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INTRODUCTION

The blending of religion and sociology in America was not as unusual as the professional sociological climate in the 1930s indicated. As early as the 1890s, two institutes of christian sociology had been formed. The American Institute of Christian Sociology was begun in 1893 and the Oberlin Institute of Christian Sociology in 1894. While neither group experienced longevity, the fact that they existed indicated that a relationship between the religious backgrounds of the sociologists and the theories of sociology was addressed prior to the formation of the American Catholic Sociological Society in 1938.

The second meeting of the American Sociological Society, held in 1909, was devoted to the topic "Religion and the Modern Society." Five of the fourteen papers presented dealt with various aspects of the topic. Even the presidential address given by William George Sumner, entitled "Religion and the Mores", was a synthesis of statements from Durkheim and Marx which dealt specifically with the scientific study of religion within sociology.  

---


2Ibid., 371.
while there was little objection to the topic, this was the last time that any interest in religion would be dealt with in this fashion by this secular organization. After this convention, any interest expressed in religion by the members was treated more as representing or advocating a particular religious group's tenets rather than topical presentations given from a specific scientific viewpoint.

It was Sumner, who as president, choose the topic which was then approved by his Executive Committee. After the planning sessions for the 1909 meeting, a memorandum was circulated to the members of the American Sociological Society. It read in part:

The Executive Committee of the Sociological Society voted to take as the general topic of its next meeting the subject, - RELIGION AND MODERN SOCIETY. - It was held that all those who should be invited to take part in the discussion of this subject should be instructed that all reference to the Divine Authority of any religion, or of religion in general, is to be avoided for the very simple reason that such topics as this lie altogether and under the realm of scientific discussion. ³

The notice was to insure the scientific analysis of the topic and not allow the papers to become instruments for proselytizing. But, it is the second sentence that would later become the overriding attitude of the society about religion. This attitude was not based on competition between the major forces of Protestantism and Catholicism, for Catholicism was a minority religion in a Protestant American

³Ibid., 370.
world. Rather, as the science of sociology became more positivist in nature, it was easier not to involve the issue of religions and values into the studies. It was also the secular society's attitude regarding this statement which became vexing to the Catholic members of the American Sociological Society. These Catholic members could not ignore nor subjugate to a minor role the issue of Divine Authority of the Catholic Church. Their writings and research were grounded in this concept of Divine Authority. To be Catholic meant that a person's belief system was ground in this concept and that it could not be separated at will. It was from this climate that the American Catholic Sociological Society was born.

It must be noted that, in the summer of 1968, thirty years worth of documents pertaining to the American Catholic Sociological Society were sent from Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin to St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Texas. During transit, a truck fire consumed all the official records which included: financial documents, minutes of the general conventions and executive council meetings, membership file index, subscription records, 100 copies of Volumes 27 and 28, miscellaneous files, and various historic documents. The only documents salvaged were some singed membership cards. An attempt to recreate these files from the personal records of the members was made. But, these files could not completely be rebuilt. The
information found in this work is a composite of articles, master theses, archival information, personal journals and documents, and personal interviews.
CHAPTER 1

CATHOLIC THOUGHT AND SOCIAL ACTION

With the publication of Pope Leo XIII’s encyclical Rerum Novarum in 1891, Catholic social thought and attitude entered a new era. The publication in 1931, of Pope Pius XI’s Quadragesimo Anno intensified and solidified the new direction upon which the Church had embarked. The Church was no longer seeking definition and clarification of its social mission. It was now a Church with the mandate to be a leader in social action and human reform. Both encyclicals expected nothing less from the Catholic population than an immediate response of total commitment to social action.

These two documents called for Catholics to be aware of, not only the life and dignity of the human person, but also his/her rights and responsibilities as a member of a world community. Since humans were considered not only to be sacred, but also social in nature, the documents stressed the call to serve the family and community. The dignity of work and the rights of workers were to be major themes addressed by Catholic social action. Catholics were impressed with the concept that the basic moral test of a society was how its most vulnerable members fared. How they fared could not be left to chance. The underprivileged had
to be sought out, their needs defined, and steps taken to meet those needs. Finally, there was to be an understanding that all people are of one human family no matter what national, racial, ethnic, economic, or ideological differences existed. The Catholic image of the "Mystical Body", all of the humanity being interrelated and interdependent working together with Christ as the head, portrayed clearly the vast global dimensions of this new call to action.¹

The old Thomistic Catholic social traditions were now reexamined and looked at from this new perspective. The encyclicals challenged Catholics not to profess a faith that they did not practice nor to proclaim a gospel message that they did not live out daily. This challenge brought prompt and varied responses from the leaders of the Catholic Church in America. Understanding the nature of the person, as the encyclicals stressed, was a necessary component to social action. It required that priests, the leaders of the Catholic faithful, be trained in something other than theology and philosophy. The science of sociology had come into its own during the past century and seemed to offer a possible solution to this need for a different form of training. There were problems inherent in this new science.

In the late 1830s, Auguste Comte had attempted to isolate sociology from the other sciences. Influenced by the works of Condorcet and Saint-Simon, Comte stressed the need for sociology to be a system built on the scientific methodology of observation, description, and classification of social facts. He advocated the complete abandonment of all philosophic methods, especially metaphysics. Comte's positivism did not allow for any interpretation of facts obtained while using this method, nor allow any value judgments. By that, he rendered sociology a "value-free" science. Grounded in these scientific inductive (positive) methods, sociology was, in theory, touted as a true science by most sociologists in the United States and abroad by the mid- to late 1930s. Its popularity and subsequent use were on the rise.²

A misunderstanding occurred relating to the term "value-free" so freely used by Comte. Incorrectly, the phrase was thought by many to apply to the researcher not, as it was meant, to apply to the data and the subsequent analysis of it. This misunderstanding prompted some Catholics to adamantly express their strong conviction that this secular science was not capable of dealing with the sacredness of the individual. They felt strongly that any attempt to study religion or values scientifically was

virtually impossible and would even be considered a profanation of the faith. Numerous attempts were made to reconcile the need for this new type of training in the study of man with this false perception of the science of sociology. Until World War I, within the field of American sociology, the acceptance of Catholic social thought moved back and forth from outright rejection to efforts at reconciliation. Much of this shift in attitude was brought about by the pronouncements of the papal encyclicals, a sense of mistrust on the part of some Protestant sociologists regarding Catholic sociologists' capabilities, and changes within the American Catholic community itself. Between the First and Second World Wars, Catholic intellectuals, especially those identified as liberals, attempted to preserve the central elements of Catholic tradition while reconciling with the larger intellectual environment in the field of sociology. To accomplish this, they accepted and participated in the neo-Thomist or neo-Scholastic revival that had already been underway in the European Catholic community for a half century. This neo-Thomistic stance gave American Catholic intellectuals a basis on which to attempt to build theologically appropriate responses that would join tradition and science within their various academic disciplines without sacrificing too much of
either. 3 Few of these met with any real, widely accepted success.

An all out attempt to address the call of the encyclicals was made by the American Jesuit Order. At the twenty-eighth General Congregation held in 1938, the Jesuits in attendance formulated and issued several decrees. The twenty-ninth decree expressly established the Institute of Social Order (ISO). This Institute was to deal with five major areas: bringing society back to Christ, the social apostolate, atheistic communism, errors regarding race and states, and a program for the modern apostolate. It was established primarily to concentrate on the defense and spread of the faith. The original call mandated:

as much as each one may be qualified, let all strive to exert efficacious influence on those means which today are particularly effective in forming public opinion, always keeping that purpose in view which the Church had in mind at the very dawn of Christianity, namely, that individual lives and all society be permeated with the Gospel teaching and thus thoroughly reformed. . . . Ours everywhere strive to imbue the Catholic laity with a spirit truly apostolic and educate them up to its requirements.

Work in the social apostolate in keeping with the Encyclicals of Leo XIII (Rerum Novarum) and Pius XI (Quadragesimo Anno and Divini Redemptoris), . . . is strongly recommended to all, is to be actively promoted everywhere, and is to be reckoned among the most urgent ministries of our time. . . . Ours should work diligently . . . to foster social organizations and institutes, . . . [and] the principles of charity and social justice must be impressed upon the minds or our

university, college, and high school students. 4

Jesuits were called to work so that individual lives and all society would be permeated with the Gospel teaching and thus thoroughly reformed. In any way that was available to them, the Jesuits were encouraged to: promote the religious, moral and temporal welfare of the working classes; to make the working men and employers aware of the Church’s social doctrines; and, whenever possible, to foster social organizations and institutes. Since education was a primary goal and function of the Jesuit Order, they were to use this opportunity to impress the principles of charity and social justice upon the minds of students attending their universities, colleges, and high schools.

FATHER RALPH GALLAGHER

Fr. Ralph Gallagher, founder of the American Catholic Sociological Society, 5 attended these Congregation meetings and was directly and deeply affected by them. He had been actively involved in the discussions both privately and publicly regarding the mandates from both the encyclicals and the Jesuits to promote social action. He firmly believed in the message and intent of the Congress and felt compelled

4 ISO Bulletin, December 1943, "What’s the ISO All About?"

5 References to this organization during the document will either use the title of the society, The American Catholic Sociological Society, or the acronym, ACSS.
to personal action.

Gallagher was a man of exceptional accomplishments. In 1932, he was the first person to receive a Ph.D. in Sociology from St. Louis University. He held two Master degrees and graduated from the New York Police Academy. He taught sociology, criminology and penology at various Catholic universities. While teaching at these universities, he was actively involved in expanding and upgrading the course offerings in the various Departments of Sociology. He was continually active with various crime prevention and delinquency related bureaus in Chicago, St. Louis, and other cities where he was stationed. He worked as a sociologist at Alcatraz and Sing Sing prisons, and served as chaplain at others. Gallagher's reputation and influence were well known in academic and political circles. He understood the value of sociology and firmly believed in applying its benefits to societal needs. He was an ardent advocate of applied sociology both as a teacher and a professional sociologist. But, being a man who was never quite satisfied with his own level of involvement, he felt that there was more that he personally could accomplish. He examined his life and saw some specific ways in which he would be able to carry out the twenty-ninth decree. He developed and expanded the concept of forming some sort of social organization and/or institute.

During the time between the World Wars, Catholic
intellectuals in America strongly felt a need to develop a response to the scientific inductive methods advocated by Comte. Catholicism was a minority religion in America, and, as such, these intellectuals felt the necessity to articulate a strong, distinctive self-identity. They were not comfortable with the popular trend toward modernist thought nor did they want to be absorbed into the Protestant approach to sociology.⁶ Applied sociology, which was viewed by these intellectuals as the ultimate aim of the science, was defined as the active promotion of human temporal welfare by formulating principles for social improvement in conformity with the axioms of ethics and religion.

Gallagher was an active member of the American Sociological Society,⁷ but did not feel that these issues about which he felt most strongly were being addressed by this larger and more universal society. During 1937, Gallagher had had two papers rejected for publication by the ASS and other Catholic members had experienced like treatment. If issues of religion were addressed by the ASS, it was the common opinion among Catholic professional sociologists that their views were not acknowledged properly. When there was an issue of religion addressed at a convention, rather than a practicing Catholic sociologist,

⁶Kivisto, 351.

⁷All references to the American Sociological Society from this point on in the work will use the acronym ASS or ASR.
often a person from Catholic Charities was called upon to give the presentation. There had been very few, if any, Catholic officers of the ASS. Definitely, no Catholic who worked for a Catholic institution had ever been an officer.  

At the American Sociological Society meeting in Atlantic City in December 1937, Gallagher met with three other members of the ASS who held the same beliefs, shared the same misgivings, and felt the same dissatisfaction with what was happening within that organization. That group consisted of Fr. Ralph Gallagher, S.J. (Loyola University Chicago), Fr. Francis Friedel, S.M. (Dayton University), Fr. Louis Weitzman, S.J. (John Carroll University), and Marguerite Reuss (Marquette University) who was reported to be a non-Catholic. The ASS was the large and universally accepted sociological organization, but this small group felt that they did not quite fit in to its structure and that their input and scholarship were not welcome.

After realizing that there must be other Catholic scholars who shared in their frustration, with Gallagher in the lead, this group of four decided to form a sociological group...
society expressly for Catholic scholars. It was not meant to replace the ASS, but rather to satisfy a need exhibited by this very specific group of sociologists. All Catholic colleges and universities as well as any interested Catholic sociologists would be encouraged to join. Gallagher assumed the role of coordinator for the first gathering. He suggested that Loyola University of Chicago, where he worked, might be a suitable place for the first formal meeting. With agreement of the other three and with permission of Fr. Samuel K. Wilson, the President of Loyola, the wheels were set in motion for the new society to be established.

Fr. Ralph Gallagher composed a letter which was sent to all Catholic colleges in the Mid-west. Dated February 21, 1938, it read in part:

for some years there has been felt the need of concerted action on the part of our Catholic institutions of higher learning in the field of social thought and action. . . . I am asking you to send a representative of your Sociology or Social Science department to this meeting.  

On Saturday morning March 26, 1938 at Loyola University’s North Side Campus, a small group of curious Catholic sociologists met. They were present because of the letter, a sense of curiosity, or a mandate by their Department Chair to investigate this new organization.

From this informal meeting came The American Catholic

---

Sociological Society. It goals simply stated were: the promotion of the concept of Catholic sociology, a sharing of curricular ideas and methodologies, and research.

Catholic Identity and Catholic Sociology

While the sharing of curricular ideas and methodologies was important to the Catholic sociological population, there were other very strong issues also present. At that time, most American Catholic sociologists had been trained in American Catholic colleges or universities and did not share the common background in methodology and epistemology that the other American sociologists did. Catholic sociologists had their foundations in philosophy and theology. This led to misgivings about the Catholic's ability to do methodologically correct research and to questioning the validity of their writings. The Catholics' ability to be value-free in their data analysis was doubted especially because their expressed end goal which was social reform. Many Catholic sociologists took a defensive posture against this perception of their work. Catholic teachers of sociology especially wanted and needed to find a vehicle for publication and a learned society at which to speak to enhance their professional credibility. Since many of the critics of Catholic sociologists were very active in the ASS, it was apparent that the ASS would not be a viable channel for the Catholics' work. If they would not be
allowed to do this at the ASS, then many felt it necessary to create their own vehicle to achieve this goal.\textsuperscript{12} Dr. Clement Mihanovich described this early group as an orphan unable to find a mother, so it created its own.\textsuperscript{13}

There was also a deep seated even though not often verbalized issue of identity. The original four members and many of the others who attended the first meeting were mid-westerners. At that time in the Chicago area, it was well known that when a person was asked where he/she lived within the city, he/she would respond by giving the name of his/her parish. That simple answer said a multitude of things about the person. It identified him/her by giving the geographical location of residence, nationality, probable income level, and the fact that they were Catholic. Much pride was taken in this type of identification. When these sociologists did not have their credibility and professionalism acknowledged by their colleagues in the ASS, it was very disconcerting. The Catholic sociologist took a great deal of pride in who and what they were and were anxious to express it to others.\textsuperscript{14}

By stating that they were members of the ACSS, they

\textsuperscript{12}Dr. Franz Mueller, interview by author, 13 October 1992, St. Paul, MN.

\textsuperscript{13}Dr. Clement Mihanovich, interview by author, 20 August 1993, St. Louis, Missouri.

\textsuperscript{14}Dr. Paul Mundy, interview by author, 10 November 1993, Silver Springs, MD.
could quickly be identified within the larger sociological community. First, they were American which meant that their training and background was much different than that of the Catholic sociologist from Europe. They took much pride in this. The country had just emerged from a great depression and was dealing with the concept of nationalism and an ever growing immigrant population. This affected the way in which the American Catholic sociologist looked at the need for social action and applied sociology. There was a pride in being American and an emphasis on conformity to "Americanism" in their studies and work. Even though the Seat of the Church was Rome, they did not want to give the impression that they were controlled like puppets by the Vatican. They had distinctive responses to the issues of the day that differed from their European colleagues and they wanted them expressed. Secondly, even though their education for the most part was from Catholic institutions of higher learning, they felt strongly that they were equally capable of being practicing sociologists as their non-Catholic counterparts. Methodology and epistemology were being introduced and taught at Catholic colleges and universities. Fr. William J. Kerby, a charter member of the American Sociological Society, offered the first sociology course taught at a Catholic college in the United States at the Catholic University in Washington, D.C., in 1895. In 1925, St. Louis University began its Department of Sociology and
was rapidly becoming one of the leading institutions in the field. By 1938, sociology was taught in most Catholic colleges and universities. While sociology was not always separated departmentally from social work or criminology, by this time, it managed to achieve departmental independence from social ethics and theology in most institutions. Catholic sociologists felt very strongly about the quality of their education and their ability to do correct research. They felt that their research had value that should be recognized and respected throughout the field.

Finally, they had difficulty reconciling the rising idea of humanism in the field of sociology. The value-free stand taken by Comte and his followers could not fully be reconciled with the teachings of the Church on the dignity of the person and the concept of soul and free will. Man was more than mortal, he definitely had a strong spiritual side that could not be ignored. The Catholic sociologists' research and methodology would bear this out.\footnote{Ibid., 10 November, 1993.} These sociologists felt very strongly that they had a right to publish and make public their research stressing their point of view. They would not be denied this opportunity.

Perhaps the liveliest issue for the Catholic sociologist was the debate over the existence of and definition of Catholic sociology. This was not an issue that could readily be discussed or debated with those who did not
understand the current position of the Catholic Church nor the thought process that lead up to this point. Auguste Comte's system of sociology was built on a scientific methodology for the classification of social facts that advocated the complete abandonment of philosophic methods. His proposed stand did not allow for any interpretation of these facts or permit any judgment of values. He rejected the issue of applied sociology which was at the core of Catholic social action. Catholic intellectuals in America felt a strong need to develop a response to this modernist thought. To accomplish this, they accepted and participated in the neo-Thomist or neo-scholastic revival that was already underway in the European Catholic community. There were elements of the Catholic faith that they themselves could not ignore. The Catholic sociologists had difficulty reconciling their heritage and training with this modernist thought process. But, the Catholic sociologists found it extremely difficult, even amongst themselves, to agree on the existence of Catholic sociology let alone come to a definitive definition of it.

In the social encyclicals written by Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI, a social apostolate was demanded from the priesthood, laity, and even student bodies. It was suggested by these Popes that Christian social education should begin at an early age and continue throughout an individual's life. This was suggested in order that Catholics would have
a solid foundation in the "great principles" of Christian sociology. Even though this was considered to be one of the major landmarks signifying the beginning of a new era in Christian social thought patterns, the debate raged over what was Christian sociology.

With these papal mandates in mind, sociology courses were introduced at a Catholic colleges as early as 1895. They were a mixture of philosophy and sociology. Eva J. Ross received her M.A. in sociology from St. Louis University and later, in 1934, her Ph.D. in sociology from Yale University. She was a college teacher, author of sociology texts, and a member of the ACSS. Ross and the others who felt that Catholic sociology was a viable entity attempted to define it for other sociologists. Ross’s writings offer a good example of the point of view of many Catholic sociologists trained in an American Catholic college during the 1930s. In her texts, A Survey of Sociology, written in 1932, and Fundamentals of Sociology, written in 1939, she attempted to define as clearly as possible the position of the Catholic sociologist.

