an aid to the establishment of central high schools. Pastors who desired to keep students in their schools as long as possible could establish junior high schools. There then would be less objection to sending students to finish the last three years of education at a central senior high school.[117]

The last problem Burns took up was the one that had haunted the CEA for years, articulation among the various levels of education. Eleven years after the founding of the CEA, there was still no evidence of any systematic connection between the parish schools, the high schools and the colleges. The solution was the same one that Burns had proposed eleven years earlier in his first report on the high schools: the bishops must take action to solve the problem of cooperation and unity. Without

positive action by the bishops, "no degree of educational organization . . . is . . . /_possible_/ of attainment." In essence Burns was stating the simple fact that only an outside and superior force could make the three levels of Catholic education work together in a system.[118]

Burns concluded that "because the high school is the keystone of the educational arch . . . the great problems met with everywhere in education appear to center there." Therefore, "what strengthens and improves the high school is bound to react in the most beneficial way upon the schools and colleges."[119]

After the 1915 report on the high schools, the concerns of the CEA shifted to other matters. Burns' last public statement to the CEA on the high school question was in 1918 when he presided at the convention in San Francisco:

> Catholic education is everywhere one in its fundamental principles; it is everywhere one in the ends it has in view; it is one in the essential means it is everywhere employing to attain those ends; why should not this perfect unity extend also to its organization? Why, for instance, should not school be linked to high school, high school to college, and college be linked to the university, in such a way that there may be no waste, no leakage, so far as these are avoidable.

This final cry for articulation after seventeen years of work indicated that the close cooperation that Burns saw as so necessary to the success of Catholic education had yet to be achieved. The campaign for articulation had failed primarily because too few bishops had taken the initiative in establishing systems within their dioceses. Nor did the restructuring of the curriculum take place: the elementary course was still frozen at

grades one to eight. The other aims of Burns and the proponents of Catholic high schools did meet with some success. High schools were growing in number and would soon be sufficient to enable the Catholic colleges to discard their preparatory departments. The quality of training for the teachers was improving too, as more summer schools opened to provide them with additional preparation.[120]

Burns' involvement in the high school movement did not preclude his interest in the other educational questions as demonstrated in his third book, Catholic Education: A Study of Conditions, published in 1917. In this book, Burns sought to "describe the condition of Catholic education in the United States . . . /in 1917/, and to direct attention to the problems that must be solved in order to insure its future progress." Some of the areas of need were: more and better teachers in the parish schools, improvement of girls' high schools, more electives in the colleges, and endowments for Catholic colleges.[121]

Burns' third book received the same good reviews as his two previous efforts. The reviewer for the Catholic World was pleased with the fairness shown in the books and with the service that Burns had performed in "bringing into the compass of a single volume this statement of the present condition . . . /the/ school." The reviewer for the American Ecclesiastical Review correctly noted that the "whole sums up the gathered fruitage of the author's long experience and ripened reflexion on education." Describing the book as "interesting as well as instructive reading," the reviewer's only criticism concerned the omission of

two books from the short bibliography.[122]

The publication of his last book closed an important and productive period in Burns' life. During the years from 1900-1919 he had been involved in the most important educational questions of his day either as they affected the Holy Cross Congregation or Catholic education in general.

The year 1919 presaged changes in the lives of both Burns and the University of Notre Dame. When the Provincial Council selected Burns as president of the University, it unknowingly opened an era of change at Notre Dame. Within three short years, Burns constructed a new and stronger Notre Dame through his re-organization of the University's management structure, finances, curricula, and the raising of education standards. When Burns was "promoted" to the newly created position of President Emeritus, he continued the most important work he had begun as president - raising one million dollars for an endowment for the University and a second million to construct needed buildings. His work on the Endowment Drive brought the University's needs to the attention of the General Education Board (GEB) and the Carnegie Corporation, both of which contributed to the drive with gifts of $250,000 and $75,000 respectively. With these two large gifts in hand, Burns was soon able to successfully raise the first million toward a permanent endowment. Burns' labors had intangible results, too; they reunited the alumni to Notre Dame and gained many new friends throughout the nation.

These changes began with the 1919 meeting of the Provincial Chapter at Notre Dame. One of its most important items of

business was to change the local superiors for the various houses throughout the Indiana Province. This upheaval in internal administration resulted from the interaction of tradition and a change in canon law. The Holy Cross Congregation followed the custom of having the presidents of its various colleges also serve as local superiors. The new code of Canon Law which went into effect in May of 1918 stated that the maximum term for a local superior was six years. Since both the president of Holy Cross College and the president of the University of Notre Dame had already served the maximum, the Chapter had to select two new presidents.

The first obedience or appointment that the Provincial Council considered was the presidency of the University. John Cavanaugh, the retiring president, nominated both his comrade James Burns and his vice-president Matthew Walsh. Despite Burns' expressed wish to serve in the Holy Cross missions in India, Cavanaugh recommended that Burns be elected because of his prominence in educational work and his fitness as a religious superior. This last point was crucial. In January of 1919 many priests at Notre Dame had signed a petition asking Rome to intervene in intra-Congregational affairs. The priest-petitioners wanted changes made in the constitution of the Congregation which included: 1. permitting two-thirds of the delegates to a General Chapter to be elected directly by the various houses; 2. separating the priests and the brothers in the voting so that only priests voted for priests and brothers for brothers. Both proposals were designed to lessen the power of the Superior-General.

The second proposal would have meant the practical separation of the Congregation into a congregation of brothers and a congregation of priests. As might be expected the Superior-General, Gilbert Francais, showed his displeasure with the petitioners by sending them from Notre Dame to other colleges.[123]

When the vote on the president for Notre Dame was taken the main concern of the members of the chapter was that a strong religious superior be elected to bring the University community back into conformity with the wishes of the Superior-General. Burns was the right person to accomplish this goal.[124]

Although the election of Burns was based primarily on his suitability as a religious superior, it constituted a significant turning point in the development of Notre Dame into a first rank university. Burns was the first president who had received graduate training; he had a true scholar's appreciation of the value of research and academic excellence, and he wanted to move Notre Dame in these directions. As the Scholastic commented at the beginning of his administration: "In Father Burns, . . . we have a president who is no stranger to Notre Dame: a man who knows and appreciates her past, understands her present, and is capable of directing her future to the highest development."[125]

For the next three years Burns concentrated on solving the most pressing problems of the University: the improvement of academic standards; the reorganization of the administrative structure; and the strengthening of financial support. Although these areas naturally impinge on and influence one another, we will examine each one separately.