Ross gave the clinical definition of sociology as the study of human social life. It aimed at adjusting the individual to a social life as near the ideal life as human society would ever reach. It was to include those activities

---

that would improve the condition of the people in order to help them attain the defined ideal life.17 Pure sociology aimed at being a positive science in that it sought its understanding of social phenomena by observing, describing, and classifying actual social facts and conditions. Sociology established statistical laws and proposed theories that accounted for those laws. Induction was to be used only in its most limited sense. Sociology was not intended to be a normative science, and, as such, it was not to be concerned with judgment of values.18

In actuality, sociology studied an individual's relations with fellow people both in the past and the present. It attempted to formulate wherever necessary and possible, the scientific principles of progress. Sociology's purpose was the scientific understanding of social phenomena and the promotion of human temporal welfare through the proper functioning of social groups. Applied sociology, which she viewed as the ultimate aim of the science, was the active promotion of human temporal welfare by formulating principles for social improvement in conformity with the axioms of ethics and religion. Sociology was mainly concerned with human temporal happiness in its social aspects, and with the study of social evils, their causes and possible remedies. It was felt that humankind's greatest

17 Ibid., 511.
18 Ross, Fundamental Sociology, 9-10.
good could be realized only when the principles of true moral philosophy and religion were applied. All human activity, even the economic, was to be governed by these principles. They were known as the moral law, which consisted primarily of a definition of the rights of God, and the correlative duties and rights of individuals. Ethics was to deal with the rightness and wrongness of human conduct, and with the standards and ideals of morality as proven by reason. Ross stressed that a person strove for a higher goal than merely temporal happiness. The sociologists had to know the norms of right conduct before principles of social action could be effectually formulated. It was imperative that the Catholic sociologist follow these principles to be certain that any ideas for social improvement were based on true philosophy and religion. Only in that way would the sociologist be assured that the work being done was for mankind's greatest temporal good.19

Ross felt that if the statements of Catholic sociologists differed at times from other sociologists, it was due to their belief in three fundamental considerations:

1. The laws that govern an individual's social life are determined by rights and duties as imposed by God.
2. An individual's temporal existence is only the precursor of an eternal life with God in heaven. Therefore, all social intercourse should be directed toward this end, and all conception of the individual's happiness subordinated to it.
3. Although some measure of scientific rules may apply to the conduct of group life, a person is an

19Ibid., 4-10.
individual possessed of a free will. Therefore, the observation of the conduct of mankind in the past will not infallibly bring us to a knowledge of future conduct.²⁰

The Catholic sociologists were to consider these truths as certain:

1. that the family and State are "natural" societies,
2. that the institution of private property is a "natural one"
3. that the Catholic Church is a supernatural society. The Church and the duly constituted State are considered "perfect" societies, that is, sovereign in their own power, and not in any way dependent upon a power other than God alone. In the natural sphere, the family was considered more important than either Church or State since it is prior to both and the latter are composed of none other than families and their individual members.²¹

Ross's argument held that it was necessary for Christian social concepts to have a place in sociology. By its very nature, Catholic sociology would be both inductive and deductive. The inductive methodology would be used only in a limited capacity. The deductive (a priori) method was a necessary component in order to acknowledge the ultimate source or cause of things and events in the social world. Her primary motive for advancing this definition of Catholic sociology was to counter various secular solutions to social problems such as socialism and eugenism which the Church strongly opposed. Catholic sociology would be based in Catholic social philosophy and could easily be used in the service of Catholic-sponsored programs for social reform and

²⁰Ross, A Survey of Sociology, 9.
²¹Ross, Fundamental Sociology, 63-64.
social action.  

Catholic sociology had a specific goal. It was to study humankind in the totality of its natural and supernatural relationships. It sought to highlight the implications of these relationships to help humans live a full life in modern society. Another and equally important purpose was to properly view humans in their true relationships to their Creator and their supernatural end which was defined as the Beatific Vision. The Beatific Vision was seen as the reward of spending eternity in the presence of God but only achieved after living a good life. Catholic sociologists believed that society must be restored to a basic and proper relationship with God. The need for and significance of christian principles in human relationships were obvious and necessary in any sociological work being done. It was a component of human nature that could not be ignored.

It was in the interpretation of the social facts that Catholic sociologists had to consider certain principles about individuals. They felt that it was obvious that the inductive method failed insofar as a human is not a wholly observable. It was necessary that the social observer be aware of the entire nature of the individual both spiritually and temporally. The observer must also be fully

\[22\text{Kivisto, 355.}\]

\[23\text{Fr. F. Gilbert Callahan, "A Descriptive Analysis of The American Catholic Sociological Review, 1940-1954" (Master thesis, Loyola University of Chicago, 1956), 5.}\]
cognizant and supportive of the findings of all other sciences whether scientific or philosophic. This awareness was especially necessary when the observer attempted to interpret the facts discovered or to effect any type of improvement in human social conditions based on these facts.

Ross offered only one definition of Catholic sociology. There were many variations on her stated major themes. Providing a definition that was both workable and agreeable to all did not prove to be an easy task. While some sought a clear definition of Catholic sociology, there were many Catholic sociologists who did not believe that Catholic sociology existed in its own right. The discussion regarding the existence and/or definition of Catholic sociology lasted for nearly thirty years within the ACSS and larger Catholic sociological community. At the end, there was no true consensus of opinion as to its definition or existence.

In an attempt to understand the core issues of this debate, A Survey of Roman Catholic Sociological Theory in the United States Since 1900 was initiated in 1939 at Duke University. It was intended to determine the nature, purpose, and methods of sociology as revealed in the works of Catholic sociologists in the United States in the twentieth century. There were four interrelated phases in the development of Catholic sociological theory that emerged. The first phase, began with St. Thomas Aquinas' socio-political synthesis which stated that facts must be
obtained through observation and experience, and that knowledge is acquired only through such experiences. The second phase, apparent during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, was represented by the mass interest in socio-economic questions in Europe and elsewhere where Catholicism flourished. This social Catholicism was seen as being rooted in the older social principles of the Church and Christian tradition. The third phase showed a definite interest developing in the area of Social Sciences. In this phase, sociology was considered to be a synthetic social science composed of Catholic social philosophy, social action, and research. The last stage, which was then considered to be in its infancy, was the attempt to make sociology an empirical science. Sociology was regarded in this stage as a definite and special social science in that it was cultural, systematic, and autonomous. The works of American Catholic sociologists were found in all of these groups. There was not one phase that was more predominant than any other.

This early study of Catholic sociological theory proposed six conclusions. First, all Catholic sociological thought is either supported by or based on some part of the Thomistic conceptual theory. Second, the social attitudes of these sociologists had definitely been developed in reaction to numerous historical events (e.g., Protestant Reformation,

rise of modern capitalism, liberalism, naturalism, and humanism, etc.). Third, the strong emphasis placed on social problems, social conditions and social changes by these authors during the nineteenth and twentieth century pushed the Church into taking an official stand on these topics. Fourth, the beginning of sociological writings by Catholics in the United States consisted primarily of restating Thomistic social philosophy and the encyclicals of Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI. Fifth, the development of sociology as a social science among American Catholics grew out of the emphasis on social Catholicism and as a reaction to the humanistic and evolutionary philosophy that was increasing in popularity. The report found this area of Catholic sociological thought as primarily a philosophical approach without definite scientific methods or techniques for studying social problems, relations, and conditions. It was viewed as an means to explain and to instill in individuals the social principles of the Catholic Church. It encouraged the application of these socio-ethical principles to social problems and conditions with the direct goal of improving the identified social ills. It became a forum in which criticism of the non-Catholic social thinkers for their extreme materialistic philosophy was acceptable. Sixth, the science of sociology was regarded by American Catholic sociologists from two standpoints. On one side, a majority of Catholic sociologists viewed sociology as a synthetic
social science. It was a unique blending of Catholic social philosophy, social Catholicism, including principles for guiding social work and carrying out social reforms, and what Msgr. Paul Hanly Furfey termed "factual sociology." On the other hand, there was a group who emphasized the empirical and autonomous nature of sociology. Establishing their foundation in Thomism, they also accepted the idea of the ordinate autonomy of the various sciences. Every science was viewed as having a definite subject matter or object, and the formal object of sociology was sociation. It was the purpose of sociology to determine which relations, processes and structures integrate (associate) and which disintegrate (dissociate). The Catholic sociologist was to use that information to the fullest in their work.

Neo-Thomism provided the ideological framework for the numerous organization-building endeavors on the part of American Catholic intellectuals during this time. It is from this religious and philosophical environment that the people who were to become the founding members of The American Catholic Sociological Society came. With their diversified training, interests, and beliefs, they attempted to come together to form a cohesive and influential group that could stand strong within the larger national sociological community. The American Catholic Sociological

---

25 Ibid., 137-143.

26 Kivisto, 351.
Society (ACSS) was one example of the many smaller special interest societies that were formed during this time. The next chapter will deal with the formation of this society in 1938 and its development through 1968.
The American Catholic Sociological Society (ACSS) was representative of not only of intellectuals found in the field of sociology but also the diversity of interests found in the Catholic Church at that time. The Society brought three factions of Catholic sociologists together. One group, like Fr. Ralph Gallagher and Eva Ross, believed that Catholic sociology existed and proved to be an autonomous form of sociology. In the second group were trained sociologists who happened to have a Catholic background. They felt very strongly about the non-existence of Catholic sociology. Dr. Franz Mueller and Dr. Clement Mihanovich, members of this group, have both stated, "We did not baptize or confirm sociology. There is no more a 'Catholic' form of sociology than there is Catholic algebra." The third group, represented by Msgr. Paul Hanly Furfey, used the ACSS and its journal as a forum for spreading the concepts of Catholic social action. He made reference to "metatheoretical analysis" which he defined as "an auxiliary science which furnishes the methodological principles presupposed by sociology." Furfey was opposed to value-free
sociology, but he promoted a value-committed sociology.¹

One of the goals² of the ACSS was to develop a theologically grounded sociological position on sociology for Catholic sociologists.³ This proved to be an unmanageable task. Thomism was used as the basis of defense for any position taken by a member of the ACSS on the issue of Catholic sociology. The language used to define Catholic sociology was familiar but vague. No one was able to offer a clear and substantive definition that could be agreed upon by the proponents of Catholic sociology and understood by the rest of the profession. To confuse the issue further, Catholic sociology was perceived as being bonded with social theology that included support for organized labor, an activist welfare state, and a staunch anti-communism stand. But, this social theology, while appearing to be an undercurrent, was never fully developed or articulated by the society's members.⁴ The second group rejected their counterparts' claim that sociology neither could nor should be value free. Yet, they could not totally agree with those non-Catholics in the profession who thought that sociology should be completely modeled after the natural sciences. To

¹Ibid., 356.

²The goals of the American Catholic Sociological Society, or ACSS for short, will be discussed later in this chapter

³Kivisto, 356.

⁴Ibid., 356.
do so would have called into question their Catholicity and put them in a defensive posture while justifying their position to the others. The choice almost appeared to be a decision between being Catholic or a sociologist. This in itself compounded the identity crisis that many in the ACSS were having.

When others came into the profession, they became sociologists without reference to their ethnic or religious background. Jews like Merton or Marxists like Bellah did not become, respectively, Jewish sociologists or Marxist sociologists, but sociologists with various personal histories that were not usually brought into question when their sociological work was being discussed. There appeared to be no loss of personal identity for them in becoming a sociologist. But, American Catholic sociologists had a much different collective self image. Many felt it was important to carry the title "American" and "Catholic" both being equal in importance. Dr. Franz Mueller argued that sociology could be viewed as a vocation, and, as such, the Catholic sociologist could serve both the Church and society at large, and do so to the glory of God. This position only served to prove that neo-Thomism was too universal to provide an basis upon which to develop a single, widely accepted Catholic sociology. ⁵

In less than two decades, opposition to construction

⁵Ibid., 357-358.
of a Catholic sociology would become dominant opinion within the Society and with Catholic sociologists in general. By the 1950s, the call for the creation of a Catholic sociology had virtually disappeared and some people, such as Ross, had crossed over to the other side. Many of the scholars who argued so adamantly on the side of Catholic sociology abandoned their efforts to develop it and were directing their work towards a variety of areas in applied sociology. The climate within the Church and world had changed and the reasons behind the need for self definition as Catholic had ceased to exist. There appears to be no evidence to show that any of these intellectuals attempted to create a distinctively Catholic approach to social reform or any other related field in which they were now engaged.6

The Beginning of the ACSS

During the initial meeting in December of 1938, it was decided that Ralph Gallagher would contact Fr. Samuel Knox Wilson, President of Loyola University in Chicago, and ask for permission for Loyola to host a meeting of sociologists from Mid-western Catholic colleges and universities. With permission granted, Gallagher enlisted the aid of Edward Marciniak, a student assistant, to compile a list of colleges to be notified about the meeting. The letter, dated

---

6Ibid., 358.
February 20, 1938, read:

For some years there has been felt the need of concerted action on the part of our Catholic institutions of higher learning in the field of social thought and action. At the convention of The American Sociological Society this past December, a few representative of Catholic colleges of the Middle West expressed the wish that a meeting of some kind be held, and they prevailed upon the representative of Loyola University to call such a meeting. So with the heartfelt approval and the welcome of the Reverend President of Loyola, I am inviting you or some representative of your department to this meeting.

The purpose of this meeting is to consider the feasibility of forming a Mid-west Conference of Catholic Sociology. A program and agenda of the meeting will be advanced to you. The plan at the present is to have a one day conference with sessions in the morning and afternoon. The date chosen is Saturday March 26, 1938, and the place is the North Side Campus of Loyola University.

May we have a reply at your earliest convenience for it will aid us in shaping our program? We believe that there is a need for such a conference and the results and benefits will be felt within our own schools and in the academic world about us.7

The response to this invitation was mixed. Dr. Paul Mundie of Marquette8 in his letter of response to Gallagher said, "the conference would give us organized and professional standing as a body for the enunciation of Catholic theories and Catholic principles to offset some of the humanitarianism in many non-sectarian institutions in


8Dr. Paul J. Mundie of Marquette University of Milwaukee was one of the original members of the ACSS. He later served as president of the society in 1940 and on the Editorial Board of the American Catholic Sociological Review. Later reference is made to Dr. Paul Mundy of Loyola University Chicago who also served as president of the society in 1965 and editor of the Review during the 1960s.
this area." 9 But, there were also serious reservation and concerns. Abbot Alcuin Deutsch of St. John’s Abbey in Collegesville, Minnesota wrote on March 7, 1938:

I will say that I am rather skeptical as to the value of a Mid-west association of Catholic Sociology. It seems to me that we have quite a number of associations and activities that call for more or less time and energy, and yet are not getting very far in the matter of influencing the thought of the country. To me it seems we might be more effective, if our Catholic men and women were to make their presence and influence felt at National non-Catholic Associations.10

As more letters of acceptance for at least an initial meeting were received, Gallagher turned to Sr. M. Liguori, B.V.M. of Mundelein College to help him plan a convention program.

The initial meeting was planned and was considered to be very well attended. Thirty-one people from thirty different colleges and universities attended. This group represented nine states and twenty cities.(see appendix 1)11

The agenda, listed below, that was presented was rather formal, but intentionally allotted much time for discussion.

Business Meeting
   Agenda

   1. Selection of temporary chairman
   2. Roll call of representatives
      Topics of Discussion
      1. Purpose of conference
      2. Relation with the Mid-west Sociological Society
      3. Relation with the American Sociological Society

---

9Ibid., 5.
10Ibid., 9.
11Ibid., 12.
4. Nature of our association
   (a) Memberships
      1) Organizations
      2) Individuals
   (b) Officers
   (c) Types of meeting and program
   (d) Dues and services

5. Shall we meet with the American Sociological Society?

6. Shall we have a separate conference each year?

7. Ways and means of aiding constituent members.

8. The influence of the conference in the field of Catholic thought, education and action.

9. The influence of the conference in academic, social, and political spheres.

10. Appointment of various committees; nominating, constitution, time and place, etc.

During the business meeting conducted in the morning, the American Catholic Sociological Society took shape and direction. During these discussion, it became increasingly evident that there were four common points that brought these sociologists together. The first, as expressed by Paul Mundie in a letter the Gallagher, was that "the conference would give us organized and professional standing as a body for the enunciation of Catholic theories and Catholic principles to offset some of the humanitarianism in many non-sectarian institutions in this area."\(^{12}\) There was a pervasive positive attitude that in unity there was strength. The groups' voice would be heard more clearly and more forcefully by the secularist than many individual sociologists working alone attempting to express the Catholic social outlook. It was also felt that the existence of their learned society would carry with it an air of

\(^{12}\)Ibid., 5.
respectability. Secondly, many of the professors felt a pressing need for discussion and positive action regarding common interests and common problems in the teaching of sociology in the Catholic college and high school. This unified, concerted action could only be achieved by knowing who your colleagues were and through honest, open discussion with them. Many felt that the standardization of curricula and teaching requirements was necessary for a solidified stand against the humanistic approach so popular in the field. The wide variety of course content and curricula, teaching techniques, and limited availability of good textbooks all contributed to the appearance of a weak or flawed teaching of sociology in the Catholic schools. The third reason was for mutual support and help that could only be given by another Catholic sociologist. Through this community, they could become acquainted and work together towards the common goals unique to their situation. Many of the issues that their research dealt with could only easily be discussed with another sociologist with the same understanding of the Catholic Church’s perspective. The final reason was the longstanding conviction that the American Sociological Society was not being supportive or understanding of the Catholic’s position. In a letter, Fr. Francis Friedel sums up their feelings by stating:

We were pretty much disgusted with the meetings of

---

13Ibid., 5.
the A.S.S. First of all, the papers were largely research topics, and to all appearances, it was a matter of research for the sake of research. Secondly, the outlook of these sociologists was poles away from ours. They were just in that period when Sociology was a science copying its procedures from the natural sciences. For these secular sociologists the approach was supposedly scientific and objective but, unconsciously, was, for all practical purposes, anti-moral and anti-religious. Value judgements then were not supposed to receive any consideration. Don't ask me how they could even talk about delinquency, crime, poverty, etc. without setting up some kind of norm. We were pretty much satiated with that sort of attitude.

The third point that entered into our consideration in the formation of our Society was that Catholic institutions received no consideration at the meetings of the A.S.A. There was a section on the sociology of religion but it was rare that a Catholic sociologist was actually invited to take part in these discussions... Actually in the meetings of the section on religion, if there was a Catholic representative, it would be some man connected with Catholic Charities somewhere or some pastor but not a professional Catholic sociologist.

We felt that we could not get adequate representation at the meetings of the A.S.A., besides, and even more important, if we wanted to stimulate work in Sociology, we would have to go out on our own. The main consideration really was the difference in outlook. There is a fundamental difference between the secularist and the Catholic social outlook. Also the A.S.A. seemed to fail in taking into consideration that the members were, for the most part, college teachers; the teaching angle was almost completely neglected. That was one of the things we wanted: the approach of the teacher.¹⁴

Even though there was a strong commitment to the new society, there were concerns expressed regarding total disassociation with the ASS. The members knew that they needed to remain associated with the larger group but they were very unsure of themselves and their new venture. The minutes of the first meeting summarize this situation by stating:

¹⁴Ibid., 6-10.
Relations with the American Sociological Society were discussed. The consensus of opinion was that while membership as an organization in that body may be advisable and desirable, the question was premature in view of the fact that the Catholic body had not yet been organized.\textsuperscript{15}

During the discussion of the nature of the organization that was to be formed, Fr. Vincent Hughes of St. Joseph's College in Adrian, Michigan moved that an organization of Catholic sociologists be formed. Dr. Frank Weberg seconded the motion. A standing vote was taken and the resolution "that there be formed an organization of people engaged in teaching sociology in Catholic schools" was passed. Ralph Gallagher suggested that a national organization be formed "instead of waiting for someone in the East to do it." Marguerite Reuss moved that the organization be called The American Catholic Sociological Society. The motion was seconded by Fr. Thomas Kane and approved. A Committee on Constitutions was appointed by Gallagher, the chair, and consisted of Sr. M. Liguori, Laurence Brown, and Sr. Marie. The Nominating Committee was made up of Msgr. Howard Egan, Sr. Canisia, and Dr. Stephen Mamchur. Thomas Kane then moved that invitations be extended to all Catholic colleges and universities in the country to join with this newly formed group. It was seconded and carried. By 12:05 PM the morning session had ended, and the new association had a name, officers and committees selected, and a purpose for

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., 13.
existence articulated.\textsuperscript{16}

During the afternoon meeting, The Committee on Constitutions proposed a tentative constitution. The Committee on Meetings had chosen Chicago in the later part of December 1938 for its next general meeting. The Nominations Committee proposed the slate of: Fr. Ralph Gallagher (Loyola University Chicago) for President, Mr. Lawrence Brown (Creighton University) for Vice-President, Sr. Liguori (Mundelein College) for Secretary, and Dr. Paul Mundie (Marquette University) as Treasurer. It was proposed that a fifth member to the Executive Council be elected. Fr. Raymond Murray (University of Notre Dame) was unanimously chosen to fill that position.\textsuperscript{17} With the business of the formation of the Society taken care of, the rest of the scheduled program was addressed.

During the afternoon session, three papers were read. Dr. Paul J. Mundie of Marquette University read a paper on school curriculum entitled "The Undergraduate Curriculum in the Field of Sociology." Dr. Frank J. Weberg of The College of St. Francis in Joliet presented a paper entitled "Training for Public Service." Its purpose was to show how such an organization as the newly established ACSS could influence the academic world. A third paper on "Research Projects in The Field Of Catholic Sociology" was read by Fr. 