Since 1901 Burns had believed that the academic or preparatory departments of Catholic colleges had hampered the collegiate departments in their development. Now that he was president, Burns began to phase out Notre Dame's preparatory department by eliminating its freshman and sophomore years. The phase-out of secondary-level classes, completed by 1924, also provided needed space for collegiate students.[126]

With the elimination of the prep school underway, Burns was able to concentrate on two other areas which affected Notre Dame's academic standing: the faculty and scholastic requirements. When Burns became president, the faculty consisted of sixty-seven instructors: thirty-three priests and thirty-four laymen. Burns' desire to have the best faculty available was frequently hampered by the low salaries that Notre Dame offered. Despite this handicap he was able to attract qualified lay professors; by 1922 there were sixty laymen on the faculty, of whom nine were Ph.D. holders.[127]

A good example of Burns' ability to sell Notre Dame to prospective faculty was his success in convincing George N. Shuster to serve as chairman of the English department. Shuster, who received his A.B. at Notre Dame in 1915 and his M.A. in 1920, accepted Burns' offer even though it meant turning down a job in Washington, D.C. which would have paid much more. Shuster recognized Burns as a man who had the vision of a new Notre Dame. As he said years later, "I never would have stayed at the place if it hadn't been for Burns."[128]

Besides recruiting laymen for faculty positions, Burns meant

to eliminate any distinctions between them and the priest-professors. A small but significant example was the change Burns made in the faculty listing in the University Bulletin of 1919: previously the priest faculty had been listed first, followed by the lay faculty; now the total faculty was listed by seniority of service only.[129]

Burns also set high standards for all faculty members. One of Shuster's reminiscences illustrates one aspect of his stringency:

> . . . there was one priest who didn't show up for classes. So Father Burns called me in and said you better get ahold of Father So-and-so and tell him he had to go to class. So taking my courage in my hands, I went over to call on him. He told me to mind my own business, that it wasn't any affair of mine whether he went to class or not. "Well," I said, "Father, in that case all I'll have to do is go back to Father Burns and tell him what you said." So he turned purple, red and indigo, and said he would meet the class.[130]

While he could be rigorous, Burns' interest in his faculty stimulated and inspired them. As Father Paul J. Foik, University Librarian, reported to a friend: "The new president knows the problem from A to Z, although he has not outlined his policy to me. . . There is nothing that gives me a greater impetus for my work than to feel that this keen interest is being taken."[131]

Besides working to improve the performance of individual faculty members, Burns hoped to make them more effective as a group by restructuring the University. Before Father Matthew Schumacher, the former Dean of Studies, left Notre Dame for his new assignment, Burns had asked him for some suggestions concerning the academic organization of Notre Dame. Schumacher's

plan, which covered many topics, called for a faculty body similar to Catholic University's Academic Senate. The proposed body would include the chief administrative officers, the Deans of the various colleges, and one representative from each college elected by the professors in that college. Schumacher recommended that the faculty group have the final authority over academic matters. Such a plan would accomplish two desirable goals: it would involve the faculty more directly in the affairs of the University and would also lessen the power previously wielded by the Director of Studies.[132]

By 1920 Burns organized a University Council, or Academic Council as it was also called, along the lines indicated by Schumacher. The Council, which included five laymen and seven priests, was given the authority to pass on all "major academic matters and to make policies and regulations." During the Burns years, the Council worked to raise the academic standards throughout the University. Its first decision concerned the Law School. Previous to 1920 no college work was required for entrance into the Law School, and it had become a refuge for weak students who had been unsuccessful in the other colleges. March 6, 1920 the Council made sophomore standing a Law School entrance requirement. Standards were raised higher when the Council later introduced tri-weekly examinations for the law students.[133]

The Council also fixed the requirements for the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. The master's degree requirements were: a bachelor's degree, residence of one year or four summers, thirty-two credit hours, proficiency in one foreign language and passing

a written examination in the major field of study. The requirements for the doctoral degree were not as specifically defined: a bachelor's degree, three years of study (no mention of credit hours), reading proficiency in both French and German before beginning the second year, demonstrable proficiency in the field of study during the three year period, passing of both written and oral examinations, and providing the University with one hundred copies of the dissertation.[134]

Evidently the Council thought more work was needed on the graduate program for in September of 1921 a committee on Graduate Studies was appointed. This was really a reactivation of a committee which had been set up in 1905 but had done nothing. The reactivated committee of thirteen, which included the vice-president, director of studies and four of the five deans, was to take over the administration of all graduate work.[135]

In other actions, the University Council established entrance and graduate requirements; set guidelines for the awarding of honorary degrees; raised the commerce department to the level of a separate college; and abolished the short programs of two years or less in mechanical and electrical engineering, commerce, and architecture.[136]

Schumacher's plan also contained suggestions for improving the internal organization of the University. Up until the Burns administration, the division of the university into colleges and departments existed mostly on paper. All academic administration was actually handled by the Director of Studies. Under Schumacher's plan the Dean of each college would have the authority

to guide the academic policy of his college. Decisions in these areas were to be taken after discussion at regular faculty meetings. Thus a realistic chain-of-command was established. Faculty members could now influence the development of their colleges through three channels: the faculty meetings held for each college; direct conversation with the dean of their college; or by having the elected representative for their college bring the matter before the University Council.[137]

By the second semester of the 1919-1920 school year, each college had its own chief administrator: Father Leonard J. Carrico, Dean of the College of Arts and Letters; Father Julius Nieuwland, Dean of the College of Science; Professor Martin J. McCue, Dean of the College of Engineering; Professor Francis J. Vurpillat, Dean of the College of Law. The College of Commerce became a fifth college in 1921 under the deanship of Father John O'Hara. Chairmen were also appointed for each of the departments within the colleges.[138]

Besides the changes in the academic and administrative spheres, the other great change in the University's structure was the institution of a Board of Lay Trustees. In common with many Catholic colleges, Notre Dame's Board of Trustees, or Corporation as it was also known, was composed solely of priests of the Holy Cross Congregation. As Burns became more involved with the problem of raising endowment money for Notre Dame, he became aware of the need for a board composed of laymen to administer endowment monies. A student of education, Burns knew that private foundations, the most likely source of large endowment

grants, had found that most college trustees had no notion of how to manage finances or how to use proper accounting methods. To avoid such problems, he asked William P. Breen, a lawyer-alumnus and former president of the American Bar Association to draft by-laws establishing a Board of Lay Trustees which would control and administer all of Notre Dame's endowment funds. Breen's first draft was ready by January of 1920. Burns then spent the rest of that year preparing the final version of the by-laws and recruiting members for the Board of Lay Trustees. Part of his preparation involved writing to Abbott W. Lowell of Harvard University since Harvard also had two boards of trustees: the Corporation of Board of Fellows, which managed the funds and revenues of the college and appointed instructors; and the Overseers, who represented the public at large. Notre Dame's situation was somewhat similar since Burns planned to have the regular Board of Trustees or Corporation administer the University, while the Board of Lay Trustees was to manage the investment and expenditure of the funds in the University's endowment. The Board of Lay Trustees could also advise Notre Dame in matters pertaining to its general business interests.[139]

The new Board was to be composed of six alumni members and six non-alumni friends. The first alumni members were an impressive group: William P. Breen, first Chairman of the Board; Joseph M. Byrne, Sr., Newark stockbroker; James D. Callery, Pittsburgh industrialist; Samuel T. Murdock, Indianapolis businessman; Clement C. Mitchell, Chicago banker; Warren A. Cartier, Michigan financier. The first non-alumni representa-

tives were equally distinguished: Edward N. Hurley, chairman of the United States Shipping Board; J. W. Johnson, president of Kokomo Brass Works; Solon D. Richardson, vice-president of Libbey Glass Company; and Francis J. Reitz, Evansville manufacturer. By the end of 1920, all was ready for the first meeting January 25, 1921.[140]

As may be noticed from the preceding list, not all of the non-alumni seats of the Board were filled. This was not an oversight; Burns wished to use remaining seats to honor men who proved helpful in securing endowment monies for the University. The first of these additions was Albert R. Erskine, the president of the Studebaker Corporation, who was elected to the Board of Lay Trustees in 1921 and soon became its second president.[141]