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., 14-15.

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., 14-15.
Even though the constitution was written and presented, it is important to note that it was only tentatively ratified at this initial meeting. It was not until ten years later in 1948 that it was formally ratified. This actions laid the foundation for a pattern of semi-completed actions that was to plague the Society throughout its history.

The members were content with the work that they had done that day. They felt secure enough with their actions and wanted the public to be aware of this new Society. Announcements regarding the newly formed Society went out to the newspapers and other learned societies. The reception of the news was positive. Mr. H. A. Phelps, Secretary of the American Sociological Society, sent a telegram to Gallagher on March 25, 1938 reading, "Best wishes of the officers and members of the American Sociological Society to the Mid-west conference of the Catholic Society during its first annual meeting and the years to come."\(^{19}\) The Chicago Herald Examiner commented on the Society by saying, "... they were assembled to launch the first organization of its kind in the country; a Catholic Sociological Society which will make its voice heard in political, social, and academic spheres."\(^{20}\)

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 10-11.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 16-17.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 17.
Two months after the organizational meeting, the first report on membership was available. At the first Executive Council meeting held on June 15, 1938, the reports showed that there were twenty-six constituent members and seven institutional members. All but three of the sociologists who attended the original organizational meeting were listed as members of the new Society. A partial explanation for this attrition lay in the fact that many of the schools that were represented at the organizational meeting sent available faculty members as observers. They were sent only to report back to the various Department Chairs and offer their assessment of the benefits of association with this new group. The Departments of Sociology, in many cases, were in a formative stage themselves. Often, the teachers of sociology, even in the established programs, were not sociologists themselves. Many of those who attended decided that it would not be beneficial to their careers to continue their membership in the ACSS.

By March 1948 only eighteen of the original thirty-one representatives were still members. In addition to the reasons mentioned before, Mr. A. H. Clemens added his own interpretation with:

At that time many of those present were teaching the subject (Sociology) in their schools but with little preparation for this specialized area; they were historians, lawyers, administrators, theologians, philosophers, etc. The society hoped to develop in such a more definite sociological mentality so as to orient their teaching and courses into channels less
philosophical and more sociological.\textsuperscript{21}

As both curriculum and credentials for teachers of sociology became somewhat standardized, those who sought or retained membership in the ACSS were professional sociologists. The society's goals were clearly stated and the interest of the membership in association with those goals was no longer mandated by the institution.

\textbf{Purpose}

The minutes of the organizational meeting repeat often the same intentions and frustrations of those gathered. There was no doubt in the minds of those present that the Society was organized as a vehicle for concerted and organized action on the part of American Catholic sociologists. This action was first of all meant to influence the American Sociological Society. The original plan being to form an effective Catholic organization that would function as a section of the ASS. Secondly, they believed that the naturalistic and humanitarian influence of American sociology must be countered and tempered by Catholic social principles and theories. This could be most effectively done by an organization of professional standing and credibility which understood these theories. Finally, there was a need to standardize the curriculum and content

\textsuperscript{21}Ibid., 18-19.
of Catholic high school and college sociology courses in order that there would be a unified approach to the field of sociology being offered to Catholic students.²²

A discrepancy occurred between the discussions found in the original minutes and the actual wording of the purpose as found in the tentative constitution proposed at the first convention. (see appendix 2) That constitutional purpose read:

The purpose of this society shall be to stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics working in the field of sociology, to create a sense of solidarity, to stimulate study and research in the field of sociology, and to unearth and to disseminate particularly the sociological implications of the Catholic thought pattern.²³

The issues of standardizing the curriculum and influencing the ASS were not mentioned. Rather, they were both implied in the new wording. Since the members were unsure about many issues, they hesitated in using very defined and restrictive boundaries within their statements. It was the intent of the writers of the Constitution to use a more inclusive language so as to not limit the output of the new Society. The phrase "to unearth and disseminate particularly the implications of the Catholic thought patterns" would not limit their influence to just the ASS or

²²Ibid., 21-22.
²³American Catholic Sociological Society Constitution, Article II, 26 March 1938.
the naturalists.\textsuperscript{24} It would enable the society's members to address the entire area of perceived false teachings found in secular sociology. The phrases "to stimulate study and research in the field of sociology" and "to stimulate concerted study" was meant to be read as including both the professional sociologist and the student being trained in the Catholic viewpoint. They were meant to include the whole concept of standardization and core curriculum. The fact that all of those who attended the first meeting were representing colleges and universities where they were teaching sociology would only emphasize the presumption that sociological curricula were included in this phraseology. By using the phrase "membership shall be opened to all who are interested in the field of theoretical, practical and pure sociology" showed a desire to open up membership to all who were interested in the whole area of practical sociology not just teachers. It reflected the original idea of a national organization and an increased base for membership.\textsuperscript{25}

Even though the wording was different than that which would be expected, the Constitutional purposes can be made to match the expressed goals of the organizational meeting.

\textsuperscript{24}The naturalists, to the Catholic sociologist, believed that grace was totally distinct from nature and that the effects of grace do not exist in the natural world, empirical research cannot measure the spiritual. To the Catholic, grace and nature are linked. Your cannot study a society without the associate values.

\textsuperscript{25}Rosenfelder, 23-24.
by reading into the wording. This situation pointed to another problem that plagued the ACSS. There was the expectation of a presumed innate understanding of what was meant to be said or done often with little or no background information or clarification offered. As with the Constitution, there was no explanation or information provided to new and subsequent members as to the intent of the constitution or the role of the membership.

Conventions

Besides the publication of the Review, the annual convention was intended to promote the purposes and interests of the Society. It was an attempt to bring together Catholic sociologists working in as many different branches of sociology as possible. It was through the conventions that they were able to acquaint others with their work/research and publications, and indicate various areas of concern in which they felt the Catholic sociologist could become involved. Cited in Rosenfelder’s thesis is a letter written to the author from Mr. F. W. Gross of Notre Dame College in Cleveland referring to the importance of the conventions. It read:

We have now a sense of our common interests, our common strength in integration, of our dignity as

---

26The official publication of the ACSS was entitled the American Catholic Sociological Review. For the sake of brevity, it will be referred to as the Review or journal.
scholars, of morals among the whole membership, of our mission as sociologists. We know who we are, and it is no longer necessary for me to travel from Cleveland to Chicago to meet a Catholic sociologist working in another educational institution only a mile or so away from where my work was done, as was formerly was the case.  

It was important that this sense of a larger entity be sustained within this organization in support of the original goals. The conventions were also a means for smaller or other Catholic sociological focus groups to disseminate their work. In the minutes from the first Annual Convention, Ralph Gallagher made reference to Msgr. Ligutti's discussion on Rural Sociology. Gallagher suggested that it would enable the listeners to take back to the classroom information regarding the problems of the farm and to acquaint the city children rural opinions and conditions.

The conventions were not only a practical means of disseminating information and papers. The served as a gathering of like minded individuals in a small and intimate setting. The conventions were described by Dr. Franz Mueller as having a sense of going home. A place where everyone knew you and you spoke the same language. Quickly, bonds of friendship and sympathetic understanding were formed among the members. These bonds tended to secure and perpetuate membership. They also helped to encourage new members to join.

Gallagher was elected the ACSS's first president in

---
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1939. He served the society as Executive Secretary for over 20 years. Since the Society was established to be a sounding board for Catholic sociologists, more than annual meetings and small newsletters were needed. Gallagher was the driving force behind the development of the Society’s journal *The American Catholic Sociological Review* and served as its editor for a decade. He felt that this would be a perfect vehicle with which to get the writings of the Catholic intellectuals into the libraries and faculty rooms of many institutes of higher learning.

In March, 1939, Gallagher received a letter from Zacheus Maher, S.J., the American Assistant of the Jesuit order, stating:

One needs but to read the decrees of the last Congregation and particularly the Encyclical of His late Holiness on Atheistic Communism to see how important is the ministry among the poor and the laboring classes of which you speak, and how vital to the future welfare of the Church is the USA, per consequens, is the promotion of the Social Studies. . . . Be assured there is truth in what you say about the possibility of overemphasis in which the late congregation emphasized . . . You have gone a very long way in establishing the ACSS and I wonder how you were able to do it. . . . You must know too that among our young men there is a deep realization of action. True, men must be prepared technically for this work: please God that is coming too. Your task is to hold the fort till reinforcements come up, meantime doing all you can to encourage their training and to increase their number.  

To receive such a letter and such encouragement from a superior only reinforced Gallagher’s drive to see the ACSS

---

28 Zacheus Maher, S.J., Rome, to Ralph Gallagher, Chicago, 17 March 1939, Transcript in Gallagher Collection, Loyola University Archives. Loyola University, Chicago.
take shape and grow. It was Gallagher's intent to carry out the directives of the Congregation and Maher through this new Society.

Constitution

During the morning session of the organizational meeting of the ACSS held on March 26, 1938, Ralph Gallagher appointed a Constitutional Committee which was to report back during that afternoon's session. This committee was composed of Sr. M. Liguori, B.V.M. of Mundelein College, who served as chair, Mr. Laurence Brown of Creighton University, and Sr. Marie, C.S.U., of Ursuline College for Women in Cleveland. Their purpose was to propose a name for the Society befitting their new stature and to offer a solid framework on which this new organization was to be built.

As soon as the afternoon session was opened, the report from the Constitutional Committee was addressed. After the presentation of the new Constitution (see appendix 2), Dr. Frank Weberg of the College of St. Francis in Joliet moved that the constitution, as it was drawn up, be tentatively adopted. Mr. Stephen Mamchur of the College of St. Thomas in St. Paul, seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the resolution proposing that the Constitution be adopted tentatively was passed. There is no reference in the minutes of the Business Meeting of the First Convention held in December of 1938 indicating that the Constitution's status
was addressed and officially changed to a permanent status. Yet, at that first Convention held in 1938, two amendments to the tentative constitution were suggested and approved. The acceptance of these amendments gave a defacto acceptance of the Constitution as it stood. It was not until ten years later that the lack of permanent status of the constitution was noticed and addressed. The Constitution was formally ratified in 1949. This situation was indicative of the manner in which many issues in the ACSS were dealt.

After the organizational meeting was over and the Constitution written and tentatively accepted, little thought was given to clearing up the details such as formal acceptance. The organization had the approval it needed to move forward and formal acceptance was viewed as a minor technicality that could be addressed later if at all.

During the course of the first ten years, seven of the original eleven Articles had been changed. Article III, dealing with membership, had the most revisions.

The first two actual amendments to the original Constitution were actually proposed by Sr. Liguori, Chairperson of that very same committee. The first amendment was to Article IV and did not call for a very significant change. It changed the title of Secretary to Executive-Secretary and along with it defined the job descriptions of the secretarial positions. The change was intended to allow

---

29Rosenfelder, 56, 59.
for the appointment of a Corresponding Secretary who would be responsible for taking the minutes of the meeting and doing various other clerical tasks. The Executive-Secretary would then be able to attend to the details of running the meetings. The second amendment was to Article VI [in the original Constitution which became Article VII in the 1948 Constitution] and called for the increase of the number on the Executive Council. The Executive Council was originally to be made up of the elected officers and one additional member elected by majority vote at the annual Convention. The amendment to this Article suggested that the number of elected members be increased from one to three. This increase was felt to be substantiated by the rapid increase in membership of the Society within a short period of time. The membership after the organizational meeting was listed as thirty-one and by the first Convention, that number had increased to ninety-three.30

By taking the Articles of the Constitution individually and looking chronologically at the amendments made, some sense of the evolution of the Constitution and the Society becomes apparent. The original Constitution can be found in appendix 2.

Article I

Article I proposed the name of the Society. The Society

30Ibid., 58.
retained the name "The American Catholic Sociological Society" that had been proposed by Marguerite Reuss in 1938 until 1970. When, after many lengthy discussions, it was determined that the name would formally changed to the "Association for the Sociology of Religion."

**ARTICLE II**

Article II set forth the purpose of the Society. There was only a slight revision to the phraseology but not of the meaning of this section. The new wording was meant to simplify the wording and was approved by the Executive Council during their meeting in 1946. It was officially published in a brochure published in 1947. The phrases "to stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics working in the field of Sociology" and the redundancy within the same line of "to stimulate study and research in the field of Sociology" in the original Article was changed to read:

The purpose of this Society shall be to stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics working in the field of Sociology, to create a sense of solidarity among Catholic sociologists, and to unearth and disseminate the sociological implication of the Catholic thought pattern.\(^{31}\)

In 1950, there was a proposed change to the wording " . . . and to unearth and disseminate the sociological implications of the Catholic thought pattern." It was suggested that it should now be, " . . . and to propagate

\(^{31}\)Ibid., 60.
the sociological implications of Catholic social thought.

The greatest change to this Article can be found in the 1963 version of the Constitution. It defines itself as a non-profit organization whose purpose was:

- to stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics working in the field of Sociology, to create a sense of solidarity among Catholic Sociologists, to present the sociological implications of Catholic thought and to encourage its membership to recognize their professional responsibilities as Sociologists.

It goes on to say that one means of achieving this purpose was the publication of *Sociological Analysis*, its official journal. It also stated that this journal should serve as a means of communication among the membership and other interested readers.

**ARTICLE III**

This Article, dealing with Membership, experienced the most changes. In an attempt to bring practice and theory together, the Article underwent extensive changes. In 1942, at the Business meeting held during the Fifth Annual Convention, a change in phraseology occurred. The first line was changed from the original, "Membership shall be open to all interested in the field of theoretical, practical and pure sociology" to the more expansive, "Membership shall be opened to all interested in the field of Sociology."

At this meeting an abbreviation in the list of various types of membership was passed. Instead of the original list of five membership categories, it now read:
There shall be the following classes of membership:

1. Constituent - open to all persons interested in the field of Sociology.

2. Institutional - open to colleges, universities and societies willing to support financially the work of the Society.

Voting power and eligibility for office was limited to Constituent members. Institutional memberships entitled such institution or societies to be represented by a person who would be entitled to all the rights and privileges of a Constituent member.

These changes were undertaken for two rather obvious reasons. First, Student and Associate members did not have voting rights or the ability to hold office. Secondly, Associate, Student, and Life memberships did not seem to be very popular. There were only four Associate members at the end of 1939. Mr. Walsh suggested at the Second Annual Convention Business Meeting that such membership be discontinued. In the Roster of the ACSS for 1941, only Institutional and Constituent members were listed.

A footnote found at the bottom of the first page of this statement reads in part, "... it includes members of the Society for the four years of its existence, 1938, 1939, 1940 and 1941. ... Membership in the Society is of two kinds, Institutional and Constituent." 32

The narrowing of the types of membership prompted the more expansive language now found in the new first sentence.

32Ibid., 63.
Further discussion of the wording came about regarding the line, "Membership shall be granted upon approval and classification of application by the Executive Council." The point at issue was regarding the criteria used by the Executive Council in classifying the applications, and trying to determine exactly what were the requirements for full membership and what were the rights and privileges that went along with this type of membership. These discussions, initiate during the 1941 Convention, prompted the President, Walter Willigan to appoint a committee under the direction of Sr. Anne, O.S.B. to formulate an appropriate amendment to set up only two types of membership. In order to understand the thoughts of the members on what constituted full membership in the Society, Sr. Anne sent out a questionnaire (see appendix 3) listing seven possible examples of requirements plus two alternatives for full membership. The members were to vote either "yes" or "no" on each example. The examples covered the gamut of possibilities from "A person who pays their dues to the Society and is interested in it." to "A Doctor's degree in Sociology or in any of the Social Sciences (widely interpreted), but if the latter, the person must be teaching at least one course in Sociology on the college level." The general response was in favor of the least number of requirements as possible. The responses indicated that the more the degree requirements would be

---

33 Ibid., 65-66.
included the more of an overall decline in membership would be experienced based on the number of people who could meet the requirements. Fr. Furfey went as far as to object to a Doctor's degree as a requirement on the grounds that there were possibly only twelve people in the United States who could even qualify for membership. 34

Gallagher wrote to Sr. Anne on December 15, 1942 thanking her for efforts but that, "Under the circumstances (letters received from Fr. McQuade and Sr. Henry opposing the restrictions), I had no other choice but to omit the membership requirements."

A change to the amendment in 1942 regarded the voting power and the eligibility to hold office. The original Constitution stated, "Voting power and eligibility for office shall be limited to Constituent members." The new amendment read in part;

Voting power and eligibility for office shall be limited to Constituent members. Institutional membership shall entitle such institutions or societies to be represented by a person who shall be entitled to all the rights and privileges of a Constituent member.

Again, the broadening of the wording and granting of Institutional privileges was necessitated in part by the streamlining of the number of membership categories. The proposed amendment was voted on at the 1942 Convention and passed. 35

34 Ibid., 67.

There is a complete reversal of this position found in a Proposed Constitution to be adopted at the 1946 Convention. In the minutes of the Executive Council Meeting held in 1945, Fr. Francis Friedel, S.M. of Dayton University was appointed Chairman of the Membership Committee. The Executive Council authorized the Executive Secretary to prepare a promotional brochure for the Society explaining its purpose and work. Since there had been no conventions held due to the war, it was felt that this brochure would help to increase the Society's visibility and add to the membership. The brochure was compiled and written by Mr. Edward Marciniak of Loyola University in Chicago and included the new Constitution passed at the 1946 Convention.

The new Article III called for six classifications of membership: Constituent, Institutional, Family, Student, Life, and Corresponding. The Corresponding category was a new type of membership which allowed "noted" sociologists outside the United States to join the ACSS. It allowed them the same privileges as a Constituent member but also indicated that their dues "may be suspended by order if the Executive Council." This addition was introduced in order to help the Inter-American Committee in its attempt to increase the popularity of the Society in Europe.\(^{36}\)

In the recommended Constitutional changes proposed in 1950, there were minor changes suggested to the Family and

\(^{36}\text{Ibid., 70-71.}\)
Life categories. In the Family section, the phrase "... open to the second members of a family" was changed to "... open to other members of a family". There was only a minor change in spelling in the Life category. The general membership were very comfortable with the categories as they stood. While most people signed on as Constituent Members, there was some call for these additional categories and the Society was intent on making itself accessible to the membership.

In 1963, a committee was established to seriously examine the Constitution and propose changes that would update it and help it correspond more closely with the needs and opinions of the general field of Sociology. Dr. Russel Barta, a member of the Constitutional Committee which proposed these changes, remembers that the Committee spent much of its time examining the wording rather than trying to change the intent or focus of the Constitution. At this time, it was proposed that the section on membership be streamlined to a general statement. The portions of it that were subject to revision such as categories, description, and dues would now be defined in the By-Laws. Therefore, items such as dues would no longer need a Constitutional amendment to be changed.

**ARTICLE IV - OFFICERS**

At the first convention in 1938, the title of Secretary was changed to Executive-Secretary to allow for a more
effective running of the meetings. This Article was not addressed again until 1944. In a letter to Gallagher, Sr. Liguori proposed a change regarding the term of office:

... all officers shall hold office from General Convention to the next General Convention, ordinarily the following year, and may be re-elected. The offices of Executive Secretary and Treasurer may be held by the same person simultaneously. Elections shall be by ballot at each General Convention, provided however, that the term of office be at least ten months.37

Part of this proposal was accepted and appeared in the new brochure published in 1946. It called for the offices of President, First Vice-President, Second Vice-President, and Executive Secretary. Each of which would be held for a term of one year and would allow for re-election. The elections would take place at the annual meeting or by referendum ballot as called for by the Executive Council. This idea of a referendum ballot was in reaction to the difficulties encountered during 1943 and 1944 when it was impossible to hold conventions and, therefore, impossible to follow certain restrictions placed on elections and referendums by the original Constitution.38

In 1950, the recommended changes to this Article called for a simple listing of the officers. There was also a suggestion for the addition of a Director of Membership to be added to the list of officers. The idea of a referendum ballot was dropped completely.

37Ibid., 72.

38Ibid.
The 1963 Constitution streamlined the officers to President, President-elect, Vice-President, and Executive Secretary. The duties of the Treasure were to be performed by the Executive Secretary. The Executive Secretary would hold office for three years while each of the other offices was for one year. The elections were to be held at the annual convention or by absentee ballot. The mail-in ballot was established because of the growing desire on the part of the membership for a more democratic structure to the Society. Many of the members were dissatisfied with what they perceived as a tight control over the elections by only the select few who were in attendance at the conventions.