One result of the formation of the Board of Lay Trustees was that Notre Dame hired H. E. Dalton and N. R. Felton, two experienced accountants from the Studebaker Corporation, to reorganize the University's accounting system. These gentlemen established an accounting system which enabled Notre Dame to have both quarterly and annual balance sheets for each department and the university as a whole. The accounting system, which made the University's financial picture more intelligible, was also in keeping with the principles Trevor Arnett, secretary of the General Education Board, had laid down in his book, College and University Finance.[142]

While Burns was in the midst of his plans for the Board of Lay Trustees, other questions which concerned Notre Dame's endowment required his attention. Because Notre Dame served as

a teacher-training institution within the state of Indiana, she was subject to regulation by the Indiana Department of Public Instruction. Among the reports the state required was one concerning the financial resources and expenses of the University. Since the state form had no place for listing the gratuitous services of the faculty, Burns also sent a letter to explain the value of the "Living Endowment," as these services were called. He estimated the value to the University of the teaching services of the priests of the Holy Cross Congregation at $125,000 to $150,000 per year. He calculated that the capital in endowment needed to produce this much income would be $3,000,000. This explanation seemed to satisfy the Department of Public Instruction for there was no further inquiry on this point until the following year.[143]

Because new regulations, effective September 1, 1921, required all teacher-training institutions to have a productive endowment of $500,000 or a fixed annual income of $25,000, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction asked Burns for more information on the "Living Endowment." Burns made some revisions in his estimate of the value of the gratuitous services of the priests. When he calculated the salaries of the members of the Holy Cross Congregation at Notre Dame based on the salaries paid to the lay teachers, Burns arrived at a figure of $93,800 which represented a 5% interest on a capital of $1,876,000. In reporting on the Living Endowment, Burns was careful to mention that the North Central Association of High Schools and Colleges, which Notre Dame had been a member of since

1906, had already accepted this concept of endowment. Since Notre Dame's more conventional endowment of railroad bonds, liberty bonds, real estate bonds and real estate consisted of only $136,684.39, it was imperative to the University that the Living Endowment be included. Burns' letter did convince the state officials who had high praise for the report.[144]

While the correspondence with the state officials had been going on, Burns was working to raise money for a permanent and more conventional endowment for Notre Dame, a necessity if Notre Dame was to overcome the financial problems she faced. Like many private institutions, Notre Dame was dependent almost entirely on money raised from student fees supplemented by whatever the Holy Cross priests could raise from stipends received for masses, parish work, marriages and the like. The two areas of most pressing need were: money to raise faculty salaries and money for constructing new student dormitories. In Burns' mind obtaining the best faculty was the highest priority, and he knew a permanent endowment would be necessary for this purpose.[145]

Burns was not the first to envision endowment monies as aid for Notre Dame. As early as 1908 John Cavanaugh had contacted the General Education Board (GEB) which John D. Rockefeller, Sr. had founded with a $10,000,000 gift. In 1917 Burns and Cavanaugh renewed the 1908 contact with the GEB when they made a trip to New York City seeking funds from various philanthropic groups. In addition to the GEB they met with officials from both the Carnegie Corporation and the Carnegie Foundation and although we know little about it, Burns had some additional contact with

Dr. Wallace Buttrick, president of the GEB, in late 1918 or early 1919. At this time Burns gave Buttrick a report on the College of Engineering at Notre Dame and a memorandum in which he emphasized the need for endowment monies to support increases in salaries and the construction of new buildings.[146]

When Burns became president, he quickly followed up these previous contacts. Dr. Buttrick responded by visiting the campus sometime in the Fall of 1919. Although no records remain of this visit, Burns undoubtedly made the most of the occasion to explain his plans for the future of Notre Dame. Two items that we know they discussed were the proposed Board of Lay Trustees and the academic standards for the Law School.[147]

Notre Dame made no formal application for funds until 1921, but informal conversations about such an application continued while the GEB took a careful look at the University. Part of the GEB's investigation concerned the Board of Lay Trustees. At Burns' instigation, Trevor Arnett, the secretary of the GEB, sent a tentative draft of Notre Dame's plan for a Board of Lay Trustees to the GEB's counsel, Starr J. Murphy, for comment. While Murphy thought a lay board would be a wise thing he cautioned Arnett:

> This, however, is a matter of internal administration, which I think the General Education Board should leave to the decision of the University, and it should not be imposed as a condition of the Board's gift.[148]

Other areas looked into during the GEB's inquiry were the organization of the Congregation of Holy Cross and its relationship to the University, and attendance statistics. Despite all the data Burns supplied, progress was very slow. Burns attempted

to speed things up by a visit to New York in early May of 1920. Shortly after his return to campus, Otis W. Caldwell from the GEB arrived for another visitation.[149]

Caldwell was impressed with the devotion of the faculty to advancing scholarship, the sincerity of the students, and the unusually good grounds of the University. However, Caldwell's kind words were not enough. Four days after Caldwell filed his report, the GEB notified Burns that Notre Dame's application "was not found mature enough for presentation to the Board . . ." The GEB did hold out some hope for future consideration, as Buttrick wrote Burns that Arnett might be sent to Notre Dame to gather more data.[150]

In November of 1920 Burns re-opened negotiations in a letter mentioning two of the recent changes at the University: sophomore standing was now an entrance requirement for the Law School; and the first two years of the prep school had been dropped. Before Christmas Burns received the good news that either Buttrick and/or Arnett would visit the campus in January of 1921.[151]

Burns immediately began to prepare for the visit by assembling financial data on the University. His report listed the permanent productive endowment at $22,000 from which the University received $1,720 actual income; scholarships provided an income of $1,000; the value of the 184 acre campus was $180,000 and the physical plant $3,914,495. The University had a total indebtedness in 1918 of $73,516.30 of which $3,028.30 was from current bills.[152]

Burns' careful preparation paid off. Buttrick and Arnett who made their visitation February 11, 1921, were favorably impressed with the information Burns had prepared, the Board of Lay Trustees, which had just held its first meeting, and with Burns himself. As Arnett reported to the GEB:

> Dr. Buttrick and I were favorably impressed with the attitude of the president towards the problems of the University and the service which he thought the University could render to the community at large; and we felt that any contribution which the General Education Board might make would be carefully guarded by the Lay Board of Trustees / sic / and would be rendering a real service toward education.[153]

The day after the visitation, the Notre Dame Board of Trustees filed formal application asking the GEB for money as part of Notre Dame's one million dollar Endowment Drive. February 25th, Trevor Arnett wired Burns that the "Board appropriated two hundred thousand dollars toward one million endowment for increasing salaries plus an annual grant of twelve thousand, five hundred dollars . . . ." This latter amount was used for an immediate increase in faculty salaries for the coming school year. When the formal papers granting the monies arrived, one clause provided that the contribution of the GEB would be paid only when Notre Dame had no outstanding debts. This condition was met when the Indiana Province of the Congregation paid Notre Dame's outstanding debt of $73,526.30. However, the main effect of the restriction on the University's going into debt was that it precluded any construction of new buildings. Notre Dame would have had to borrow to build, since all funds collected in the Endowment Drive were earmarked for the endowment. This set

of circumstances explains why Father Burns built no new buildings, for which he has sometimes been unjustifiably criticized.[154]

In addition to the monies that Notre Dame received from the GEB, the Carnegie Corporation also awarded the University a grant of $75,000 towards its one million dollar Endowment Drive. Unfortunately we have only unconnected details of this story.

After Burns and Cavanaugh had made their initial contacts with the Carnegie Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation in 1917, all efforts toward obtaining a grant were directed to the Carnegie Foundation. By the end of 1919 the University's application had been transferred to the Carnegie Corporation, since the Foundation's main concern was pensions for college professors.

While on a trip to New York in January of 1920 Burns tried without success to see Mr. Henry Pritchett, president of the Carnegie Corporation's Board of Trustees. Burns did have some success in seeing some of the other trustees, but we don't know what reception he was given or what was discussed. Burns' next move was to write all the alumni and friends of the University who might know Carnegie Corporation trustees.[155]

By the end of 1920 Burns once again journeyed to New York and this time was successful in seeing a decision-maker: Dr. James R. Angell, the president of the Carnegie Corporation. Again, we have no records of this meeting, but Burns followed it up with renewed efforts to get friends of the University to use their influence with the trustees of the Carnegie Corporation.

By May of 1921, three months after the General Education Board grant, Dr. Angell notified Burns that the Carnegie Corporation had appropriated $75,000 to Notre Dame. With this as an added incentive, Notre Dame was ready to begin its fund raising drive for the million dollar endowment.[156]

Although the story of Notre Dame's fund raising drive is interesting in its own right, for our purposes it will suffice to say that on June 12, 1922 Burns was able to announce that the University had surpassed its goal of $1,000,000 in pledges. Burns thanked all who had rallied to Notre Dame's support, but he let them know more appeals were coming by announcing that the University would begin a second drive to raise an additional million dollars for the new buildings so urgently needed on campus.[157]

Burns' highly successful fund drive had a peculiar sequel when the Provincial Chapter met just two weeks after the triumphant announcement. One of the offices to be decided by the Chapter was, of course, that of president of the University. Burns was eligible for reappointment since he had served only three years, but before the question was discussed, Father Charles O'Donnell, the Provincial, stressed that the spirit of canon law did not favor long terms for superiors. After O'Donnell had completed his opening instructions to the Chapter, the amended Chapter minutes record that ". . . Burns asked to be relieved of the superiorship /as president of Notre Dame/ and gave many good reasons for his request." The minutes provide no further clue as to what effect O'Donnell's admonition or Burns' request

had - or, indeed, what was discussed at all - but the delegates chose a new man. Father Matthew Walsh was to be President of Notre Dame and superior of the religious community; Father Burns was designated President Emeritus and Director of the Fund Drive.[158]

There are two conflicting explanations for Burns' short tenure as president: that he did not care for the public relations aspect of his office and was therefore happy to resign; or that his colleagues were ready to elect a new man because of the changes that Burns had made. While there are no definitive statements concerning the issue, we can infer from specific facts that he was indeed fired.

If the supposition that Burns disliked the public relations aspects of the presidency, as McAvoy reported in "Notre Dame 1919-1922: The Burns Revolution," is true, it then becomes difficult to explain his acquiescence to his selection as President Emeritus. With his President Emeritus duties as Fund Drive Director, Burns knew that he would be intimately involved with meeting people and persuading them to donate their money to the University. Certainly talent in public relations and an enjoyment of it is a prerequisite for success such as Burns enjoyed in raising funds for the University. Secondly, Burns was the only one term superior not re-elected. The unamended minutes do not even indicate that he was suggested for another term. And we must wonder why his 1922 "good reasons" for not being president proved more convincing than his 1919 arguments in the same vein. Whatever the reasons, the 1922 Chapter was a group willing

to see him leave and happy to accept his pro-forma resignation. Finally we have a letter that Burns wrote to his friend Dr. Buttrick announcing his new position as President Emeritus. In what seems clearly to be face-saving, Burns explained:

> Shortly after I returned from the East in July, I asked to be relieved of the presidency of the University, in order to devote all my time to raising money for it . . . I have made the big reforms I wanted to make, and now it is a question of supplying the means needed for further development.[159]

Why, then, was he not re-elected? First, the specific conditions which had figured prominently in Burns' selection, i.e., the need for a strong religious superior was gone. Secondly, the "big reforms" Burns had made in his three years of whirlwind activity - the dropping of the freshman and sophomore years of the preparatory school, the improvement of academic standards, the reorganization of the university, faculty involvement in the decision-making process, the establishment of a Board of Lay Trustees and the Endowment Drive - certainly could have alienated various members of the Congregation who felt that there were too many changes in too short a period. Whatever the reasons, the ending of the Burns' administration was a loss to the University and the community. For the next few years Burns' main concern would be the gathering of money on the pledges already received and working to get additional monies for the needed buildings.

Burns did collect the pledges on the first million dollars, but despite all of his efforts to raise the second million in the Building Fund Drive, he received little cash. He did, however, secure over $800,000 in pledges and was able to interest

hundreds of people in Notre Dame. Part of the reason for the lack of success in the second part of the campaign was that drives were being overworked. "A huge unpopularity finally was attached to the word 'drive' and the thing it stood for." The other reason was the general state of the economy as the nation entered the Great Depression. Many who had made pledges simply could not pay them.[160]

1929 marked the closing of the fund drives and with them another important share of Burns' life was closed. From 1919 to 1929 Burns had concentrated most of his interest on the improvement of the University. The reforms he instituted during his three short years as president - the reorganization of the University administratively, academically, and financially - was a lasting change that formed the basis for a stronger Notre Dame. His work on the two drives had the beneficial effect of reuniting the alumni to the University through the Homecoming Games, the Alumnus, and Universal Notre Dame Night. In addition Burns brought Notre Dame and her needs to the attention of the philanthropic foundations and thousands of people across the nation.

In 1938 Burns was honored by being elected the First Assistant Superior General of the Congregation. Since the Congregation of Holy Cross included both French and English speaking religious, the Superior General and the First Assistant between them had to command both languages so that one of the two highest officials could communicate directly to the various members. The new Superior-General, Albert Cousineau, elected in 1938 was a French-speaking Canadian, so the new First Assistant had to be

someone who could speak English. Despite Burns' failing health and his seventy-one years, the Congregation elected him to this important post.[161]

As First Assistant, Burns established his residence in Dujarie Institute where he was to be chaplain to the brothers who lived there. During the two years Burns spent at Dujarie, he was often sick. The indications are that he was suffering from some form of cancer as well as lumbago. Because of his physical condition Burns was no longer able to continue his active involvement in the affairs of the NCEA or of Notre Dame. However, Burns remained alert and enjoyed the arguments he started at the dinner table in Dujarie. Brother Agatho, a resident, kept a short diary on Burns in which he recorded many of the dinner table "arguments" and conversations. Agatho observed that "It seems to be an accepted thing between Father Burns and Brother William that the meal is incomplete unless there is a discussion on some topic of world interest . . ."[162]

During the months of January and February of 1940, Burns health continued to deteriorate. Many of the priests were shocked at Burns' condition, and Father Hugh O'Donnell, President of Notre Dame, tried to induce Burns to go to the hospital. Burns, however, had no intention of having a doctor or entering a hospital. To Brother Agatho, Burns was like an old warrior who had determined to spend whatever years remained to him in seclusion preparing for death. And like the old warrior, there was no lessening of rigor: Burns still bent his knees when he kissed the altar during Mass and would spend a full forty-five

minutes in the sacristy after Mass making his thanksgiving and praying.[163]

By the end of the summer of 1940 Burns' condition had worsened, and he was taken to St. Joseph's Hospital in South Bend. Even while a patient he refused to talk about his condition, and instead preferred to discuss modern education or some of his other interests with his visitors. His condition continued to deteriorate; he died at 7:45 p.m. September 9, 1940 at the age of seventy-three.[164]

V. Evaluation of Burns and Concluding Remarks.

Throughout his life, James Burns showed a high degree of consistency in the standards he set for himself and others. He maintained a life-long scholarly interest in Catholic education which was matched by the actions he took as president of Notre Dame and provincial of the Holy Cross Congregation. The standards he set for others led to his life-long involvement in the intra-community struggle over the education of the priests and brothers.