ARTICLE V - MEETINGS

This article's wording has not been changed since the original Constitution. It calls for at least an annual meeting with the location determined by the Executive Council. It is interesting to note that the ACSS has tried, whenever possible, to hold these conventions at the same time and in the same city as the American Sociological Society. In the 1963 Constitution, Article V, Meetings, and Article VI, Executive Council, switched numbering.

ARTICLE VI - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

There have also been numerous changes to this Article. A slight change involving phraseology to the end of the first sentence with the addition of the words "between
annual meetings" took place between 1938 and 1948. All of the other changes have involved the number of representatives on the Executive Council in addition to the four officers.

The first change took place in 1938 and increased the non-officer membership from one to three. At the organizational meeting, Fr. Raymond Murray C.S.C. of Notre Dame University, had been elected as the fifth member of the Executive Committee. No place had been left for his name to appear on the official stationary nor had there been any designation of an official title such as the other Executive Council members had. It was felt that this position was necessary for more than just the obvious reasons, but no one knew quite how to deal with it. On October 25, 1938, Sr. Liguori wrote of her concerns on this matter to Miss Marguerite Reuss. She wrote:

I'm going to propose an amendment to our Constitution to the effect that . . . the Vice Presidents be increased by one. We have no title for Dr. Murray on the Letter head, as it is at present, and I think it would look better if he were listed as an officer. Or alternatively, I might propose the extension of the membership of the Council of non-officers, to the number of 3 or 5 or even 7. 39

This communique and the situation it represented prompted the first proposed amendment to the constitution. In later communication with Miss Reuss, Sr. Liguori discussed her unsuccessful attempt to make the change

39Ibid., 57.
immediately because of the restrictions of Article VII which required a draft of the proposed changes to be sent to each member thirty days prior to the meeting.

At the Fifth Convention held in 1942, the number of additional members was increased to five. In 1946, an amendment was passed that increased this number to seven. These changes were made in part because of the increase in membership and an effort to be more representative of the various regional sections of the Society and expanding makeup of the membership. Another important reason for this change was becoming increasingly obvious. By increasing the number on the Council, more control of the direction and committees was taken from the hands of a select few. This, in turn, would increase the appearance of the democratic process in the Society's actions and decisions.\(^{40}\) This would prove to be a valuable asset when encouraging future members to join the Society. The appearance of officers names on the letterhead seems to be done with some real intent and carried some prestige. On the 1958 letterhead, the list of officers listed include: President, President-Elect, Vice-President, Executive-Secretary, seven members of the Executive Council, and four Ex-Officio Members (Secretary to the Executive Council, Membership Committee Chairman, Research Committee Chairman, and Immediate Past-President's name and not his title).

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 74.
In the 1963 Constitution, the membership of the Executive Council dramatically changed. It now included the President, President-Elect, Vice-President, and Executive Secretary along with the immediate past President and seven members who were to be elected to two year terms on a staggered schedule of election. The Editor of Sociological Analysis, the Chair of the Convention Program Committee, and the Secretary to the Executive Council were to be non-voting members. The function of the Council was the same.

ARTICLE VII

Originally, this article stated that the constitution and its by-laws could be amended by a two-thirds vote of the constituent members attending any regular convention. It required a draft of the proposed changes to be sent to each member thirty days prior to the meeting. In 1950, a recommendation was made to drop the thirty day restriction for notification, but it was not adopted. There were no other attempts made to change this Article.

ARTICLE VIII - COMMITTEES

The original Constitution called for all Committees to be named by the Presiding Officers at the meeting at which they were appointed. The length of term would be determined on an as need basis. Their services would be terminated by the acceptance or rejection of their reports at the next regular meeting of the Society. The only real changes came
in the phraseology used in the 1963 Constitution when the Committees were provided for in Article I of the By-Laws instead of the Constitution.

**ARTICLE IX - VACANCIES**

There were no changes in the wording of this Article since the original Constitution. In the 1963 Constitution, this article referred to "Dues" and the title "Vacancies" was dropped from any Article.

**ARTICLE X - DUES**

The changes in this Article came about as a direct result to changes made to Article III on membership. The original dues listed in the 1938 Constitution called for Constituent and Student Memberships to be $1.00, Associate Members to pay $2.00, Institutional was $5.00, Life membership was listed at $25.00. All dues were payable annually beginning on January 1st. In 1939, dues for a Constituent Membership were increased to $3.00 annually. Fr. Raymond Murray, President of the ACSS indicated at the Business meeting held on September 29, 1939 that the increase was needed "... to encourage a publication of some sort." Also, at this meeting the Associate membership was eliminated. The Student, Life, and Institutional memberships stayed the same. These categories were to receive the new publication at no extra cost to their
membership. In 1942, when only two types of members were recognized, Constituents were charged $3.00 annually while Institutions paid $5.00. By 1946, the Society was experiencing financial problems. Dr. C.J. Nuesse proposed that dues be raised to $5.00 and the price of the Review to cost $3.00 annually.

One of the final changes to this Article came about at the Eighth Convention in 1946. They finally revised the wording to eliminate all references to actual dollar amounts and based on the respective classes of membership found in Article III. They continued to emphasize that the fiscal year started on January 1st and all dues were payable on or before April 1st.

In an effort to avoid frustrating but trivial debates over dues and subscriptions, the 1950 recommended changes called for new members to pay dues of 100%, 75%, 50% and 25% of the regular scheduled annual amount based on the quarter of the year during which they became members. There appears to be no reason for this recommendation other than pure frustration over inquiries by new members.

The 1963 Constitution simply called for dues to be paid annually. In this form of the Constitution, Article IX dealt with dues and Article X with Local Chapters.

---
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ARTICLE XI - INCORPORATION/LOCAL CHAPTERS

In 1938, the constitution called for the ACSS to be incorporated in the State of Illinois as a learned society. There is no record of any action being taken until 1946 when Gallagher sent a letter to Edward Barrett, Secretary of State of Illinois, requesting information and the necessary forms. In August, Mr. Barrett replied by sending the application forms, giving clearance for use of the name American Catholic Sociological Society, and requesting a $10.00 filing fee. The Executive Council decided there would be no practical benefit for the Society from incorporation, which would be a waste of ten dollars. The idea was dropped and Article XI was then changed to deal with Local Chapters.43

The new Article XI called for local chapters to be formed under the direction of the Society and through the approval of Executive Council. These chapters were subject to revocation by vote of the Executive Council. While they were in existence, they were expected to function under a model constitution as prepared by the Executive Council (see appendix 4). Notification of revocation of a Local Chapter would be done through the mail.

During the 1949 Convention, it was obvious that the original Constitution, which had only recently come to light as never being formally ratified, needed to be seriously

---
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considered. The President convened a committee made up of Russel Barta, Edward Marciniak and James J. Burns (Chair) which proposed extensive changes in the form of six motions. The first two motions dealt with some phraseology in Articles II and III. The third motion suggested that the duties of the Treasurer be handled by the Executive Secretary. The fourth motion suggested the addition of the Membership Director and the Chairman of the Social Research Council to be ex-officio members of the Executive Council. Motion five dealt with Article VIII. It called for the establishment of a Social Research Council to be made up of the Chairmen of the several Research Committees of the Society. The sixth motion suggested that Article X be amended so that new members, joining the Society after July 1st, would pay one-half the regular dues for that year. There was no recommendation that the amendment process be changed.

While many of these were acted on in total or in part, it did not satisfy the growing need for a truly updated Constitution. On March 26, 1960, Tom Imse wrote to Dr. C.J. Nuesse:

This Committee on Committee business has kept me really jumping this winter. I believe I told you that Fr. Thomas has us---really it is the Executive Council,-- working on what really amounts to a complete organizational review and revision to propose to the Society. Actually, we are not proposing anything really radical, except that we are trying to regularize all that goes on and prepare a constitutional revision and, mainly, some by-laws to fit the
organization. It has really had me busy.\textsuperscript{44}

By Winter, 1963, the constitution was rewritten and appeared in the \textit{American Catholic Sociological Review}. There was little variation except for some of the numbering of the Articles themselves. They now covered:

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Article I & - Name \\
Article II & - Purpose \\
Article III & - Membership \\
Article IV & - Officers \\
Article V & - Executive Council \\
Article VI & - Meetings \\
Article VII & - Amendments \\
Article VIII & - Committees \\
Article IX & - Dues \\
Article X & - Local Chapters \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textbf{BY-LAWS}

\textbf{Article I. Committees}

Section 1. Categories of Committees
Section 2. Standing Committees [listing six committees]
Section 3. Ad Hoc Committees
Section 4. New Sections for Special Interest
Section 5. Annual Reports of Committees

\textbf{Article II. Membership}

Section 1. Membership
Section 2. Membership Dues

\textbf{Article III. Publications}

\textbf{Article IV. By-Law Amendment Procedure}

\textbf{Affiliations}

As a direct result of the decision to publish the first

\textsuperscript{44}Thomas P. Imse, Buffalo, NY, to C. J. Nuesse, Washington, D. C., 26 March 1960, transcript in Nuesse collection, Catholic University of America Archives, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
news bulletin, the issue of affiliation with other learned societies was brought to the forefront. In September of 1938, Marguerite Reuss was appointed by the Executive Council to be editor of a newsletter of ACSS activities. By October 8th, she had sent a note to Ralph Gallagher informing him that this newssheet, entitled The Bulletin, was typed and awaiting last minute corrections and additions before being sent to the printer. By early December, the galley proofs had been run but The Bulletin was never formally printed. The legal machinery of the Catholic Church prohibited its publication.

The Code of Cannon Law dating from 1918 was the legal document that delayed The Bulletin's publication. The opening Canon of Title XXIII stated that "The Church has the right to forbid the publication of books by the faithful unless she has officially examined them in advance." Books was defined as including "daily publications, periodicals, and other published writings of whatever kind, unless the contrary appear." Chapter One of the same Title began by stating, "Even though published by laymen, the following require approval: ... in general all writings which contain anything of special importance to religion and good morals." 46

46Morris, 334.
Since the goals of the ACSS included the promotion and clarification of Catholic theories and Catholic principles, the dictates of Canon Law had to be followed. This held true especially for any member of the priesthood or religious orders, congregations, or institutes who might be involved with the publication. Canon 1386 stated:

Secular clergy are forbidden without consent of their Ordinaries [i.e., bishops], and religious without permission of their major superiors and of the Ordinary of the place, to publish books even treating of profane subjects, and to contribute to or edit papers, magazines, or reviews.47

The officers of the ACSS sought a way to fulfill the requirements of Canon Law. They found that the need for prior inspection and approval could be taken care of by the in-principle approval implicit in affiliation with the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC). The NCWC offered the institutional means by which various American Catholic organizations could act in cooperation with the hierarchy on all matters of national interest, especially those that involved definite expressions of Catholic philosophies. In particular, what they offered to an organization like the ACSS was a means for obtaining the required approval of the Catholic leadership for their written materials and convention topics prior to publication.48

47 Codex Iuris Canonici, 405.
48 Morris, 333.
In October of 1938, Gallagher traveled to Washington to meet with Bishop Michael Ready, the General Secretary of the NCWC with the express purpose of gaining affiliation for the ACSS.\textsuperscript{49} Once this affiliation with the NCWC had been approved, there would be simultaneous approval of their works by the Catholic hierarchy required by Canon Law and their incorporation into the bureaucratic structure of the Catholic Church.

Since \textit{The Bulletin} had been composed before formal affiliation with the NCWC had been initiated, it would have been considered an unauthorized publication if it had been sent to press. Gallagher did not want to put the new affiliation to a test so soon. It was left up to Sr. Liguori to notify Reuss, who was unaware of the canonical legalities imposed upon such publications, that this issue of \textit{The Bulletin} could not be published and to offer her apologies. This issue of \textit{The Bulletin} never went to press.

By December 28, 1938, Gallagher was able to announce the affiliation of the ACSS with the NCWC's Department of Social Action, a National Conference section chaired by Bishop Edwin O'Hara.\textsuperscript{50} As an affirmation of the ongoing relationship between the two organizations and as a show of respect for O'Hara, he was elected annually as Honorary

\textsuperscript{49}Rosenfelder, 41.

\textsuperscript{50}Ibid., 41-42.
President of the ACSS from 1939 until his death in 1956. At that time, affiliation between the two Societies was still required by Canon Law. Bishop John Wright of Worcester, Massachusetts, was O'Hara's successor as episcopal moderator for the ACSS. The ACSS Executive Council had intentionally requested Wright's appointment to this position based on his experience in higher education. Wright was the last episcopal patron named to the Society but the end of his tenure goes unmentioned by any formal documentation or even note of thanks in the Review. By the time that the American Catholic Sociological Society became the American Society of Religion in 1970, changes in the post-Vatican II policies no longer made affiliation with the NCWC mandatory but rather a question of choice on the part of the Society. Documentation was not found to support the continuation or dissolution of this affiliation.

The relationship between the NCWC and the ACSS appears to be one on paper only. There is no documentation regarding the influence that the NCWC had on any publication, either positively or negatively. Bishop Edwin O'Hara is not mentioned as keynote speaker, honored guest, etc. in the convention notations or minutes. He did present at the conventions a few times during his tenure, but not in a position of honor. During their tenures as President or

---
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during their involvement with the *Review*, neither Dr. Franz Mueller nor Dr. Clement Mihanovich ever submitted material to O'Hara or the NCWC for approval prior to publication or presentation at conventions. They knew of no other officer who submitted anything for approval. Dr. Paul Mundy, even during a controversy over an article by Gordon Zahn, did not receive any overt guidance from the NCWC. The decision to publish was his alone. There is also no record of any material being barred by the NCWC from publication or presentation. The only reference found was in a letter to Gordon Zahn from Br. D. Augustine dated April 8, 1955. Within this letter, reference is made to establishing a publicity clearing committee after he learned that there was to be "... some sort of check on the releases for the next convention of the ACSS..." The letter goes on to read in part, "Possibly one of the things that brought back to my mind the details of my interview with Archbishop O'Hara was a remark of Father Gallagher that the Society has been warned before all meetings to be careful concerning press releases."

It is not clear if Archbishop Edwin O'Hara or Fr. Ralph Gallagher issued the warning. More control appears to be exerted by Fr. Samuel Wilson than ever came from the NCWC. Wilson recommended that Fr. Joseph W.

---

Maguire, C.S.V. be prevented from being involved in the first convention by stating:

You may not know that Father Maguire has been guilty of two overt acts of enmity against the Society [Jesuits] from which we are still suffering. As a result of this, I have consistently succeeded in preventing the appearance of his name upon any list of officers or others in the National Catholic Educational Association during the past five years. I do not like to see Father Maguire put forward in any work in which Jesuits have any voice.  

Wilson sent this note to Gallagher on November 28, 1938 and Maguire's name did not appear on the program for the convention held on December 26-28, 1938. There is no indication that the NCWC or Bishop O'Hara ever rejected a topic, speaker, or article during its years of affiliation with the ACSS.

While the issue of affiliation with the NCWC was crucial to a Catholic organization wishing to do any form of publication, it was not an issue that was open to discussion or debate. Rather, it was simply a matter of detail with which to attend. The issue of affiliation with the American Sociological Society was an entirely different affair. It was obvious to Gallagher and others that affiliation with the ASS was desirable for several reasons. First, there was a aura of acceptability and credibility inherent to belonging to a larger organization that functioned as an
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54 Samuel Knox Wilson, Chicago, IL to Fr. Ralph Gallagher, Chicago, IL. 28 November 1938, Transcript in Gallagher Collection, Loyola University Archives, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois.
established, definitive source to the wider sociological community. This affiliation might help to eliminate or allay the perceived conception that Catholics lacked the professional ability or appropriate training to be professional sociologists. This conception, expressed by many non-Catholic sociologists, was based not so much in religious bigotry but in a misunderstanding over how the Catholics were trained at Catholic colleges. Secondly, in order to disseminate the Catholic viewpoint to a larger audience, affiliation with the ASS would make greater fiscal sense. The ASS had a much larger subscription circulation number and a diversified individual and institutional membership list. Within the calendar year 1938 alone, the American Sociological Society had a total membership of 1,025 with an average distribution of 1,564 copies of the American Sociological Review. This type of circulation rate would bring the concepts and views of the ACSS into many more hands than the ACSS would be able to reach through their own efforts. Thirdly, many of the members of the ACSS were members of the ASS and had established friendships within that organization that they did not want to take the chance of severing by appearing to belong to a disgruntled or disenfranchised group. Gallagher himself was among those

---

55 Rosenfelder, 43.

with ties to the ASS in that he was on reasonably good terms with H. A. Phelps, Secretary of the ASS.57

At the organizational meeting of the ACSS, it was stated that one of the primary purposes of the Society's formation was to exert an influence on the ASS. It was felt that if they would present a united front that would demand acknowledgement of, at least minimally, their existence as a group of professional sociologists and the existence of an alternative point of view to the mainstream. But, this affiliation or influential stand did not prove to be as easily established as many had hoped.

From the very beginning, Ralph Gallagher pushed for affiliation by saying:

... Association membership in the ASS would better expedite the ends of the Catholic organization. Meetings may or may not be held with the ASS. There are obvious advantages in possible exchange of speakers if meetings are held at the same time and place.58

Fr. George Hilke backed Gallagher's suggestion by indicating that they, the ACSS, "... affiliate first then clarify our own ideas with their help. Only by affiliation with the ASS can the influence of this body be best assured." Fr. Cavanaugh said, "Antipathy to Catholic thought is due in great measure to misunderstandings which can be eliminated by joint meetings and interchange of speakers and ideas." Dr. Paul Mundie recommended affiliation with the learned

57Morris, 332.

58Rosenfelder, 43.
societies in the field. He even went on to suggest that the ACSS should affiliate with both the American and the Midwest Sociological Societies.\(^{59}\)

Not all of those present were in favor of the affiliation. Fr. Thomas Kane suggested that the question of affiliation was premature. Dr. Stephen Mamchur felt that, "Catholic influence best extended individually." Fr. Francis Friedel wondered if there would be a commensurate return for the expense involved. He referred to other organizations to which he belonged that "... had nothing to gain from joining with the regional secular society in the same field."\(^{60}\)

The discussion appeared to be causing more confusion than consensus. Sr. Henry moved that the question be tabled for the present and her motion was seconded. The ACSS would, for the time being, continue as an independent organization without affiliation with the ASS or any other learned society.

At the same time, the ASS was showing a guarded interest in the new society. In 1938 at the Atlantic City meeting of the ASS, Gallagher spoke to Phelps about the possibility of this new organization of Catholic sociologists taking form. Two weeks before the

---
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organizational meeting, Gallagher again talked to Phelps and asked for advice on the question of affiliation along with a request for a copy of the ASS constitution. The ASS constitution arrived quickly. Mr. E.T. Craggier, Chairman of the Committee on Regional Societies in the ASS Affiliation, contacted the newly formed ACSS and suggested that they might additionally seek affiliation with the Midwest Sociological Society. He recommended this affiliation on the basis that it would help "... preserve an integrated and solid front for our whole sociological work in the country."61 Phelps himself telegraphed his best wishes to Gallagher on the start of the new organization. In the "Current Items" section of the American Sociological Review, an announcement about the newly formed ACSS read:

American Catholic Sociological Society has issued the report of its first annual convention at Chicago, 1938. It contains the constitution, financial report, membership list, organizational material and digests of the 19 papers presented. Members of the Society were engaged upon about 50 research projects at the time census was taken in the fall of 1938. The members reported 35 books and 190 magazine and newspaper articles recently published. On December 28, 1938, there were 73 members and 20 institution members from 20 states.

Ralph A. Gallagher, Loyola University, Chicago, was the first president and Raymond W. Murray, Notre Dame, is the president for 1939.62

This was exactly the type of promotion that those in

61Rosenfelder, 47.
favor of affiliation hoped would come their way. In August of 1938, months after receiving the request for information on affiliation and with no subsequent application for membership being submitted, Phelps questioned the intentions of the ACSS. He also inquired if the fees involved with affiliation were a problem. Sr. Liguori finally responded to Phelps' questions by indicating that the membership fees were a definite concern, but claimed the more substantial reason for tabling the question was the immaturity of their organization. She was careful not to close the door on later application efforts. She wrote:

The consensus of opinion favors close cooperation with the ASS, and a motion settling the time and place of the Annual Meeting of the ACSS at Chicago when and where the ASS meets was passed unanimously. (Later amended to two days in Chicago and one in Detroit to be in accord with the change made by the ASS in their convention plans.)