The influence of Father John A. Zahm on Burns may be noted both in the development of Burns' philosophy of education and the scholarly example that Zahm set for Burns. It was also Zahm who sent Burns to Washington, D.C. in 1900 thus enabling him to study for his Ph.D. at Catholic University while serving as superior of Holy Cross College.

Burns' choice of a dissertation topic, "The Catholic School System in the United States during the Colonial Period," showed how the major interest in his life had switched from science to education as he centered on the problem of the development of Catholic colleges. This major interest was related to the study of the Catholic school system because Burns had already seen the need for unity within the system. The logical way to provide for unity was first to discover how the system had developed and what its current status was. His dissertation launched Burns into such a study. After expanding the dissertation into a book which covered the period to 1840, Burns continued his research and completed the second of his histories, covering the growth

and development of Catholic schools 1840 to 1912. His third book, which focused on the current situation of Catholic schools in 1917, completed Burns' comprehensive historical survey of the subject.

Zahm's influence on Burns also carried over to the intra-community controversy on the education of the priests and brothers. Zahm, Burns, and Cavanaugh were members of the progressive wing of the order which wanted graduate training for the priest-professors and a higher level of training for the brothers who were gradually moving into high school work. While the progressive wing finally succeeded in gaining their goals, it was an arduous struggle in which Burns played a very key role.

The support that Burns gave to Zahm as a member of the Provincial Council while at Notre Dame increased when Burns became superior of Holy Cross College. Here he served not only as a spiritual guide for the seminarians and young priests, but also as their advisor in educational matters, often helping them to choose a specialty in which they later achieved great success. When Burns became provincial in 1927 he was able to exert an even greater influence on the formation of the priest-professors and to make certain, at long last, that the brothers received the minimum of a baccalaureate degree.

Burns' work with the Catholic Educational Association most clearly demonstrated his interest in the development of Catholic colleges. He had been a member of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities and became an officer of the CEA soon after its formation in 1904. At this time most Catholic colleges

had preparatory departments which were often larger than the collegiate departments. Burns recognized that such prep schools were actually millstones which kept the colleges from developing into first rate academic institutions. Before the colleges could abolish their prep schools, other feeder schools would have to be established. These feeder schools, the central Catholic high schools, were to provide both terminal and college preparatory education, and thus to serve as a vital and necessary link between the parish schools and the colleges.

Burns was one of the chief proponents in the movement for central Catholic high schools and served as chairman of the High School Committee whose investigations and publications served as the most important impetus to the movement. Just as Burns had expected, the growth of the central Catholic high schools went hand-in-hand with the gradual elimination of the preparatory departments in the colleges and the subsequent improvement of the colleges.

When Burns became president of Notre Dame in 1919 it was the culmination of a life-long interest. His association with the University began when he came to Notre Dame as a student in 1880. After Burns became a priest his influence on affairs at Notre Dame increased when Zahm appointed him a member of the Provincial Council. Even after he was sent to Washington, D.C., Burns was still in contact with affairs at the University through his friend, John W. Cavanaugh. And, of course, he influenced the University through his supervision of seminarians and priests who later became faculty members of Notre Dame.

The first thing that concerned Burns as president of Notre Dame was gaining a permanent endowment. For a number of years Burns had recognized the need for a permanent endowment to ensure the development of the University. While president of Holy Cross College, he had accompanied Father Cavanaugh on an unsuccessful trip to New York seeking foundation monies. As president and president emeritus he was able to obtain enough foundation and private monies to ensure Notre Dame's $1,000,000 endowment.

As part of his program to raise the academic standards at Notre Dame, Burns reorganized the academic structure, began the gradual elimination of the prep school, and sought to obtain the best faculty possible. He was also responsible for the institution of a Board of Lay Trustees to manage all endowment monies.

Although Burns had a very short term as president, his influence on the University did not stop with the end of his presidency. Because of his work on the endowment drive he was in constant touch with events at Notre Dame. Later as provincial, he was the immediate Superior of the presidents of the University and thus able to continue his influence. The culmination of this was when his protege, Father John F. O'Hara became president and implemented many of Burns' programs.

As Provincial Burns was also able to exert influence on the education of the brothers and the priests. He had always believed that the brothers needed a better education in order to fulfill their teaching mission in the high school. Now he was able to enforce this standard. Similarly he was able to see that the priest-professors received the specialized training

needed for University teaching.

Burns' contributions to the Congregation of Holy Cross can be listed under three main points:

1) His influence in raising the educational standards for the priests and brothers.

2) The sound guidance he gave to younger members of the community particularly while president of Holy Cross College and provincial of the Indiana Province.

3) The role model he provided younger men by his commitment to excellence as exemplified in his own scholarly pursuits; his work at Notre Dame; and his continuous commitment to Catholic education.

A man who accomplished any of these three would have lived a useful life. Burns' ability to accomplish all three marks him as one of the great men of his Congregation.

[1]Arthur J. Hope, C.S.C., Notre Dame One Hundred Years, revised (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1948), pp. 341-343. Hereafter cited as: Hope, Notre Dame; the dates given for Burns' entry at Notre Dame range from 1881-1882. He was, however, here at Notre Dame in October of 1880 as he is mentioned in the October 16, 1880 issue of The Notre Dame Scholastic as being a member of the St. Cecilia Philomathean Association. This would have made him thirteen when he first came to Notre Dame. "Local Items," The Notre Dame Scholastic, XIV (1880), 76. Hereafter cited as: Scholastic; Thomas Elliott, C.S.C., Private interview, July 12, 1973.

[2]Ralph Edward Weber, Notre Dame's John Zahm; American Catholic Apologist and Educator (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1961). For this study Weber's doctoral dissertation, "The Life of Reverend John A. Zahm, C.S.C., American Catholic Apologist and Educator," was used, p. 129. Hereafter cited as: Weber, "Zahm"; Hope, Notre Dame, pp. 175, 181.

[3]Hope, Notre Dame, pp. 234; 260-261; Weber, "Zahm," pp. 176-177. The Vatican conferred the degree on Zahm with the hope that it would serve as an incentive for him to continue his work for the development and propagation of Christian science. His published works cover a variety of topics, but the most important are those which deal with science and religion: The Catholic Church and Modern Science, Catholic Science and Catholic Scientists, "Catholic Dogma and Scientific Dogma," "Christian Faith and Scientific Freedom," "Faith and Science," "Friends and Foes of Science." The culmination of Zahm's work was his book, Evolution and Dogma which was published in 1896 and placed on the Index in 1898.

[4]Thomas Elliott, C.S.C., Private interview, July 12, 1973.

[5]Hope, Notre Dame, pp. 253, 255, 262.

[6]James A. Burns, C.S.C., Diary, Book I, June 30, 1895, Burns Administrative Correspondence, Archives of the Indiana Province of the Priests of Holy Cross. Hereafter cited as: Diary, Burns AC, PA.

[7]Hope, Notre Dame, pp. 252-262; "Diary," Book I, March 23, 1895, Burns AC, PA; Thirty-Fifth Annual Catalogue of Officers, Faculty, and Students of the University of Notre Dame for the Academic Year 1878-1879 (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1879), p. 18.

[8]Diary, Book I, May 17, 1895; February 18, 1896, Burns AC, PA.

[9]Ibid., May 22, 1895, Burns AC, PA.

[10]Ibid., June 17, 1895, Burns AC, PA.

[11]Ibid., June 17, 1895, Burns AC, PA; Weber, "Zahm," pp.

222-223. When the House of Studies in Washington became generally known as Holy Cross College is unclear. Zahm referred to it as that as early as 1896 in a letter to Burns while Burns referred to it as either the House of Studies or the Washington Seminary until he arrived there in 1900 when he, too, referred to it as Holy Cross College.

[12]Ibid., February 18, 1896; March 4, 1896; Burns AC, PA.

[13]Diary, Book I, December 20, 1897, Burns AC, PA.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Ibid., December 31, 1897; Book II, January 4, 1898, Burns AC, PA.

[16]Ibid., January 23, 1898, Burns AC, PA.

[17]Weber, "Zahm," pp. 322-326; Peter E. Hogan, S.S.J., The Catholic University of America, 1896-1903; The Rectorship of Thomas J. Conaty (Washington, D.C., 1949), p. 91. Hereafter cited as: Hogan, Conaty; Diary, Book II, January 25, 1898, Burns AC, PA.

[18]Diary, Book II, January 23, 1898; January 25, 1898, Burns AC, PA.

[19]Ibid., March 1, 1898; April 19, 1898, Burns AC, PA.

[20]Ibid., July 29, 1898, Burns AC, PA.

[21]Ibid., August 15, 1898, Burns AC, PA; Thomas Elliott, C.S.C., Private interview, July 12, 1973.

[22]Diary, Book II, August 15, 1898, Burns AC, PA.

[23]Ibid., February 14, 1899, Burns AC, PA.

[24]Ibid., February 23, 1899; March 27, 1900; April 22, 1900, Burns AC, PA; Coleman J. Barry, O.S.B., The Catholic University of America, 1903-1909; The Rectorship of Denis O'Connell (Washington, D.C., 1950), p. 66.

[25]John A. Zahm, C.S.C. to James A. Burns, C.S.C., September 10, 1900, Zahm Administration Correspondence, PA.

[26]Hope, Notre Dame, p. 279; Weber, "Zahm," p. 129.

[27]Patrick J. Carroll, C.S.C., "Mind in Action," Ave Maria, LXIII (April 20, 1946), 496-497. Hereafter cited as: Carroll, "Mind in Action." Weber, "Zahm," p. 357.

[28]Carroll, "Mind in Action," (April 27, 1947), 524, 525, 527.

[29]Gilbert Francais to Zahm, October 11, 1905, as cited in Carroll, "Mind in Action," 526.

[30]Weber, "Zahm," 367-369; James P. Doll, C.S.C., "The History of Graduate Training for Holy Cross Priests," Educational Conference Bulletin of the Priests of Holy Cross, XXV (December 1957), 32. Hereafter cited as: Doll, "Graduate Training."

[31]James A. Burns, C.S.C., Diary, Book II, January 23, 1898, Burns AC, PA. Doll, "Graduate Training," 33.

[32]Doll, "Graduate Training," 35; Diary, Book II, July 28, 1900, Burns AC, PA.

[33]Burns to Morrissey, October 15, 1906; November 22, 1906, Morrissey Administration Correspondence, PA. Hereafter cited as: Morrissey, PA.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Doll, "Graduate Training," 35.

[36]Ibid., 36; Burns to Morrissey, September 12, 1909, Morrissey, PA; Florence Elberta Barnes, Texas Writers of Today (Dallas, 1935), 182. Paul J. Foik, C.S.C. to Miss Gertrude Blanchard, January 8, 1924; Foik to Paul R. Byrne, October 7, 1920, Private Papers of Paul J. Foik, C.S.C., Microfilm copies of originals from Catholic Archives of Texas, PA. Hereafter cited as: Foik Papers, PA.

[37]Doll, "Graduate Training," 36.

[38]Burns to Morrissey, January 7, 1907, Morrissey, PA.

[39]Burns to Morrissey, May 22, 1909; June 11, 1904, Morrissey, PA. Hope, Notre Dame, pp.399, 402.

[40]Hope, Notre Dame, pp. 357-358. Burns to Morrissey, June 29, 1907; September 12, 1907, Morrissey, PA.

[41]Burns to Morrissey, January 18, 1914; May 28, 1916; June 23, 1917, Morrissey, PA. Hope, Notre Dame, pp. 442-443. Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., Father O'Hara of Notre Dame, The Cardinal-Archbishop of Philadelphia (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1967), p. 55. Hereafter cited as: McAvoy, O'Hara.

[42]Burns to Morrissey, September 19, 1906; June 19, 1912, June 22, 1914; June 18, 1916, Morrissey, PA.

[43]Burns to Morrissey, May 27, 1913; June 20, 1913, Morrissey, PA.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Burns to Morrissey, June 24, 1913, Morrissey, PA.

[46]Burns to Morrissey, December 28, 1913, Morrissey, PA.

[47]Ibid.

[48]Burns to George Sauvage, C.S.C., August 22, 1907, Sauvage Papers, Archives of the University of Notre Dame. Hereafter cited as: AUND.

[49]Burns to Morrissey, October 13, 1914; October 29, 1914; November 27, 1914, Morrissey, PA.

[50]Burns to Morrissey, December 10, 1914; December 17, 1914, Morrissey, PA.

[51]Hope, Notre Dame, p. 286. Burns to Julius Nieuwland, C.S.C., April 19, 1905, Nieuwland Papers, AUND; Virginia Bartow and Ruth Tarlton, "Chemistry, Societies of, "Encyclopedia Britannica (1973), V, 441.

[52]Burns to Morrissey, September 12, 1907, Morrissey, PA.

[53]Hope, Notre Dame, p. 346.

[54]Ibid., p. 355.

[55]Burns to Peter Schroeder, P.S.M., March 9, 1930, Burns PA. Brother Edward Sniatecki, C.S.C., Private telephone interview, January 28, 1975; Brother Damian Daele, C.S.C., "A Consideration of the Progress Made in the Training of the Brothers of Holy Cross as Teachers" (Unpublished bachelor's thesis, University of Notre Dame, 1925), p. 8; Brother Ephrem O'Dwyer, C.S.C. to Father William Cunningham, n.d., Burns AC, PA.

[56]Hope, Notre Dame, p. 355.

[57]Peter P. Forrestal, C.S.C. to Burns, March 3, 1928; August 24, 1924; Burns to El Illustrisimo Senor Don Leopoldo Eijo y Garay, August 27, 1929. Burns AC, PA; Bulletin of the University of Notre Dame, XXXIV (1939), 17. Hereafter cited as: N.D. Bulletin.

[58]Burns to Philip S. Moore, C.S.C., November 15, 1930; April 25, 1931; July 19, 1931. Burns AC, PA.

[59]Hope, Notre Dame, pp. 453; 469; 478; N.D. Bulletin, XXXIV (1939), 25; Moore to Burns, March 11, 1935. Burns AC, PA.

[60]Burns to James McDonald, C.S.C., April 26, 1930; to Leo L. Ward, November 3, 1930. Burns AC, PA; N.D. Bulletin, XXXIV (1939), 30.

[61]Burns to Moore, November 15, 1930; to Leo L. Ward, February 14, 1931. Leo L. Ward to Burns, April 17, 1931. Burns AC, PA. Hope, Notre Dame, p. 473.