With that, Sr. Liguori quietly tabled the possibility of affiliation for the time being.

The issue of affiliation with the ASS appeared to be resolved, at least in the mind of Fr. Ralph Gallagher, when he wrote to Fr. Samuel Wilson on November 10, 1938, "... The American Catholic Sociological Society is affiliated with the American Sociological Society." Again, a few days
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64 Ralph A. Gallagher, Chicago, to Fr. Samuel Know Wilson, Chicago, 10 November 1938, Transcript in Gallagher Collection, Loyola University Archives, Loyola University, Chicago.
later, in reply to a request from Wilson for a copy of the convention program, Gallagher again wrote, "... We are an affiliated body or chapter of the American Sociological Society and we are supposed to have one meeting at the annual convention." Since this affiliation was not as resolved as Gallagher indicated it was to his superior, it was imperative that it not be a dormant issue for very long. Gallagher initiated the discussion of affiliation at the First Annual Convention. At the Business Meeting held on December 28, 1938, both Eva Ross and Paul J. Mundie agreed that affiliation would be agreeable and recommended, but at a later time. They cited a need for more clarification on the ACSS part of its own terminology and ideologies. Ross questioned, "Can we express Catholic thought in a group like that at this time? First of all we have to discuss more in detail what is sociology. How do our ideas differ from non-Catholics?" Mundie suggested that the idea be tabled for the incoming Executive Council.

On June 13, 1939, the new Executive Council discussed the proposed affiliation, but decided that the question again needed more discussion. The issue was to be discussed at the Second Annual Convention's Business Meeting. At that
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meeting held on December 29, 1939, the subject of publishing a periodical was also listed under New Business. That discussion took so much time that the question of affiliation was never addressed. The debate over affiliation with the ASS was to come up repeatedly over the following years.

The Minutes of the Fifth Annual Convention's Business Meeting held on December 29, 1942 read:

Following a discussion of the points of regional societies and affiliation of societies to both of which there was opposition, the Chairman dismissed the topics as lacking a motion for their proper consideration.

There is no further mention made of affiliation in the Minutes of the Executive Council Meetings from 1945-48.

C. J. Nuesse, President in 1954, stated in a memo to the Executive Council that he would personally like to have the annual meetings, after 1955, held in conjunction with the ASS. One of his reasons was, "It seems to me that our Society should encourage, at least implicitly, the participation of its members in their more inclusive professional group." Paul Reiss felt that the bridge linking the two organizations was strengthened in 1958 when the ACSS decided to hold its annual meeting at the same time
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and place as the ASA. But this proved to be an empty hope.

In 1965, the American Sociological Association (ASA), formerly the ASS, ACSS and the Rural Sociologist Society all scheduled their conventions to meet at the same time in Chicago. Dr. Helen Lopata was on the ASA convention committee and was a good friend of Dr. Paul Mundy who was in charge of making the arrangement for the ACSS convention. It was well known that many sociologists were members of all three of these organizations. In an attempt to share resources and appease the constituents regarding conflicts in the scheduling of sessions, the ASA invited the three organizations to plan the conventions jointly. This was the first time the conventions were arranged in such a unified manner. From that time on, it was just taken for granted that the ASA and ACSS would meet together. The Rural Sociology Society felt that it had little to offer in terms of speakers and input since its numbers were in decline. Its relationship was more that of a junior partner. This joining of conventions came about quite by accident. It was not due to any preplanned negotiations or formal affiliation that this cooperative venture took place.\textsuperscript{70} It was due to the friendship of the three convention planning officers that year. The immediate benefit of making better use of speakers and accommodations was well received by the three associations’ boards.

\textsuperscript{70}Mundy interview, 10 November 1993.
Influenced by this new appearance of cooperation, a new opportunity to address affiliation with the ASA was again suggested. On September 15, 1965, Fr. Andrew Greeley sent a memorandum to the Executive Council of the ACSS. In it, he stated that at the ASA Convention he talked to Wilbert Moore, President of ASA, at length about the possibility of affiliation with the ASA. Moore suggested that application for affiliation should be made as soon as possible. Greeley went on to ask for advice about whether now would be an appropriate time to poll membership so that formal application to the ASA could be made. He did not want to wait until the January Executive meeting before discussing this and wanted to get the application to Moore while he [Moore] was still president. He went on to say:

I am not terribly optimistic about the reception we may receive from some of the members of the ASA; I would be surprised if the fires of nativism have been completely extinguished. In fact, I think our chances for affiliation are much better when a sympathetic man like Moore would be presiding over the ASA council meeting . . . But I would not think of conducting a poll of the membership unless there was practically unanimous agreement of members of the executive council that now is the time to do it. ①

Greeley also informed the members of the Executive Council that the 1966 convention, would be held in Miami Beach and that accommodations were being made jointly with the ASA. Applications for attendance would only be found in

①Andrew Greeley, Memorandum to ACSS Executive Council, 15 September 1965. American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
the May issue of the American Sociologist which will be sent to all members of the American Sociological Association. ²²

On October 10, 1965, Fr. Andrew Greeley sent a memo to all members of the ACSS regarding affiliation with the ASS.

This memo read in part:

if accepted . . . our relationship would be roughly the same as that of the Rural Sociological Society . . . and the various regional societies. We would not lose our corporate identity or independence, we would send delegates to the meeting of whatever body the ASA's current reorganization produces . . . the fact of our meetings would be noted in the ASA programs, and the possibility of joint sessions would come into existence. We would have no control over ASA policy and they would have no control over ours but we would both be committed to recognizing each other's existence officially and in addition . . . we would recognize the ASA as the principal professional body of sociologists to which we, a specialized body, had become affiliated. . . .

The principle disadvantage which might be envisaged is that such a move would commit the society to its own eventual extinction or to a course of action which would permanently limit the area of interest of the society and its programs. [Both of which he goes on to refute]

We have made some informal inquiries of the ASA and have reason to think that our application would be favorably received, though of course there is no certainty on this matter. Without reviewing ancient history it is well to keep in mind that a previous attempt at closer cooperation several years ago was not successful; thus I think that, while the climate is much more favorable at the present time, we should not be unduly optimistic. ²³

In calling for a vote, Greeley stated that he was looking for a substantial majority, perhaps 3/5 vote, in order to proceed. He also stated that very strong opposition from a

²²Ibid.

²³Andrew Greeley, Memorandum to ACSS Members, 10 October 1965. American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
small group of members would definitely give the Council cause to drop the issue for the present. The Executive Council was not expected to act on the matter until January. But, Greeley requested a quick reply in order that all members of the Council would have sufficient time to study the responses rather than just relying a tabulation report. He was hoping for a strong, positive, early response in order to start the process rolling as soon as possible.

In a memo in early 1966 to all members, Greeley gave a brief report on the progress toward affiliation with the ASA. He wrote:

The balloting last winter on the subject was overwhelming with only five negative votes and nine reservations from the entire membership. This unanimity is not normally found in elections in the free world, and I personally almost suspect that there was a plot. We have written a formal letter of application to Dr. Wilbert Moore of the American Sociological Association and it would seem that our application will be acted on at their council meeting this summer, while there is no clear precedent for such an application and I would caution the membership of the ACSS to be cautious of their expectations.\textsuperscript{74}

Again, the process of affiliation with the ASA ground to a stop. Between August 1967 and May 1968, there were a series of letters that were exchanged between Gordon Zahn, president of the ACSS, and Dr. Edmund Volkart, executive officer of the ASA, regarding the question of affiliation. On August 28, 1967, Zahn wrote:

\textsuperscript{74}Andrew Greeley, Memo to ACSS Members, undated, 1966. American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
For most of its history the Society has scheduled its annual meetings concurrently with the ASA and a state of friendly cooperation has been achieved in matters of convention programming arrangements and the like. Two years ago a poll of the membership of the ACSS revealed an overwhelming majority favoring a closer and more formal affiliation with the ASA -- somewhat similar to that now enjoyed by the RSS and the SSSP.

It was generally understood that an approach was made at the time and that our request was taken under consideration by the appropriate governing body of the ASA. Now, however, Mrs. Myers informs us that her files contain no record of the matter, and we must assume that the discussion never got beyond the informal verbal stage. To correct this oversight and, even more important, to reduce further delay, we are submitting this as a written request that the matter be placed on the ASA’s current agenda for at least preliminary consideration.

We hope that the ASA will select a representative . . . to meet with the undersigned to explore the possibility . . . so that the matter may be placed before our respective memberships at the Boston meeting for action at that time.

[letter co-signed by Donald N. Barrett, immediate past president] 75

A frustrating letter of reply was dated September 8, 1967, in which E. H. Volkart wrote:

Your request regarding affiliation . . . was placed on the Agenda of the 1968 Council, but I regret that the unexpected amount of time the Council had devoted to the Vietnam Resolution, and the travel plans of Council members prevented the consideration of many Agenda items . . .

Under the circumstances two courses of action seem possible: (1) That the matter be placed on the Agenda of the Council when it meets in January, 1968, i.e., the next meeting of the Council; (2) That some preliminary explorations be made between now and that meeting to clarify the types of affiliation your Society may be seeking.

The later seems preferable at this time since, under our new Constitution and By-Laws, the former

75 Gordon Zahn, Milwaukee, to Dr. Edmund Volkart, Washington, D.C., 28 August 1967, transcript in American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI.
types of affiliation with the Rural Sociological Society and the SSSP--including membership on the Council--no longer exists. Indeed Article III, Section 5d of the new By-Laws, suggest possible modes of affiliation upon which the Council may make decisions.

Since, according to your letter, there has already been an unfortunate delay regarding this matter I would hope that we could make as much progress as possible in the coming months toward a clarification of affiliation so that the Council may be properly informed at its next meeting.\textsuperscript{76}

On October 2, 1967, Zahn responded with:

I quite agree with your suggestions that an effort be made to explore the possibility of ACSS affiliation with the ASA so that the matter may be put on the Council’s January agenda. At the time our membership indicated its desire to affiliate, the relationship then existing between the ASA and the RSS was the model they had in mind. However, since such relationships no longer can be obtained, it would be best to see what alternative arrangements could be made.

It would seem to me that any affiliation which would formalize the cooperative relationship the ACSS has enjoyed in the past would be of mutual benefit. Since, as you know, our Society has decided to restrict its focus to the Sociology of Religion and Values, an affiliation that would permit closer consultation and fuller participation in ASA program selections devoted to this area of study would be most desirable from our point of view. I am sure, too, that the Council’s decision to designate a representative to the ACSS would be approved and welcomed by our membership.

Is it your feeling that the necessary explorations can be made through correspondence, or would you prefer that we name someone to discuss the matter personally with you in Washington?\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{76}E.H. Volkart, Washington, D.C., to Gordon Zahn, Milwaukee, 8 September 1967, transcript in the American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

\textsuperscript{77}Gordon C. Zahn, Milwaukee, to E.H. Volkart, Washington, D.C., 2 October 1967, transcript in the American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
There was an ever growing sense of frustration on the part of the ACSS Executive Council. The membership was anticipating positive results regarding affiliation. It appeared that the ACSS's request was being stalled without valid reasons. On October 5, 1967, Volkart answered:

Our new Constitution notes specifically that the Council may recognize "other societies or associations as cooperating or affiliated organizations for purposes of planning programs." Thus should Council approve your suggestion for closer consultation and fuller participation regarding program this could probably be implemented in time for the 1969 Annual Meeting.

At the same time since you mentioned the current focus of your Society I should point out that the ASA does not have a formal Section devoted to the Sociology of Religion and Values. Our current Sections are: Social Psychology, Methodology, Medical Sociology, Criminology, Sociology of Education, Family, and Theoretical Sociology. Obviously your own special interests could be relevant to anyone of these.

The proposal that our Council designate an official representative to ACSS can also be placed before the Council as part of the general concept of fuller cooperation.

Looking over that above it seems to me that you are making essentially two interrelated proposals for affiliation, and you letter can be brought to Council's attention as an official request for action. 78

Volkart again wrote on May 3, 1968:

I am writing to bring you up to date as to the proposed affiliation between the ASA and the ACSS. This matter has been under discussion, but as you will realize the concept of "affiliation" under the new Constitution remains a little vague. Accordingly, Council will resume discussion of this matter at its meeting Sunday, August 25, and we hope to be able to inform you of the action taken prior to the meeting of the ACSS Executive Committee on Monday, the 26th.

Frankly, I anticipate a favorable outcome but wanted to keep you informed in the meantime.\textsuperscript{79}

Even though these discussions had been going on for thirty years, the issue was never brought to closure. No formal application was made to, recorded by, or approved by the ASS. Once the American Catholic Sociological Society became the Association for the Sociology of Religion in 1970, there was no further need to promote the idea of affiliation. The conception regarding the professional competence of Catholic sociologists was no longer an issue in the larger sociological community. The ACSS was firmly established and proved to be a viable outlet for Catholic social action. The ACSS's own constitution and direction had undergone considerable changes that would make it very difficult to function as an adjunct of the ASA. The initial hesitation and cautiousness during the late 1930's and early 40's proved to provide an insurmountable barrier to an non-retrievable opportunity.

A much different form of affiliation was to be discussed regarding the State of Illinois. In the 1938 Constitution, Article XI read, "The Society should be incorporated in the State of Illinois as a learned Society." Gallagher eventually raised the question with the Illinois Secretary of State in 1946. The appropriate forms were sent

\textsuperscript{79}E.H. Volkart, Washington, D.C., to Gordon Zahn, Milwaukee, 3 May 1968, transcript in the American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
out, along with a note requesting a $10 filing fee for incorporation. Rosenfelder notes that, "It was decided, however, that since no practical benefits would be derived from incorporation, it would be a waste of ten dollars, so the idea was dropped." In 1961, Paul Reiss pointed out that even though the Society had all along operated as if it were an approved non-profit organization, there was no current constitutional reference to this practice. He suggested that an explicit statement to that effect in the constitution would be very helpful in obtaining tax exemptions, postal rates, etc. In the 1963 ACSS Constitution, Article II proclaimed the Society to be a non-profit organization, "as defined by the United States government." This was an issue that never seemed to hold any importance among either the membership or the Executive Council.

Throughout the years, discussion of affiliation with other societies had been discussed. The American Council of Learned Societies, The Social Science Research Council, and The National Council of Catholic Charities are among those that have sought some form of alliance with the ACSS. In 1941, the Catholic Political Scientists hoped to organize as an adjunct of the ACSS. Fr. Dowling had even suggested to
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Gallagher that the ACSS change into the "American Catholic Society of Social Sciences". It would then be able to include economic, political and sociological sections.\textsuperscript{83} Gallagher replied that, at that time, the ACSS was still too young and not even clearly enough defined within its own ranks. The ACSS was not ready to begin adding sub-sections or affiliates. This was, in effect, the same rational that had already been expressed in discussions regarding affiliation with the ASS and continued to be the position taken with most organizations seeking affiliation with the ACSS.

It is difficult to determine if this was truly the way that the Executive Council actually felt or if it just proved to be an effective stall tactic. There was a fierce sense of loyalty and nationalism among the members of the ACSS. They were proud of their independent stand and were not favorable to their purpose being compromised or muddled by other organizations. The ASA would have been useful in achieving one of the more important goals of the ACSS but affiliation with these other smaller organizations would not have been beneficial. But, it is more likely that this is another example of the ACSS inability to take a firm stand or make a decision about some matters of importance. The Executive Council had a history of letting prime opportunities slip by their grasp.

\textsuperscript{83}Rosenfelder, 51.
Local Chapters

The basic concept of the membership being divided into five formal national sections was considered to be a desirable internal structure from the very beginning. The minutes of the Executive Council Meeting on June 15, 1938 indicate that the establishment of sectional groupings was discussed and given tentative approval pending the membership campaign data. Dr. Paul Mundie of Marquette strongly favored their establishment as a means of realizing the aim of the Society to foster camaraderie and closeness among the members. Gallagher viewed it as a way to encourage membership and make the Society more visible on the local level. The actually decision to establish the local chapters was tabled pending further data and interest shown by the members. The topic came up occasionally over the next few years, but little interest or true direction in formally establishing the sectional groups was evident.

The Second World War had far reaching effects on the normal lives of people throughout the country. The continuous travel restrictions, difficulty in obtaining hotel rooms, food and gas rationing, and the other general difficulties inherent to a wartime economy prompted the Executive Council to vote unanimously to suspend the national conventions during 1943 and 1944. In place of the
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national convention, the Council strongly encouraged the members to hold regional meetings. They felt that good and productive meetings could and should be arranged using local talent. These meetings would serve three purposes. The first would to be to seek out heretofore untapped areas of interest and speakers. Secondly, there would be the added benefit of strengthening the ties and fellowship of the local members. Thirdly, these small meetings would provide newsworthy events that could be used to maintain interest in the Society and possibly help to increase membership.

During these two years, regional meetings were held in Washington, St. Louis, St. Paul, New York, and Chicago. These meetings were considered to be well attended and provided some very positive feedback to the Executive Council. At each of these meetings, it was found that a sizeable number of attendees were interested in the field of sociology, even Catholic sociology, and were not yet members of the ACSS. The Council found it difficult to determine if it was the content of these meetings or the locations that attracted the attendance. It was decided that no matter the reason the Society would try to capitalize on this new interest level.

With solid documentation now in hand regarding attendance and the quality of local speakers, the Executive Council saw their chance to move from hypothetical to

---
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practical discussions regarding the further development of the local groups. Some of the early discussions at the conventions and Executive Council meetings were referred to and rehashed. There was now a push on to make this a permanent arrangement.

Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey was very verbal about this issue and brought the subject up in a letter to Gallagher in 1944. It read in part:

Since we are having these local meetings, the question occurs to me whether it might not be worth while to organize these local chapters. That would give us at least a skeleton organization in each city which would be responsible for the annual local meeting and which might even have small and informal meetings from time to time during the year. This idea might do a lot for spreading the influence of the Society.86

Fr. Furfey's proposal was brought to the Executive Council for their opinions. The members expressed a wide range of opinions about it. Eva Ross felt that it would " . . . lead to factions and frictions and take away the unity given to the Society by Fr. Gallagher."87 Fr. Bernard Mulvaney, while being opposed to local chapters, did approve of the regional meetings. He felt strongly that these meetings could effectively be run by local groups but that it would be mandatory that they be organized and held under the strict guidance of the Executive Council in order that the Society's purposes and end not be tainted by second-hand
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interpretations. In spite of offering a myriad of restrictions, in essence, a majority of the other members agreed with the organization of local chapters on a permanent basis. All of these opinions were brought before the Executive Council on June 10, 1944. It was decided unanimously to submit an amendment providing for the establishment of local chapters to the general membership at the Sixth Annual Convention held in Chicago in 1945. The amendment was adopted and replaced Article XI which originally dealt with incorporation in the State of Illinois and had become a mute point. A Model Constitution that these new local chapters were expected to adopt was written. (see appendix 4)

Local Chapters were now officially approved of and encouraged by the ACSS, but, in spite of the support of the membership, making them a reality was a different story. By the Executive Council meeting in September of 1945, no request had been received to establish any Local Chapters. There is an unusually worded notation in the minutes of this meeting that Clement Mihanovich and Alphonse Clemens would "... take on the responsibility" for setting up a Local Chapter in the St. Louis area. Mihanovich suggested in interview that they were encouraged strongly to take on this responsibility. The St. Louis Chapter received Executive Council approval before the Eight Annual Convention was held
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in 1946. Cleveland and Philadelphia were the next two applications received and were approved at the that Convention. 89

While the purpose of these Local Chapters was being fulfilled and the word of the ACSS was spreading, there was a problem brewing. One of the primary intents of the Local Chapters was to act as a means of increasing membership in the parent ACSS. There was a constitutional requirement that all members of the Local Chapters would have to be members of the ACSS. In 1946, the Cleveland group suggested the establishment of an Associate Membership while the St. Louis group requested establishment of a Sustaining Membership. The Philadelphia Chapter had already written into their proposed constitution a Participating Membership. 90 Each of these memberships were intended for those persons who wished to participate in various degrees in Local Chapter activities but did not care to vote or hold office in the parent ACSS. The problems of terminology and level of involvement that these memberships offered could be traced directly back to the constitutional model set forth by the Executive Council. The model did not address these issues at all nor was the Executive Council willing to do so. Eventually, each local chapter was left on its own to set the limitations of membership and the name that they would
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be listed under.