[62]Leo R. Ward, C.S.C. to Burns, November 22, 1934; January 20, 1935; Burns to L. R. Ward, January 30, 1935; March 14, 1935; June 27, 1935; to Charles C. Miltner, C.S.C. /1935/; Miltner to Thomas Steiner, C.S.C., December 23, 1935. Burns AC, PA. Hope, Notre Dame, p. 365. Burns to Francis W. Howard, April 9, 1932. Burns AC, PA; N.D. Bulletin, XXXIV (1939), 35, 30.

[63]Burns to Stanislaus F. Lisewski, C.S.C., May 27, 1935; June 22, 1935; Lisewski to Burns, June 6, 1935; Ascension Thursday, 1936. Burns AC, PA. Miss Grace Newrock, Private telephone interview, February 27, 1973; N.D. Bulletin, XXXIV (1939), 25.

[64]Thomas T. McAvoy to Burns, May 8, 1937; May 12, 1937; May 24, 1938. Burns AC, PA. N.D. Bulletin, XXXIV (1939), 24.

[65]David Joseph Arthur, C.S.C., "The University of Notre Dame, 1919-1933: An Administrative History" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1973), p. 216. Hereafter cited as: Arthur, "Notre Dame;" Hope, Notre Dame, p. 457; McAvoy, O'Hara, pp. 123-124; 144.

[66]The Consecration of His Excellency John Francis O'Hara, C.S.C., D.D., Titular Bishop of Milasa and Delegatus Castrensis, January 15, 1949, cited in McAvoy, O'Hara, p. 202. O'Hara to Trevor Arnett, Personal Correspondence, Most Reverend John Francis O'Hara, Military Ordinal. AUND, cited in McAvoy, O'Hara, p.212.

[67]James A. Burns, C.S.C., The Catholic School System in the United States; Its Principles, Origin, and Establishment (New York, 1908), pp. 5-6. Hereafter cited as: Burns, Principles.

[68]Burns to Howard, February 14, 1905; June 8, 1905. Archives of the National Educational Association. Photocopies available in the Archives of the University of Notre Dame. Hereafter cited as: NCEA, AUND.

[69]Burns to Morrissey, January 17, 1907, Morrissey, PA.

[70]Burns, Principles, pp. 34-35.

[71]Ibid., pp. 15-16.

[72]Ibid., pp. 35-38.

[73]Book Review of The Catholic School System in the United States by James A. Burns, C.S.C. (Chicago, 1908), Catholic World, LXXXVII (1908), 548-550.

[74]James A. Burns, C.S.C., Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States (New York, 1912), p. 6. Hereafter cited as: Burns, Growth.

[75]Burns, Growth, p. 6.

[76]Ibid., pp. 346-350.

[77]Ibid., pp. 357-359.

[78]Ibid., pp. 360-370.

[79]Ibid., pp. 371-379.

[80]Book Review of Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States by James A. Burns, C.S.C. (Chicago, 1912), Catholic World, XCVI (1912), 393-394. Book Review of Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States by James A. Burns, C.S.C. (Chicago, 1912), Ave Maria, LXXV (1912), 697-698.

[81]James Howard Plough, "Catholic Colleges and the Catholic Educational Association: The Foundation and Early Years of the CEA, 1899-1919" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1967), vi-71. Hereafter cited as: Plough, "CEA." Hogan, Conaty, pp. 68-69.

[82]Plough, "CEA," pp. 84-86.

[83]Ibid., pp. 110-111.

[84]James A. Burns, C.S.C., "The Catholic High School Movement," Report of the Third Annual Conference of the Association of Catholic Colleges of the United States, III (1901), 30. Hereafter cited as: RCCA.

[85]Ibid., pp. 25-33.

[86]Ibid., p. 495.

[87]Ibid., p. 497.

[88]Ibid., pp. 498-499.

[89]RCCA, III (1901), pp. 131-132. Herbert G. Espy, The Public Secondary School (Boston, 1939), p. 53.

[90]RCCA, III (1901), pp. 109, 133.

[91]Plough, "CEA," pp. 132-133, 139. RCCA, IV, 1902, p. 97.

[92]RCCA, IV, 1902, p. 94.

[93]Plough, "CEA," p. 163.

[94]Burns to Howard, March 12, 1903, NCEA, AUND.

[95]"Report of Joint Committee on High Schools," Report of

the Proceedings and Addresses of the First Annual Meeting, Catholic Educational Association, I (1904), 41. Hereafter cited as: RCEA, I (1904); Ed. Reform, p. 322 cited RCEA, p. 41.

[96]Ibid., pp. 49-52.

[97]Ibid.

[98]Ibid.

[99]Ibid., p. 41.

[100]Plough, "CEA," pp. 200-201.

[101]James A. Burns, C.S.C., "Coordination and Cooperation in Catholic Educational Work," Catholic Educational Association Bulletin, III (1906), 42:44. Hereafter cited as: CEAB.

[102]Plough, "CEA," p. 213.

[103]Ibid.

[104]Ibid., pp. 257-258, 263; Burns to Howard, August 23, 1908. NCEA. AUND; RCEA (1908), p. 47.

[105]James A. Burns, C.S.C., "The Elementary School Curriculum - Its Origin and Development," CEAB, VII (1910), 64-69.

[106]Plough, "CEA," p. 266. RCEA, V (1908), 47.

[107]Burns to Howard, March 2, 1909; March 20, 1909. NCEA. AUND; Plough, "CEA," p. 263.

[108]James A. Burns, C.S.C., "Report of the Committee on High Schools," CEAB, VIII (1911), 61-62.

[109]Ibid., pp. 62-65.

[110]Ibid., p. 51.

[111]Ibid., p. 52.

[112]Ibid., p. 70.

[113]Ibid., pp. 56-58.

[114]Ibid., p. 60.

[115]Ibid., p. 71.

[116]James A. Burns, C.S.C., "The Condition of Catholic Secondary Education in the United States," RCEA, XII (1915), 389.

[117]Ibid., p. 394.

[118]Ibid., p. 392.

[119]Ibid., p. 394.

[120]"Address of the Very Reverend James A. Burns, C.S.C., LLD.," CEAB, XV (1918), 44.

[121]James A. Burns, C.S.C., Catholic Education: A Study of Conditions (New York, 1917), p.v. Hereafter cited as: Burns, Study.

[122]Book Review of Catholic Education by James A. Burns, C.S.C. (New York, 1917), Catholic World, CVII (1918), 251-252; Book Review of Catholic Education by James A. Burns, C.S.C. (New York, 1917), American Ecclesiastical Review, LVIII (March, 1918), 355-357.

[123]Provincial Chapters Book 1918-1943, July 1, 1919, p. 9. Provincial Administration Papers, PA. Matthew Schumacher, C.S.C. to James A. Burns, C.S.C., January 15, 1919, March 29, 1919; Burns to Schumacher, March 8, 1919. Private Papers of James A. Burns. PA.

[124]Arthur, "Notre Dame," p. 92.

[125]J. W. Hogan, "Father Burns, President of Notre Dame," Scholastic, LIII (1919), 9.

[126]Philip S. Moore, C.S.C., "Academic Development, University of Notre Dame - Past, Present and Future" (Mimeographed copy, University of Notre Dame, 1960), pp. 13, 14, 16.

[127]Arthur, "Notre Dame," p. 117; Bulletin of University of Notre Dame; General Catalogue 1921-1922 (Notre Dame, 1922), pp. 11-17. Hereafter cited as: N.D. Bulletin.