While the Executive Council gave its tacit approval to Local Chapters, after the establishment of the first few, they never were pushed nor became very popular. More and more attention was paid to various sections of the country as opposed to the Local Chapters. For example, in 1958, a list of "Regional Directors of Membership in the ACSS" was published. This list included thirty-three names from New Hampshire to California and Canada to Texas. (see appendix 5) The 1961 research survey divides the country into ten sections: New England, Middle Atlantic, South Atlantic, East North Central, West North Central, East South Central, West South Central, Mountain, Pacific, and other. These appear to be the standard divisions that were taken into consideration when the Executive Council dealt with topics such as: membership, conventions, attendance, subscriptions, and research topics.

Shift in Power

When the ACSS was founded, there was no question as to its religious affiliation nor to the fact that Gallagher was its visionary and leader. Even though the Society appeared to be very formally structured, the actual manner in which it operated was very loosely organized. One of the evidences of this was the fact that ten years after the organizational meeting, and in spite of the formal acceptance of several
amendments, the 1938 Constitution had never formally been ratified. This was not due to lack of direction, purpose, or inadequate managerial skills, rather it was the style of organization with which Gallagher was most comfortable. Shared values, goals, and principles were all that were necessary to carry the Society forward. This shared Weltanschauung did not require a highly formalized organizational structure nor did it demand fastidious attention to details. It simply required tacit approval of procedures which was, in effect, given by the members when they chose to join the Society.

By 1948, some members felt that the attitude of the ASS could be modified in their favor if the ACSS would bend a little on its focus. Gallagher's emphasis, and thus the perceived focus of the Society, was on the "holiness" of Sociology and the elements of social action that flowed from this work. Clement Mihanovich referred to Gallagher's insistence on the existence and role of Catholic sociology as being perceived by some within the Society to be a liability to their credibility as sociologists rather than an asset. 91 There was a small but growing group of individuals who felt that, by studying the sociology of religion, they might have a greater impact on the field and thus gain a higher level of respectability from their secular peers. This concept was not often expressed publicly
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but during the late 1940s and early 1950s it was often viewed as a professional handicap to be a member of the ACSS. Most of the members belonged to the ASS or other learned societies and only listed the ACSS in a cursory manner. They looked for a way in which to get their focus acknowledged as at least an alternative choice by Gallagher. They felt that this might be an opportune time to try to take the upper hand in actively seeking affiliation with the ASS on their terms without causing a great deal of unrest among the membership or change in actual purpose of the Society. They needed some form of leverage to use and they decided upon a survey of the general membership.

In May of 1948, this survey was constructed under the leadership of Franz Mueller the then President of the ACSS. (see appendix 6) The survey was composed to appear to address questions regarding the annual convention and a few logistical question regarding the editorial staff of the Review. It was in actuality a veiled device to get hard core data from the membership that could be used to get Gallagher to ease his control over the Society. Mihanovich tallied the results and they were published in their entirety in the October 1948 issue of the Review. Question eight asked if the Executive Secretary, which was Gallagher but unnamed in the question, should be regarded as managing editor ex officio of the Review. The membership agreed 115 to
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fourteen, that the Executive Secretary should in fact be a non-voting member. In the question that dealt with who should appoint the book and periodical review editors, 101 members felt that it should be done by either the editorial board or the executive council as opposed to the nine who felt that it should be done by the Managing Editor (Executive Secretary). Question sixteen asked if the office of Executive Secretary should be considered permanent until resignation or should the membership at an annual convention be able to elect another. Affirmative votes for the position to be permanent numbered seventy, fifty-one agreed with annual election, and thirty-one abstained. Question seventeen asked if the executive council should appoint a committee to examine the present constitution and propose any need changes. The wording in the question was very carefully selected and states in part, " . . . that some of the functions now exercised by the officers of the Society are (though not un-constitutional) non-constitutional because no provisions are made for them in the constitution." The vote was 130 for and seventeen against the appointment of such a committee. While the survey results were not strong enough to remove Gallagher totally from a central position, they did leave his complete control handicapped and left the issue of the Society being out of

---

touch with the membership unanswered.

In 1950, Clement Mihanovich was the president of the ACSS and C.J. Nuesse was the immediate past second vice president. On June 18, 1950, Fr. Joseph Fitzpatrick, S.J. wrote to C.J. Nuesse:

I met in Chicago last week with Ed Marciniak and Russ Barta. We are all anxious to do something in a very quiet, off-the-record way to get the Cath. Sociol. Society to meet the problems of closer relations with Sociological thought outside the Church. . . .

We would like you to write a perfectly innocent letter both to Dr. Mihanovich and to Father Gallagher suggesting that, in our December Convention we discuss the following problem: "At this mid-century mark what should be the role of the Catholic Sociologist with reference to general problems of sociology." The point would be to attempt an examination of our professional obligations in the presence of the sociological problems of the mid-century. The ultimate objective (which must never be publicly mentioned) is to prompt us to face the problem of association with non-Catholics in the field.

We suggest that your letter bring the question up, and ask Dr. Mihanovich and Fr. Gallagher what they would think (a) either of listing the question on the Convention program for discussion; or (b) appointing a committee to meet and report on this question to the Convention.

. . . By all means keep my part in this quiet. Also keep mum on our ultimate objective. My official report to Dr. Mihanovich was full of remarks about the need of taking our place in the world of Amer. Sociology with non-Catholics. And if Father Gallagher knows I am involved, he'll be suspicious.94

On June 21, 1950, Nuesse replied, "Your letter interests me very much; I agree that the problem is most urgent, and I am

not adverse to the course of action you suggest."

Edward Marciniak was due in Washington the next Sunday and Nuesse suggested that they might get together to discuss this matter. On September 20, 1950, Nuesse wrote to Mihanovich.

He began the letter by stating that he received the tentative program for the ACSS convention. He then wrote:

There is one suggestion, prompted in part by discussions which developed among some summer session students, which I should like to pass on to you. In our discussions such questions as the following were frequently raised: What are the professional obligations of a Catholic sociologist? What is the distinctive task of a Catholic sociologist? Why don't Catholic sociologists produce more scientific research? Upon what research problems should Catholic efforts be concentrated? These are a few samples. I know that you are familiar with questions of this type since they arise at virtually every meeting of the Society.

It seems to me, however, that the Society should provide opportunities for defining the role of the Catholic sociologist. Could some provision be made for discussion along these lines at the December convention. The topic might be phrased broadly: "What should be the role of the Catholic sociologist with reference to the general problems of sociology in this mid-century period?" I am not proposing further argument as to the existence of a "Catholic sociology" -- I would prefer to let that matter at rest until some fresh contributions are offered. . . . The question I am proposing involves particularly the definition of our individual and corporate professional responsibilities.

I do not have any detailed proposals for procedures . . . Possibly the topic might be listed for general discussion . . . I am sending a copy to Father Gallagher."

---


96 C.J. Nuesse, Washington, D.C., to Clement Mihanovich, St. Louis, MO, 2 September 1950, transcript in Nuesse collection, Catholic University of America Archives,
In the listings for the Twelfth Annual Convention held on December 27-29, 1950, there is no specific reference made to the incorporation of this topic either as a formal talk or in any discussion sessions. There was a Presidential Address given by Mihanovich and in the Social Psychology section a talk by Fr. Thomas Harte entitled "Catholic Opinion on Selected Issues" during which it might have been mentioned. There was no formal documentation of these talks.

The 1942 constitutional amendment dealing with the wording of the membership clause opened membership up to "... all who are interested in the field of sociology." The various amendments increasing the size of executive Council numbers meant for the Executive Council to be more representative of the "various sections of the country, and religious orders" that had now become active in the Society. By the mid-1950s, many members were becoming increasingly uncomfortable with the way in which they felt that the intent of Article VI, dealing with the Executive Council, was being manipulated. The membership of the Council was limited to candidates elected at the annual ACSS Business Meeting from a Council-approved slate. More and more members saw this as disenfranchising all but a select few members of an inner circle. This concept is reinforced by simply looking at the lists of past presidents, vice-

Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

97Rosenfelder, 74.
presidents, and executive council (see appendix 7 and 8). Between 1940 and 1946, Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey's name appears seven times. Between 1942 and 1948, Sr. Liguori's name appears six times. Clement Mihanovich's name appears five times in five years and Ross's name appears four times in nine years. When you couple these offices with the number of times that their name appears in co-ordination with articles printed in the *Review* (Furfey had articles appear in 10 out of twenty-eight issues. Ross had five articles between 1940-43, and eight between 1944-53.), the ACSS appeared to be a club run by old friends who staunchly insisted on perpetuating viewpoints and loyalties that no longer interested the majority of the Society's members. This was only reinforced by the casual dismissal of the 1942 Amendment which gave voting rights only to Constituent members or representatives of member institutions. A former officer recalls Business Meetings at which "Anyone occupying a seat could vote." Membership status was not checked during a vote either by pre-registration or by some other sort of verification such as a paid membership receipt.

For the December meeting in 1956, the Nominating Committee, which included Sr. Jeanine, Msgr. Robert Navin, and C. J. Nuesse, prepared a slate of officers to be presented by Sr. Jeanine. John Donovan, who had been Sr. Jeanine's First Vice-President, had already been approached

---

98 Morris, 336.
and had accepted the nomination for the Office of President on this slate. It had become practice since 1951 to nominate the current First Vice-President for the office of President the following year. Sr. Jeanine had been the exception by being the second vice-president in 1954 and then elected to president for 1955. Donovan was unable to attend the Business Meeting that was expected to elect him. The meeting did not go as planned. C.J. Nuesse explained the events of the meeting in a letter to Donovan:

I was distressed and embarrassed by the turn of events at last week's meeting of the American Catholic Sociological Society. . . . Sister Jeanine presented the slate of the nominating committee and I understand from her that some of the young turks and aggressive democrats, feeling that there should be competition for the various offices, proceeded to nominate with abandon. If this had been anticipated, arrangements might have been made to move to close the nominations more swiftly, but this would have been interpreted as undemocratic, I suppose.

At any rate, three strong candidates were nominated from the floor to be your competitors for the office of president-elect. Your absence was probably a disadvantage. I understand that the race was neck-and-neck but, as you may already know, Father Mulvaney [actually elected first vice president] was declared elected. A similar situation developed in voting for the Executive Council.

. . . Confusion of this sort reflects adversely upon the Society. I certainly had no thought of such an eventuality in asking you to accept the nomination.99

The problem did not end with the letter to Donovan. On the same day, Nuesse also wrote to Bela Kovrig:

99C.J. Nuesse, Washington, D.C. to John Donovan, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, 3 January 1956 [57], transcript in Nuesse collection, Catholic University of America Archives, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
I was most regretful and embarrassed by the confusion in respect to the election of officers. In your own case, the members present seem to have felt that they were rectifying a constitutional omission of the practice of including the immediate past president as an ex officio member of the Executive Council. It was the opinion of our committee that this should have been undertaken through a different procedure. While all this is not "catastrophic," to use your own term, it is not the ways a society’s business should be conducted.100

According to Loretta Morris, the Executive Council had also encountered an unexpected twist with this election. The Council had expected to approve the slate of officers for 1957 headed by John Donovan. Gallagher, acting independently and as Executive Secretary, removed Donovan from nomination without notifying the Council. Gallagher’s only stated reason for this change was that Donovan had not attended every ACSS meeting. No one challenged Gallagher’s decision or methods and, at the December 1956 annual meeting, the nominations from the floor went unchecked. Nuesse did not make reference to this at all in his letter to Donovan. Allen Spitzer’s name was one of the three from the floor officially placed in nomination for president for 1957.101 He was elected and Mulvaney was elected the first vice president.

There was a growing number of members who felt professionally and intellectually insulted by the way in

100C.J. Nuesse, Washington, D.C., to Bela Kovrig, Milwaukee, WI, 3 January 1956 [57], transcript in Nuesse collection, Catholic University of America Archives, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

101Morris, 336.
which the ACSS was being run. Everyone present knew that Gallagher had the habit of leaving these meetings right after giving his financial report. Unwilling to go as far as open confrontation with Gallagher, an uneasy truce was held until he had finished his financial report. After his departure, a proposal that suggested a change in the by-laws was presented and was to be voted on by the total membership before the next annual meeting. That change resulted in a constitution amendment to Article IV which would now allow mail-in ballots.102

The March 1957 edition of the Review only hints at the troubles encountered at the December 1956 meeting which had been held in Milwaukee. Under the heading "Varied Items" in the News of Sociological Interest, a list of the past presidents of the ACSS from 1938 through 1956 was printed. This list appears with no comment except for the sentence which preceded it which read, "The following is a list of past presidents of the Society, as requested from the floor at the Milwaukee convention:"103 A few pages later was a report of the nominating committee for the 1956 elections. The report had three recommendations. The first dealt with nominations to vacant office, and the third calls for the Executive Secretary to complete a list of past officers and

102 Ibid., 337.

executive council to be supplied each year to the president and chairman of the nominating committee. The second recommendation read:

2. Your committee notes that constitutional amendments adopted at the annual meeting in 1955 did not provide for membership ex officio on the Executive Council of the immediate past president of the Society. This provision has previously been in force and your committee believes that it served to promote continuity and advancement of the work of the Society. It is urged that after appropriate discussion action be initiated to restore the ex officio membership of the immediate past president on the Executive Council. 104

There was no mention as to who the new officers were for 1957 in this or any other volume of the Review that year.

With the elections over, there was still the unfinished business of the perceived affront to John Donovan to be dealt with. Sr. Aquinice Kelly, O.P. was among the number who felt that only his vindication and election to the presidency would restore the Society's self-respect and improve its image in the eyes of its members. Sr. Aquinice was administrative assistant to Gallagher and the Executive Council and as such was aware that the only reason for Donovan's absence from the ACSS meeting was due to financial circumstances. Without an elected position on the Council, Sr. Aquinice had no voice in the proceedings and could do nothing administratively to help him. She tried unsuccessfully to persuade President Nuesse at the 1956 Council meeting to do something for Donovan. When her

---

104 Ibid., 60.
efforts on Donovan's behalf failed, she decided to set things in motion for the 1957 annual meeting by herself.

At that meeting, she spoke highly of Donovan to a number of the members whom she knew well. She made it a point to suggest that the slate nominee, Edward Huth, was obviously a good man but relatively unknown to the membership in spite of being second vice president in 1950. She continued to bring up Donovan's name whenever possible during the day and speak in glowing terms of his work for the Society and his ability. By the time of the Business Meeting, almost everyone present had heard Donovan's name. Sr. Aquinice's mission was completed when Donovan's name was added to the slate of candidates by a nomination from the floor. A vote was taken and Donovan won the election.\textsuperscript{105} Bela Kovrig was elected vice president.

This incident struck a deep blow to the position of control that had been enjoyed by the Society's traditionalists over the selection of the officers. It opened the door for those who felt that the ACSS should spend less time and identify less with the traditional religious stance of the ACSS. The push was on to devote more effort and attention to structure a more purely sociological association. Whether Gallagher saw the foreshadowing of the future direction of the ACSS or not, is not really known. But, he did resign as Executive Secretary in 1961. Even

\textsuperscript{105}Morris, 337.
though Gallagher was appointed lifetime Honorary Vice President in 1962, he had little active participation in the Society from that time until his death on March 10, 1965.

The Society continued to struggle with participation from the membership. During the end of the 1960s, Ralph Lane and Jack Curtis of California were appointed to set up a newsletter entitled "News and Announcements." There were several instances within the Review where they asked for news items or apologized for the tardiness of the newsletter due to lack of information. In 1966, Andrew Greeley was asked to consider the nomination for president. He had only had his Ph.D. for two years and did not feel ready to take on such a role. The executive board originally accepted his rejection, but after finding no other candidate, came back to him and insisted. This time he accepted.\textsuperscript{106}

By 1969, it was decided that the Society should change its name and focus of study. It became the Society for the Study of Religion in 1970. Over the thirty years of its existence, membership varied from the original thirty-one to 420 in Greeley's tenure. As the Society began to change, many members like Mihanovich left because they no longer supported its direction. Others just didn't keep up their membership because they were members of other, larger organizations whose roles and functions were approximately

\textsuperscript{106}Andrew Greeley, interview with author, 22 June 1993, Chicago.
the same.

The need to focus on being a sociological organization changed as the group focused on the specific topic of sociology of religion. The Review was the official publication tool of the society. The next chapter will document the development and change in that tool as the focus of the society changed.
Prior to the late 1930s, a curious set of circumstances surrounded Catholic sociologists. Most of the trained Catholic sociologists in the United States were members of religious orders and/or professors in Catholic universities or colleges. The Jesuit educators, like other religious orders, found themselves in positions that offered them few, if any, concrete reasons to publish their studies. Little pressure was exerted on these sociologists by the institutions where they worked or by their religious communities to write, do research, or be published. The publish or perish mentality normally found by their secular counterparts in public institutions did not apply to them. Also, the economic stress of independent or family living expenses that a secular professor might have was not an issue to members of religious orders. Therefore, the additional monies received from publication to supplement the teaching income were not necessary.

Gradually, larger numbers of secular professors were teaching at Catholic universities. These sociologists were concerned with publication for both professional acceptability and economic reasons. Since most Catholic
sociologists trained in the Catholic institutions in the 1930s and 1940s had little or no training in methodology, they were considered to be primarily theorists. This lack of or inadequate training in methodology left the impression that the Catholic sociologist had little or no concept of correct sociological research. This proved a barrier to publishing in sociological journals. These professors found many of the secular learned societies biased in their treatment of Catholic professionals. Dr. Clement Mihanovich, for example, submitted numerous articles to the American Sociological Society (ASS)^1 for publication. All were rejected except one which was returned to him for correction. He made the suggested changes and resubmitted the article. After a wait of three months, he was informed that they would not be able to use the article at all. His experience with book reviews was equally negative. Of the many books that he had published, only one was reviewed by the ASS. This review read simply, "This textbook has been written by a Catholic." His experiences were not unique. Within the professional sociological circles, there were often subtle biases expressed toward Catholic sociologists who received their degrees from a Catholic instead of a public university. These Catholics were often very aware of

^1For the sake of brevity, the American Sociological Society will be referred to as ASS or ASA. This society changed its name to the American Sociological Association at a later date.
being treated with less respect than the secularly trained counterparts.²

At the organizational meeting of the American Catholic Sociological Society (ACSS)³ in March 1938, while expressing reasons grounded in very different backgrounds, both Dr. Paul Mundie and Fr. Ralph Gallagher suggested that the Society should publish a journal. Mundie, well known as a popular social club lecturer, suggested it as a means of exposure for their work to the general public. In order to reach as many people as possible, his theory was to use the journal as a vehicle to publishing their papers "... even philosophical papers couched in sociological language." He suggested that it might, "... be a good idea to publish a little magazine encouraging us to use sociological language showing the Catholic angle."⁴ Gallagher believed that one of the functions of membership should be the sharing of Catholic social thought and ideas to help each other solidify concepts or find appropriate sources of additional information to support their position. In order to accomplish this, he felt that it was important to write papers and discuss relevant books. The publication of a

² Mihanovich interview 20 August 1993
³ For the sake of brevity the American Catholic Sociological Society will be referred to as the ACSS.
⁴ Minutes of the American Catholic Sociological Society Organization meeting held on March 26, 1938 in Chicago, Illinois.
magazine would allow the membership to disseminate their work and aid one another. The magazine would allow their work to be available to researchers, students, teachers, and libraries in an easily accessible format.  

On September 29, 1938, Marguerite Reuss was chosen to be the editor of the proposed newssheet for ACSS activities. It was to include: the tentative program for the First Annual Convention, a roster of the Research Committee, the dates of other sociological conventions, a book review section, the Constitution of the ACSS, and the minutes of the organizational meeting. While the work was completed on this bulletin by October 8th, it never passed the galley proof stage because of the lack of proper authorization by the Hierarchy of the Catholic Church. (see chapter 1) While appearing to be a very valid reason, it is not clear if that was the only or the real reason for the delay. There is no indication if Ruess had any help with writing this bulletin, but there is an interesting line in a letter from Sr. Liguori to Reuss dated 22 December 1938, "I was sure that he [possibly Fr. Gallagher] had reached you before the printing was under way, because he was very much against its printing from the very start, particularly the book reviews." There was no further evidence found of a problem that Gallagher or

---

5 Ibid.
6 Rosenfelder, 96.
7 Ibid., 97.
anyone else might have had with the bulletin or any opposition to the book reviews. But, the Bulletin never officially went to print with the official reason being stated as the lack of proper ecclesiastical approval.

The Society did not formally print anything until after the First Annual Convention in December of 1938. A booklet entitled Report of the American Catholic Sociological Society was printed. It contained a summary of the papers read at the first convention, a copy of the Constitution, the minutes of the Business Meeting held at the convention, and a list of the membership.\textsuperscript{8} This booklet was sent to all members of the ACSS in June of 1939 and was viewed by Gallagher as a test balloon. If the Report was well received, it would be used as a strong argument for the creation of a periodical magazine for Catholic sociological thought. Gallagher received what he considered to be a suitable number of favorable letters and sufficient requests for copies to make publication of a formal journal a definite reality.

It was during the second annual convention in 1939 that the Quarterly Review came into being. At the Business Meeting, it was formally proposed and accepted unanimously that the annual dues be increased to three dollars "... to encourage a publication of some sort, the nature of the publication to be determined by the officers of the

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., 97-98.
Society." The responsibility for the organization and planning of the new journal was assigned to Gallagher.

On January 11, 1940, Gallagher sent a letter to the Executive Council calling for suggestions as to the format and contents of the Review, as well as the personnel needed to accomplish the task of publication. Rather than indicating the direction that the Review should take, his letter was a series of questions eliciting a broad range of responses. Sr. Mary Ann Joachim O.P. was in favor of articles and book reviews by members only, a section for sociological news, papers read at the conventions, a summary of the work of the Society to date, and dignified advertising. Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey suggested that the articles for the Review be solicited from anyone, even non-members, who could provide works of interest to Catholic sociologists. He also was in favor of a large book review section, but felt that an editorial page would be out of place in a scholarly journal. Not all responses were favorable to a large scale publication. Fr. Raymond Murray suggested, that for financial reasons, the Society should move slowly and build up a cash reserve in order to fund a "dignified" quarterly in the future. He also expressed concern as to the "who" that it would take to manage and write for such a large undertaking.\footnote{Ibid., 100.}
After duly noting the opinions expressed, Gallagher informed Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara of the decision to go forward with the publication. Bishop O'Hara's response was positive and appeared in the first issue of the Review which was published in March 1940. It read:

It is with great satisfaction to learn of the prospective publication of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW. It will provide an admirable vehicle for the work of our Catholic sociologists now happily cooperating in the American Catholic Sociological Society. May both the Society and the REVIEW prosper in the faithful performance of the important tasks for which they have been founded.\( ^{11} \)

O'Hara went on to sign the letter using his titles: Bishop of Kansas City; Chairman, Social Action Dept., N.C.W.C.; and Honorary President American Catholic Sociological Society. There was no question that O'Hara's approval carried with it the approval of the Catholic Church hierarchy.

With the affirmative vote of the membership, the suggestions of the Executive Council duly noted, and the approval of the Church hierarchy firmly supporting the decision, Dr. Paul Mundie, President of the ACSS, went ahead with the appointment of an editorial board. Mundie made it clear in his letter to the appointees that the Review would be under Gallagher's direction until the Board could propose a definite plan to the Council.\( ^{12} \) (see appendix 9) Dr. Franz


\( ^{12} \)Paul J. Mundie, Milwaukee, to Franz Mueller, St. Louis, 28 February 1940, Copy of original received from recipient.
Mueller was told in his copy of the letter that the first two issues would require little work because of the directive of the society to publish the papers of the annual convention in the first two issues. The Board, after that, would need to "take steps to secure papers of high scholarship." Gallagher, with the assistance of Edward Marciniak, assumed the task of co-ordinating the first volume of the Review. By March 1940, only three months after membership approval, the first issue was published.

Within the first few pages of the first volume of the Review there is a statement from President Paul Mundie introducing the new endeavor of the Society. Mundie stated the purpose of the Review very clearly when he wrote:

The REVIEW is intended to further the exchange of knowledge and to promote research among Catholic sociologists. . . . Three years ago the American Catholic Sociological Society was founded upon the express principle that sociology was more than a conglomerate of the social sciences and the Society was to offer a medium to scholars to aid in the development of a sociology consistent with fundamental truth. . . . It is expected that the REVIEW will not only publish the papers of the annual conventions, but will serve also in publishing research articles and book reviews. . . . Thus, we launch the quarterly in high hopes for its success as a scholarly and scientific contribution to sociology.13

His statements reflected two of the goals of the Society. One was to act as a channel for the publication of members' research projects and assist in the exchange of their ideas about sociology. The second and more fundamental goal was

for the Society to act as an agent to get the writings and opinions of Catholic sociologists into the public arena.

The first volume adhered closely to the recommendations made by the members of the Executive Council. The *Review* contained seven articles, six of which were from papers read at the Second Annual Convention. It also contained a summary of the Second Convention along with committee membership lists, resolutions passed, and the recommendations from the student session. There were two pages of news regarding members, other learned society meetings, and college class offerings. Placed prominently within the first few pages were a dedication to Frederic Siedenburg, S.J., citing him as a leader and pioneer in the field of Catholic Sociology, a list of the editorial board, and the statement from Paul Mundie.

**Policies**

The first volume of the journal set the format for the *Review* that would be followed for the next twenty years. While additional sections or lists appeared occasionally, there was no change to the basic structure. Even though the Editorial Board was very efficient in producing the first volume, not all the necessary policies and procedures were established or published before its dissemination. In the typical policy making fashion of the Society, problematic situations, rather than being anticipated, were addressed as
the need arose. Documentation regarding the proposal, acceptance, rejection, and/or amendment of any policy regarding the Review is very limited. Rarely were these policies ever disseminated to the general membership or potential contributors.

During the Second Annual Convention, Dr. Franz Mueller indicated that many members were interested in having their work published but were not certain where they could have this done. "Our articles are too Catholic for sociological periodicals and too sociological for Catholic periodicals." This lead to the establishment of a policy stating:

Manuscripts are accepted on the basis of their interest to sociologists and on the basis if their contribution to a scholarly and scientific sociology. Ordinarily the Society only publishes the writing of members of the Society. ¹⁴

As noted by Rosenfelder, a research census conducted by Reuss in 1938-39 indicated that the members had written 189 articles in 1938 and 279 in 1939. These numbers did not include pamphlets, books, monographs, or research projects. Even though there was a policy mandating the acceptance of only original material and never printing an article in toto which had appeared elsewhere, these figures suggested sufficient evidence that there would be an ample supply of articles from which the editorial board could draw for publication. ¹⁵ The reality of the situation did not prove to

¹⁴Rosenfelder, 108.

¹⁵Ibid., 109.
be as bountiful as it appeared to be for the census.

In August of 1940, Gallagher wrote to Dr. Paul Mundie expressing concern that he had only received one article for the September issue. Gallagher also expressed his frustration over the difficulty in obtaining material even from the members of the editorial board. During 1943, in a series of letters between Ross and Gallagher, he suggested that they remove the names of "inactive people and substitute people who would actually be interested in the magazine." Ross felt that these board members should be removed if they were not contributing to the Review. A compromise was reached by asking the Board members to provide "one acceptable article" annually for use in the Review. In 1944, still cautious regarding the supply of articles, Gallagher wrote to Furfey asking for an article to be used in the December issue. He wrote:

I have just enough material for the December issue if I use two rather lengthy and tortuous articles now in my possession. I would rather use one of them in the March issue if I can get another article by December 4th.

During the following years, much of the attention of the society was directed towards membership drives, increasing convention attendance, and the development of the local chapters. While discussions regarding the lack of articles did not become the main focus of Gallagher or the

---
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editorial board, the situation was still present. It is evidenced in a memorandum sent out by John Donovan in 1954 which discussed the status of the ACSS Research Council. In it he refers to a memo sent out in 1952 regarding the rethinking and reshaping of certain ACSS committees, Research Council included, that were, for the most part, inactive. Offered as partial explanation for the Research Council's inactivity was "... that individual and group research by Catholic sociologists is still disappointingly small." Donovan agreed with this earlier statement by adding, "... Since the preparation of this memorandum no evidence has appeared to challenge this critical evaluation of the Research Council and its activities."¹⁸ The lack of research is indicative of the situation. The less research done the fewer articles available for publication. While articles were accepted from anyone in the field, Catholic or not, little effort was made outside of the society to procure publishable papers. One of the goals of the ACSS was to stimulate research among Catholic sociologists. While admittedly not doing much to meet this goal, the leaders laissez-faire attitude did little to fill the pages of the Review.

In March 1960, a special report of the Committee on Committees was published offering some proposed changes to

the Constitution before coming to the convention. One such change was for Article III - Publications. This change was made in order to help increase the number of available articles and called for:

All papers included in the program of the annual convention are considered to be offered to THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW for first publication privilege. The Editor of the REVIEW shall acknowledge, immediately, receipt of written copies of these papers and shall notify the author of acceptance or rejection within three months of submission of written copy. Rights to publication automatically revert to the author if the Editor fails to send such publication notification. Any intention of an author to use material to be included in a paper given at a convention for publication other than in the REVIEW must be approved by the Editor of the REVIEW previous to delivery of the paper at the convention.¹⁹

In August of 1961, committee reports refer to this amendment being passed. The reports goes on to say:

There is not a large number of good articles submitted to the Review for publication. For this reason, in order to maintain high standards in the Review, a long range planning of issues, with the solicitation of articles, has been instituted. This practice included the appointment of special editors from the editorial board for certain issues to be devoted primarily, though not exclusively, to special topics. Future issues are planned which will be devoted to "Minority Groups," "Values and Medical Sociology," "Sociology and Higher Education," "The Family," "Catholics in American Society," "The Sociology of Religious Organization" and "Sociology and Catholic Values."

The publication of short research articles has been instituted as a means of bringing to publication good research material which for some reason is not in the form of an article of the usual length. . . .

Book reviews continue to be processed by the book review editor. A policy of publishing fewer but more

substantial reviews is under consideration. Also planned are some review articles.\textsuperscript{20}

It appears that throughout the journal's later stages it was just as plagued by a lack of articles as it was throughout its earlier history. Both Fr. Sylvester Sieber and Dr. Paul Reiss, during their tenures as editors, made references to the lack of articles of worth. They both suggested that, because of the constant need for additional articles, the journal experienced difficulty in sticking to its publication time table.

The most reliable statistics regarding the number of articles offered for publication are found in the Publications Committee reports of 1965, 1966, and 1968. The 1965 report, which appears to be typical of the quality and quantity of articles received, dealt with the six issues of \textit{Sociological Analysis} published between August 1, 1964 to July 31, 1965. During that time, eighty-two articles in total were submitted. From this group, the journal actually printed twenty-nine articles and research notes along with three review articles, and ten book reviews. This represented the work of thirty-seven authors or co-authors. Regarding the rest of the articles, three were withdrawn by the respective authors, thirty were rejected, seventeen were returned for revision, and five were still being reviewed. It is interesting to note that fifty-nine of these eighty-

\textsuperscript{20}\textit{American Catholic Sociological Review}, Vol. XXII, No. 3 (September 1961): 262.
two articles came from papers presented at the 1964 meetings of the ACSS. The statistics regarding these convention papers show that seventeen were accepted, twenty-two rejected, three withdrawn, fifteen returned for revision, and one was left for review.  

It is not indicated in these reports or other documentation why so many articles were rejected or conversely why so few were submitted. During his tenure as editor, Dr. Paul Mundy expressed an ease with the review procedures. He indicated that he considered the percentage of rejections to be neither significantly above or below the norm for journals of this size and limited scope.  

The original editorial policy called for especially questionable papers to be passed among the board members for opinions. The lack of geographical proximity of the board lead to frustration and problems on this part of both the authors and the board. The time needed to send these papers around the country lead to unavoidable delays in notifying

---


22 Dr. Paul J. Mundie was one of the founding members of the ACSS. He was associated with Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. This reference is made to Dr. Paul Mundy, a member of Loyola University’s faculty, who served as President of the ACSS in 1965 and who also served as editor of the Review.

23 Mundy interview 10 November 1993.
authors if the submission would be used or not. In some circumstances, the lack of communication between the editor and the author left the author wondering if the document had even been received. Other authors had other publication offers on these same papers that could not be responded to pending the decision of the ACSS editorial board. The approval procedures irritated some authors and had a definite impact on their willingness to write for the Review.\(^{24}\) While this type of process was not unusual for journal publications, the authors seemed to think that the smaller ACSS should be capable of more personal and timely responses. This reaction could be assessed as a sense of the author doing the Review a favor by submitting articles to it instead of a secular publication. The actual review process was not explained in detail or in print to potential authors until the publication of the 1965 Publications Committee report mentioned earlier. The process, as it then stood, called for two members of the editorial board to independently review each article. A third member would review any article upon which there was a substantial difference of opinion from the first two reviewers. The editor received the reviews of each article. The author would receive detailed comments on the paper regardless of the editorial decision made to publish or not.\(^{25}\)

\(^{24}\)Rosenfelder, 113.

\(^{25}\)Publications Committee Report 1965.
procedure does not seem exceptionally difficult or vague to warrant the continual difficulty in obtaining a sufficient quantity of acceptable articles.

Except for two notable instances, there is little documentation regarding either the acceptance or the rejection of particular articles until the late 1960s. These exceptions include one that occurred in 1943. The Review did not publish an article by Sr. Ann Joachim, even though it had already been typeset, because it had been printed in another magazine. The other revolved around the publication of a controversial article written by Gordon Zahn after World War II.

The lack of articles was not the only problem that plagued the Review. Numerous typographical and substantive errors appeared within its pages. Throughout the journal, corrections appeared under the heading "Corrigenda." An article written by Dr. Franz Mueller which appeared in the December 1943 issue highlighted the types of mistakes that were made. The five errors in that one article included: "res publica" for "republica", "identity of civitas" for "identity or civitas", "have no part" for "have a part", "into that of a still" for "into a still", and "as one of wants and economic intercourse" for "as one of the wants as

26Rosenfelder, 110.
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economic." \(^{28}\) This was not an isolated instance nor were proofreading errors found for only a short duration. In a letter dated July 26, 1949, Dr. C.J. Nuesse wrote to Gallagher:

> On the Review, I gather that there are serious printing problems, though I do not know specifically what they are. Proof reading needs to be more carefully planned, I believe -- there were, for example, a considerable number of errors in Father Harte's paper as it appeared in the March issue.\(^{29}\)

At the Seventeenth Annual Convention held December 28-30, 1955, the following resolutions were passed.

The American Catholic Sociological Society also resolves that any article published in *The American Catholic Sociological Review* and later incorporated into a book either in its exact form or in a substantially equivalent form should include a courtesy acknowledgement of such prior publication in the Review.

Be it further resolved that *The American Catholic Sociological Review* shall have prior publication rights to all papers presented at the annual meetings of the Society, and the Review shall be provided with advance copies of all papers considered for such publication.\(^{30}\)

Various policies were established without much discussion or debate. It was the practice of the Society that the editorial board be appointed by the incoming


\(^{29}\)American Catholic Sociological Society Executive Council Meeting minutes, 30 July 1949. American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

president of the ACSS. The only indication of the workings of this selection process appear in a letter from Gallagher to Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey. Gallagher expressed his opinion that the consideration of this appointment should be based on the person being a prominent member of the Society and a writer, preferably having written for the Review. In the beginning, this drastically limited the eligible numbers of candidates for the positions.\textsuperscript{31} No formal policy was ever printed as to how the board was selected. One issue that did make it to the policy level regarded an honorarium to be paid for any article published. It was simply decided that no honorarium would be paid to any contributor. Nor would any stipend be paid to the editor or any editorial board member. In order to try and ease this strict stance, at a business meeting held in December 1952, a resolution was read by Sister Mary Liguori, B.V.M., Chairman of the Committee on Awards. It established an award to be given annual. The policy read:

An award of $100 shall be made annually (but withheld any year in which there is no adequate publication of creditable dimensions in the field of sociology) to a person or persons who have been selected by a committee of five members appointed by the President at the annual business meeting to be known as the "committee on Awards" (the selection not subject to Executive Council veto and not to be made for text books or for those largely edited or for dissertations per se) for a sociological contribution made by a member of the society and published in the calendar year between October 15 to October 14

\textsuperscript{31}Rosenfelder, 109.
immediately preceding the business meeting.\textsuperscript{32}

The Committee on Awards unanimously named the Rev. Dr. Paul Hanly Furfey as the first recipient of the $100 award for his publication, \textit{The Scope and Method of Sociology}. It was judged the outstanding sociological contribution for the period October 15, 1952 to October 14, 1953. They went on to call for nominations for the time period of October 15, 1953 to October 14, 1954 so that the second award could be granted at the annual meeting in December 1954.\textsuperscript{33}

In reference again to the lack of articles and their quality, the Awards Committee report of 1963 states that it had only received two submissions for the Award: Nicholas Timasheff, \textit{The Sociology of Luigi Sturzo} and Thomas Imse, \textit{The Professionalization of Business Management}. Holdovers from previous years when no award was given because of the paucity of submissions were: Gordon Zahn, \textit{German Catholics and Hitler's Wars} and Sister Mary Elizabeth Dye: \textit{By Their Fruits}. The award was given:

\begin{quote}
In recognition of his scholarly attempt to penetrate the social thought of Luigi Sturzo and to draw out its sociological implications and in recognition of his long years of service to The American Catholic Sociological Society the Committee has voted to grant the award to Nicholas Timasheff for his book, \textit{The Sociology of Luigi Sturzo}. Furthermore, because of the significance of the issues raised the Committee voted to give an honorable mention to Gordon Zahn, \textit{German Catholics and Hitler's}
\end{quote}


Wars.  

It is interesting to note that the award for the paper was also supported in "... recognition of his long years of service." It makes it sound like the committee could not justify the award based on the work's merit alone. There are other occasions when the award was not given.

During the business meeting held on December 29, 1942 four resolutions were adopted. One of the resolutions read:

Be It Further Resolved That: The American Catholic Sociological Society exert its best efforts to encourage its members to foresee needed research for the exigencies of the times and the problems of the future and to promote this research by all means in its power.  

It was also decided that case studies, biographies, or any article which might coincide with the publications found in other Catholic magazines [ie., Thought, Commonweal, America, etc.] and which were not strictly sociological in nature would not be published in the Review.

In 1961 Paul Reiss, speaking as Editor, offered some recommendations to the Society. One of his proposed amendments referred to the Society's standing as a non-profit organization. He says:

The American Catholic Sociological Society as a professional society is and has been a non-profit

---
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organization. However, there is no reference to this situation in the Constitution. An explicit statement in the Constitution that the Society is established as a non-profit organization would be very helpful for tax exemptions, postal rates, and other purposes.  

He further points out that there is no constitutional provision authorizing the publication of The American Catholic Sociological Review or its establishment as the official journal of The American Catholic Sociological Society. Like many other issues in the Society, the existing situations or practices were often not backed up by policy. Reiss felt strongly that it was appropriate that such an important activity of the Society should be explicitly authorized and established in the Constitution of the Society. To that end, he proposed the following amendment to the Constitution:

To Article II the following paragraph is added:

As one means of achieving its purposes, the Society shall publish The American Catholic Sociological Review as its official journal. Through the publication of articles, book reviews, news and announcements, The American Catholic Sociological Review shall serve as a medium of communication among the membership of the Society and other interested readers on professional and sociological matters.  

In order to compensate for the lack of articles and to make sure that acceptable size volume went into publication on time, numerous minor format changes were implemented. The first was an expansion of the book review section to include

---
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a short review section and a periodical section. The "News of Sociological Interest" was expanded to include openings, sabbaticals, and other societies' conventions and occasionally a summary of various meetings. A roster of members was periodically printed, as well as, a list of research projects, papers, and books. The Review was also used as a vehicle of communication regarding their own committee reports and convention news. Occasionally, an entire issue was devoted to one topic. Very few of these changes lasted for any length of time and appeared to be included as stop-gap measures to arouse interest or provide a fresh look. These measures were evident in the Editor's notes preceding the issue on de Chardin which read:

In July 1962 a "monitum" on the work of de Chardin was issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office. This "monitum" neither condemns the work outright nor forbids the reading or discussion of it but simply calls attention to dangers contained therein in the application of theories and concepts of evolution to metaphysics and theology. The "monitum" thus does not raise obstacles to our discussion here of the sociological implications of the work of de Chardin.