[128]George Shuster, Private interview, University of Notre Dame, May 13, 1970. Hereafter cited as: Shuster Interview.

[129]N.D. Bulletin, 1921-1922, pp. 6-11; Arthur, "Notre Dame," p. 232.

[130]Shuster Interview. Shuster believed that it was this type of thing that ended Burns' presidency.

[131]Paul J. Foik, C.S.C. to Paul Byrne, October 16, 1920. Foik Papers, PA.

[132]Schumacher to Burns, July 31, 1919, Walsh Presidential Papers, Archives of the University of Notre Dame. Hereafter cited as: WPP, AUND.

[133]Minutes of the University Council of the University of Notre Dame, March 6, 1920, December 2, 1920. AUND. Hereafter cited as: Minutes of the University Council, AUND.

[134]Ibid., March 6, 1920, March 27, 1920, April 24, 1920; N.D. Bulletin, 1919-1920, pp. 30-31.

[135]Minutes of the University Council, September 24, 1921. AUND; Moore, "Academic Development," p. 34; N.D. Bulletin, 1921-1922, p. 10. Committee members were: Fathers Matthew Walsh, Joseph Burke, William Cunningham, Leonard J. Carrico, Julius Nieuwland, John A. O'Hara, William A. Bolger, John C. McGinn, William Carey, Charles Milter; Francis Vurpillat, John M. Cooney, and Jose Caparo.

[136]Minutes of the University Council, April 4, 1921, May 2, 1921, April 20, 1921, March 21, 1921. AUND.

[137]Arthur, "Notre Dame," pp. 103, 245. Schumacher to Burns, July 31, 1919. WPP. AUND.

[138]Arthur, "Notre Dame," pp. 245-246.

[139]Raymond B. Fosdick, Adventures in Giving; The Story of the General Education Board - A Foundation Established by John D. Rockefeller (Evanston, Ill., 1962), pp. 129, 138; Burns to Wallace Buttrick, D.D., January 7, 19/20/, O'Hara Presidential Papers. AUND. Hereafter cited as OHPP. AUND. The date on the letter is 1919, an obvious new year mistake in dating. Also Burns to Dr. Abbott W. Lowell, October 9, 1920; William P. Breen, LL.D. November 22, 1920, Burns Presidential Papers, AUND. Hereafter cited as: BPP; George B. Hill, Harvard College By An Oxonian (New York, 1894), p. 297.

[140]Burns to Breen, November 22, 1920, Joseph M. Byrne, Sr., January 11, 1921. BPP. AUND.

[141]Burns to Albert Russell Erskine, June 4, 1922. BPP. AUND.

[142]McAvoy, O'Hara, p. 69; Erskine to Burns, June 1, 1922; Burns to Erskine, June 4, 1922. BPP. AUND.

[143]Burns to Superintendent of Public Instruction, June 24, 1920. BPP. AUND.

[144]"Legislation for Higher Education," Circular of Information Number 11, Teacher Training Series, Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, March, 1921; Linnaeus N. Hines to Burns, April 7, 1921. WPP. AUND; Burns to State Department of Public Instruction, April 9, 1921. OHPP. AUND; Report on Endowment and Income of University of Notre Dame, September 1, 1921. OHPP. AUND. See also North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary

Schools, "Standards of Accrediting Colleges and Universities," Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting, XII (1915), 45, "The college, if a corporate institution, shall possess a productive endowment of not less than $200,000."

[145]McAvoy, O'Hara, p. 69.

[146]John Cavanaugh, C.S.C. to General Education Board, January 8, 1908, General Education Board Papers. Photocopies of the originals from Rockefeller Archives. AUND. Hereafter cited as: GEB Papers. AUND; Burns to Andrew Morrissey, C.S.C., March 21, 1917. Morrissey, PA; Burns memorandum on College of Engineering of the University of Notre Dame, January 23, 1919. GEB Papers. AUND.

[147]Burns to Dr. Wallace Buttrick, January 7, 19/20/. OHPP. AUND.

[148]Starr J. Murphy to Trevor Arnett, March 11, 1920, GEB Papers, AUND.

[149]Arnett to Burns, March 15, 1920; Burns to General Education Board, March 20, 1920. OHPP, AUND; Trevor Arnett, Memorandum of Conference with Father James A. Burns, President of Notre Dame University, May, 1920. GEB Papers, AUND.

[150]Otis W. Caldwell, Report of May 19, 1920 Visit to University of Notre Dame, May 21, 1920. GEB Papers, AUND; Burns to Buttrick, May 28, 1920, OHPP, AUND.

[151]Burns to Buttrick, November 24, 1920. OHPP, AUND; Burns to Arnett, December 24, 1920. BPP, AUND.

[152]Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., "Notre Dame 1919-1922: The Burns Revolution," Review of Politics, XXI (January, 1959), 442. Hereafter cited as: McAvoy, "Burns Revolution." The key word in Burns' description of the endowment is productive. Most of the University's holdings as listed in his 1921 report to the Indiana State Department of Public Instruction were not income-producing. See p. 441.

[153]Trevor Arnett, Report of February 11, 1921 visit to University of Notre Dame, February 1921. GEB Papers, AUND.

[154]Arnett to Burns, February 25, 1921 (telegram). OHPP, AUND; Buttrick and Arnett to Burns, May 16, 1921. OHPP, AUND; McAvoy, "Burns Revolution," p. 442; Arthur, "Notre Dame," p. 129.

[155]Burns to Morrissey, January 22, 1920. Morrissey. PA. Burns to Byron V. Kanaley, March 8, 1920; Samuel T. Murdock, May 16, 1920; Clyde B. Furst, PH.D., December 7, 1920. BPP, AUND.

[156]Burns to Dr. James R. Angell, December 11, 1920; Honorable Morgan J. O'Brien, May 5, 1921; May 30, 1921. BPP, AUND.

[157]Burns, "The Campaign," pp. 831-832; Warren A. Cartier to John C. McGinn, C.S.C., June 5, 1922; Burns to Officers and Members of the Notre Dame Alumni Association, June 11, 1922. Alumni Association Papers, AUND.

[158]Provincial Chapter Book 1918-1943, June 30, 1922, pp. 51, 57-58, Provincial Papers, PA.

[159]McAvoy, "Burns Revolution," p. 448; Burns to Buttrick, August 8, 1922. GEB Papers, AUND; Arthur, "Notre Dame," p. 139.

[160]James A. Burns, C.S.C., "The Notre Dame Endowment and Building Campaign," Notre Dame Alumnus, III (1924), 70. Webster Schultz Stover, Alumni Stimulation by the American College President (New York, 1930), p. 51.

[161]Hope, Notre Dame, p. 355; Thomas Elliott, C.S.C., Private interview, South Bend, Indiana, January 7, 1975.

[162]Brother Agatho, C.S.C., "Diary on Father Burns," February 7, 1940. OHPP, AUND. Hereafter cited as: Agatho, "Burns," OHPP, AUND.

[163]Thomas A. Steiner, C.S.C. to Charles C. Miltner, C.S.C., December 31, 1935. Burns Papers, PA; Agatho, "Burns," January 26, 1940; February 14, 1940. OHPP, AUND.

[164]Hope, Notre Dame, p. 355. Patrick J. Carroll, C.S.C., "Twighlight Memories; Father James A. Burns," 6. Private Papers of Patrick J. Carroll, C.S.C. PA. "Father Burns, Former Head of N.D., Dies," Tribune (South Bend, Indiana), September 10, 1940.