The coincidental issuance of the "monitum" regarding de Chardin would make examination of his work in this related field an adventurous subject for discussion for Catholic sociologists.

---

39 Volume 23, Number 4 (December 1962) was devoted to the work of the French paleontologist, Pierre Tielhard De Chardin.

Contents of the Review

From the Review's inception, the editorial board felt that it was important to include a section that would highlight and disseminate news items that might be of interest to the members. The purpose of this section was clear in its purpose. It was meant to act as a networking source for the members and spread the word about conventions, major curricular changes, or the opening of new departments. Often notices of new books published or research being conducted by a member was included. Occasionally, faculty openings were published along with scholarship and research grant availability. There was never a set policy as to what should be included. In the beginning, the section ran approximately two pages and often appeared to be a haphazard collection of information until the late 1950s and early 1960s. In 1961 the section title was changed to "New & Announcements" and Sr. Miriam took over as its editor. Using her social contacts within the Society, as well as editorial skills, the section grew in size to a well organized 4 to 6 pages per issue. The new format included news of institutions, people, and meetings. Since the Review contained formal book and periodical review sections and publisher advertisements, there was little need to include the latest publication by the members. With the completion of Sr. Miriam's tenure as section editor in 1964, "News & Announcements" was dropped from the journal without
any explanation. By the Spring 1966 issue of *Sociological Analysis*, it was announced that Jack Curtis and Ralph Lane of the University of San Francisco were to serve as editors of a newsletter for the membership independent of publication in the journal. Using the familiar language of the original news section, the newsletter was to serve as a:

medium of communication among members of the Society. The newsletter will contain news of members of the Society; announcements of special meetings; institutes, etc.; notification of vacancies and applicants for positions; reports of the Society and its committees.41

The intention was to publish the newsletter quarterly using the same time frame as the Journal. They selected the name "News and Announcements" to give an attitude of openness and make it "less stuffy than the usual." The intention was to fill it with news about meetings, departments, schools, regional activities, and individuals. By January 9, 1968, Ralph Lane was writing to Sr. Claire Marie Sawyer, Executive Secretary of the ACSS, regarding the state of the "New and Announcements" and possibly offering a glimpse into why it was dropped. He wrote:

Jack Curtis and I did want to explain {To the executive Council at their meeting} why the Newsletter has not appeared. Well, simply and solely because we get virtually no news sent to us. Probably they see no point in doing so because we don’t come out often enough, but

our assessment is that:

1) The places that are very active (e.g. Notre Dame, Fordham, etc.,) don't need News & Announcements. They either have their own or they send stuff to the American Sociologist; or

2) ACSS members don't do a whale of a lot!

In any event, regardless of the reasons, we have a recommendation:

Semi-annual publication would be sufficient. One issue in the Fall with a call for papers for the next annual meeting and as much business of the Society as should be included. Incidentally, there never has been any regular policy on how much of the business of the Society should appear in N&A. The summer or late spring issue could carry a preliminary program and as much information on the forthcoming meeting as possible. Most of Vol. 1 and a good part of one issue of Vol. 2 are devoted to the annual meeting. So, we guess that's what N&A is all about.42

Sr. Claire Marie forwarded the letter along to Br. Eugene Janson, President of the ACSS for his comments. Janson felt strongly that the "News and Announcements" should be maintained. He agreed with the concept of two per year but suggested that they budget for three in case it was needed. He felt that "a set policy must be laid down by the Executive Council as to the items of business that should be included in the publication."43

In tandem with the "News and Announcements" section, a short-lived section entitled "Notes of Sociological Interest" was begun in the October 1944 issue. Its purpose

42Ralph Lane, San Francisco, to Sr. Claire Marie Sawyer, OSF, Milwaukee, 9 January 1968, Transcript at American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives. Marquette University, Milwaukee.

43Eugene Janson, San Antonio, to Sr. Claire Marie Sawyer, OSF, Milwaukee, 30 January 1968, Transcript at American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives. Marquette University, Milwaukee.
was to be a brief informative, yet in-depth section of interest to the members. Various curricular events, training, seminars, etc. were described. It was to be more than a simple listing of time and location. Rather it included a short but detailed description of the topics to be covered. The section ran quarterly through the October 1948 issue.

A section first published in 1938 was the result of a research census compiled by Marguerite Reuss. The census resulted in a list including monographs, books, pamphlets, magazine and newspaper articles which had all been written by the members of the ACSS. This appeared to be a valuable tool in furthering one of the goals of the Society which was encouragement of sociological research. The quality and quantity of work listed in the original census was one of the main reasons that Gallagher felt that a journal would be successful. Much to the dismay of Gallagher and the editorial board, little of it made its way onto the pages of the Journal. While Ruess's name appeared in the listing of the Editorial Board members from December 1941 until December 1945 followed by the title "Director of ACSS Research Census," this feature only appeared in 1940, 1941, and 1942. The only possibly related reappearance of this section is found in the "Notes of Sociological Interest" published in December 1947 with the listing of graduate dissertations in Sociology from 1943 through 1947.
The Roster of ACSS was a section that would only appear sporadically. When it first appear in June 1941, it was intended as an annual feature. It did appear again in 1942 and 1943 but was then dropped. By October 1946, the title was changed to a "Who's Who Among Catholic Sociologists" and the data for this enlarged section was compiled by Clement Mihanovich. Rather than being a list of members, their academic affiliation and tenure in the ACSS, the expanded biographical sketches were intended to give more personal information about the members. The intent was to build the self-esteem of the ACSS by letting the members know what positions, accomplishments, and leadership roles had been attained by the Catholic sociologists in the ACSS. It was intended to instill pride and a desire to do more in each member. The production of this list proved to be very tedious and time consuming.\(^{44}\) This section appeared only once again in 1951. In 1954, a simplified list of members offering only their names and addresses appeared for the last time.

The Book Review section has been an integral part of the journal since the beginning. As the numbers of available or acceptable articles varied, this section took on a different significance. The first issue in 1940 started with only two reviews. After its publication, Dr. Paul Mundie, President of the ACSS, wrote to Gallagher complimenting the

\(^{44}\)Mihanovich interview 20 August 1993.
Review but suggesting that, "The book reviews, however are not my idea of what scholarly book review should be." This letter prompted Gallagher to write to several Catholic publishers requesting copies of appropriate books to be reviewed. By April, after receiving five books for review and the promise of others to follow, Gallagher wrote to Mundie suggesting that it would now be appropriate to appoint a book review editor. In 1942 Paul Mundie was appointed Book Review Editor and held that position until 1943 when co-editors were appointed. The section grew in size under the direction of numerous editors, with an all time high of fifty-one reviews being printed in September 1957. (see appendix 12) By 1964, the Review had completed its transformation into Sociological Analysis and the size of this section dropped drastically. In 1965, Robert McNamara, S.J., became Book Review editor replacing Donald Barrett who resigned after several years of service. In a report issued in 1965, a decline in activity in this section was blamed on the transition of editors not on a format change.

By the June 1943 issue, a new feature was added to

---
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the Book Review section. In this issue seven books were reviewed, but there were also three "Shorter Notices" which became simply "Short Notices." It included reviews of a yearbook of social work, a consumer information handbook, and a pamphlet. While the nature of these works did not call for a detailed and lengthy review, the editors felt that they carried enough content to be brought to the attention of the subscribers. The short notices were usually a brief paragraph. The abbreviated length of the review did not stop the reviewers from being candid in their analysis. In a 1945 issue, one book was described as, "This work is one of propaganda in the best sense of the term." Another reads, ".. the authors necessarily lack the Catholic positive attitude, but they make a good attempt to be fair to religion, and even the Catholic attitude." Unlike the regular book reviews, who the authors and/or editors of these short reviews were is not mentioned. These notices ran regularly through October 1957. From then until March, 1963 they ran sporadically. They did not appear at all in Sociological Analysis.

Volume 1 of the 1946 edition offered for the first time a section called "Periodic Review." C. J. Nuesse was listed as the editor. Three articles were reviewed. In an opening comment, Nuesse wrote:

members of the Society who peruse the first six volumes of their official publication will be convinced that there has been both expansion in the scope of its service and to Catholic social thought. While sociological research and theoretical are well reported in other journals, the progress of the REVIEW has demonstrated that Catholic sociologists require an organ to serve their own particular needs. Through it they can make available the results of their own investigations, as well as critical evaluations of sociological literature undertaken from a point of view consistent with sound philosophy and theological principles. They can also find in it a medium for contacts with other students of social science or social action who share the Catholic tradition. These general objectives will determine the particular aims of this department in presenting brief notices of current periodical literature.

At least until additional space can be allotted, or until readers clearly indicate other preferences, the scope of these reviews will be limited to articles on specifically sociological subjects or subjects on the margin of sociology which have special pertinence for Catholics [his italics]. No attempt will be made to list or review other significant contributions to sociological literature which do not have such pertinence. Readers are invited to comment on this policy, to suggest articles for review, or to submit brief signed reviews to the department editor.50

Each issue of volumes published from 1946, Volume VII, through 1949, Volume IX, carried these reviews. The 1950, Volume XI, publications carried no reviews of this type. They began again in 1951 and appeared regularly through March 1958. They did not appear again until the publication of the last one in September 1960.

In the first issue of Volume VIII of 1947, brief summaries, along with length and purchase price, of five doctoral dissertations were printed. There is no indication

---

given as to why these five were chosen or included. This was repeated in numbers two and four of 1947 and once in 1948 and once again in 1949.

Starting in March 1957, each issue had a list of publications received for review. This continued through September 1958 Volume XIX, Number 3. Again, no explanation is given for this publication. In September 1959 a list of reviews lost due to a fire at the publishers was printed. The list of publications received appeared only a few times after that with no regularity.

The inclusion of an index to each volume first appeared in December 1941. It appeared only on the final pages of the final publication for that year. It listed the title of the article, the author, and page number. The index continued to appear regularly until 1960. It only appeared again in 1965 and 1966.

While the agenda of the annual convention was published with great regularity, many other items of interest were not afforded the same treatment. There seems to be no pattern or underlying reason why and when some of these items were published. Scattered throughout the issues can be found the constitution, constitutional suggested changes [but not all], and committee reports. Also, small obituaries were published on the more prominent members of the society.  
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51Fr. Ralph Gallagher obituary was published in Vol. XXIV, No. 4 (December 1964): 255.
Notation of other members' deaths were published in the "News of Sociological Interest" section.

There was an attempt made to stimulate debate and discussion about the articles printed. A mildly controversial article was published in the June 1943 edition of the Review. The article was entitled "A Postwar Reconstruction Program for the American Catholic Sociological Society" and written by Robert C. Hartnett, S.J.. A notation on the bottom of the page read, "The editorial board of the REVIEW would welcome additional comment upon the matters discussed in this issue by Father Hartnett and Miss Ross." The hoped for result would be an ongoing written discussion and clarification of Catholic thought which directly referred back to one of the ACSS primary goals. These hoped for responses did not materialize. On July 4, 1943, Gallagher wrote to Hartnett to bemoan the fact that a letter from Hartnett was the only letter received regarding the above mentioned article.

In an attempt to revitalize this section, on the back of the title page of the June 1967 issue, the following announcement appeared:

THE AUTHORS MEET THE REVIEWERS

In the summer issue we shall inaugurate a new department which we shall run whenever appropriate. Because of the
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first two reviews in this issue, we think that a most appropriate time has come to start the new department. Our plan is essentially this: whenever a reviewer takes serious issue with a book we shall open the pages of Sociological Analysis to rebuttal and counter-rebuttal by author and reviewer.

-Bk. Rev. Ed. 54

The following pages of the journal indicated that the members took little opportunity to use this option.

In the September 1959 issue, a section entitled "From the Editor's Desk" appears for the first time. It was initiated as an opportunity from the editor to describe what the coming pages hold or to make comments to the readers. The issue that it appeared in was the twentieth anniversary issue of the journal. In it, Sylvester A. Sieber, editor wrote:

The criticism might well be leveled at us that we have not permitted authors to use the pages of the magazine to engage in or provoke violent controversy but such criticism is based upon the false Hegelian assumption that truth will only eventuate from the collision of acrid and headstrong disagreements as if good music is produced only by climatic dissonances or that anger is the only genuine sign of character. The pursuance of the true, the good and the beautiful in any field of endeavor demands self-discipline and that applies a fortiori to any science that probes into the "why" the "how" and the "wherefore" of human interaction and behavior. Although we have never mouthed the "Preserve me from all that is ugly" of one of Ibsen's characters, we have always maintained that one need not employ the frenetic and fanatic approach to lay hold of the cultural and social realities of the human scene. 55


This statement appeared during the middle of the Zahn controversy.

**Finances**

The cost of publishing the Review was a concern from the very beginning. The Review was published by the Mission Press of the Society of the Divine Word at Techny, Illinois beginning in 1940. They published the Review at far below cost and, at the same time, produced a high quality printed product. Without this financial support, the publication could not have lasted long at all. Techny’s contribution was so great that at the Business Meeting at the 1946 Convention, Ralph Gallagher publicly expressed the ACSS appreciation for their efforts:

> The Review has not paid for itself in printing and publishing. If it were not for the kindness and generosity of the Society of the Divine Word fathers and brothers at the Mission press at Techny, Illinois, the ACSS would never have been able to carry on this most important and much needed project. I would like to thank publicly Father Markert and his workers for their kindness to the ACSS.\(^{56}\)

The Society of the Divine Word continued to publish the Review until 1948 when a decrease in their staff forced them to discontinue this service.

Even with the constant plea for articles and the financial assistance from Techny, the Review often appeared to be floundering. Within the minutes of the Executive

\(^{56}\)Rosenfelder, 123.
Council meeting held on July 30, 1949, there is a brief but significant paragraph regarding the Review. It read in part:

. . . Sister M. Gabriel wrote that because of the delays in publishing, interest in the magazine is weakened so getting that set seems to be of primary importance. The same view was expressed by Dr. Nuesse. Dr. Mihanovich suggested that shorter, and more articles be included in each issue and reports of the research committees be printed. Dr. Huth suggested some changes in format and indicated that advertisements would help cover expenses. 57

Later in the same minutes, it was reported that the ACSS was running at a deficit of $275.57. This deficit was in spite of the fact that the Society had carried forward a balance of $258.45 from the previous year. Most of the expenses were tied up in printing costs and associated clerical and postage costs. The monies available were based on a total membership of 225. 58

Often, the reports of subscription numbers were sketchy. While they were tied to membership numbers, they were not always the same and, at times, fluctuated greatly. The first issue in March 1940 was sent to all the 228 registered members of the ACSS. The March 1948 issue was sent to a total 575 subscribers. This outnumbered the membership of the ACSS by almost 200. Of these, fifty-two subscriptions were sent to foreign countries. 59

---
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difficulties arose regarding dues and the money spent on publication and associated mailing costs.

In 1958, there was an all out attempt made to increase membership size and subscription. The society established regional directors of membership and advertising. Quotas of ten new members and one ad had been set for each regional director to be met before December 19, 1958. They were encouraged to discuss the journal and the ACSS with their colleagues and students. The directors were also asked to show their support of the Society by "using and recommending use of the Review for classroom assignment." Ad rates were set as $10 through $35 inside the Review and $15 to $50 for an inside cover or back cover ad. It was even suggested that the representative find some way to meet with "your local Ordinary and interesting him in our Society." A listing of other directors was enclosed in order that " ... you get in touch with them and map out your respective prospects to avoid wasted effort."

From a report issued in September 1961, it was clear that subscription numbers and the associated cost of

60Francis Emerick, Chicago, to General Membership of the American Catholic Sociological Society, 18 September 1958, Transcript at the American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives. Marquette University, Milwaukee.

61Francis Emerick, Chicago, to Regional Directors of Membership and Advertising, 15 September 1958, Transcript at the American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives. Marquette University, Milwaukee.
publishing the journal was a pressing issue. During the year covered by the report, much time was spent placing the membership records in order. At that time, there were approximately 400 subscriptions, most of those from libraries and including about forty-five foreign subscriptions. Approximately half of the subscriptions were handled by subscription agencies. As of April 1, 1961, 165 subscriptions for the current year were not paid up. This number actually represented a larger percentage of subscriptions than memberships paid up for that calendar year.

There were a few sources of financial drain that were addressed that year. Complementary subscribers who were almost entirely foreign, were notified that their subscription would be put on a regular basis and that they, therefore, would be expected to pay for the journal. All exchange subscriptions with other periodicals, which were also entirely foreign, were cancelled. These exchange subscriptions were not viewed as beneficial to the Society.\(^6\)

The financial report also indicated the need for some very serious financial measures to be taken. The income from membership and subscriptions and a $246 contribution from

---

Marquette University\textsuperscript{63} amounted to $1,956.45. The to-date expenses totaled $1,538.04, leaving a balance as of August 5, 1961 of $418.41. The estimated expenses for the remainder of the calendar year were $3,110. Minus the additional help from Marquette, that left an estimated deficit of $1,940. This report was followed by a notation which read:

> It should be noted that this deficit for 1961 results from all expenses for the year being incurred by the office at Marquette while about one-half of the subscription and membership income for 1961 was paid to the former business office [Loyola]. Marquette will support the editorial work carried on there up to $1,000 annually.\textsuperscript{64}

In order to help ease the financial strain of publication, President Andrew Greeley established an Advertising Committee in July of 1961. This committee was composed of Sr. Rebecca as Chairperson, Sr. Florence Marie, and Br. Herbert Leies. This group did not become operative due to a temporary inability to serve and be present at the convention by two of its members. It was replaced in August 1961 by Br. Herbert Leies, Chairperson, Sr. Mercedes, O.S.B., Dr. Donald Barrett, and Mr. Paul Hanlon. The committee's functions were listed as: soliciting ads for the Review and convention program, setting advertising rates and policies, and notifying the secretary-treasurer of orders

\textsuperscript{63}These funds were donated by Marquette University because the editor was employed there and solicited these funds.

\textsuperscript{64}American Catholic Sociological Review, Vol. XXII, No. 3 (September 1961): 264-265.
and bills. The first list of advertisers for the convention programs was compiled, additional publishers rates were set, and policies regarding copy were established. The committee suggested that the Review should do "... no over-loading ... with advertising, nor cheapening ... by ads not in dignity with the Review." It was also suggested that, in order not to infringe on reading space in the present standard 100 page issue, advertisements should be restricted to no more than six pages (4 inside pages, 2 for back cover). If eight or more pages of advertisements were secured, an additional eight pages of copy would be needed to bring the Review up to 108 pages. The estimated current cost to printing one page of the review was $12. They set a projected deadline of October, 1961 to mail letters to the publishers seeking advertising. In 1965, the securing exhibitors and renting display spaces at the conventions was taken over by a Coordinator of Exhibits appointed to represent the three Societies meeting jointly at that convention. Those three Societies were the ACSS, The Rural Sociological Society, and the Society for the Study of Social Problems.

On July 31, 1966, The Advertising committee submitted a

65 American Catholic Sociological Society Advertising Committee Meeting minutes, 29 August 1961. Transcript at the American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives. Marquette University, Milwaukee.
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report discussing the securing of advertising space in Sociological Analysis from August 1965 through August 1966. The year's total was eight and one half pages (two pages per issue). This was a similar amount to the previous year publication. No campaign to address advertising was undertaken for 1966 because the publisher could not guarantee that deadline dates for the various issues of Sociological Analysis would be met. The committee felt that this would be detrimental to their personal and professional image and future requests for advertisements. For the 1966 convention, thirty-five publishing houses and university presses were contacted. Only five pages of advertising came from this campaign. The explanation given for the very limited response was "small membership attending the conventions" and ".... the giant ASA convention immediately following ours is attended by a number of the A.C.S.S. members." The income generated from these attempts for the year totalled $380 with the convention only bringing in an extra $250. Total receipts were estimated at $630. A further financial benefit came when all expenditures for postage and similar items were absorbed by the Sociology Department of St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Texas.\footnote{Herbert Leies, San Antonio, to Andrew Greeley, Chicago, 31 July 1966, Transcript at the American Catholic Socioligical Society Collection, Marquette University Archives. Marquette University, Milwaukee.} Based on the publishing commitment problems and the cost of
publication, the committee decided to look for a different printer. Bids were taken and it was hoped that the change would realize a saving of $1,200 annually on printing costs.\footnote{American Catholic Sociological Society Publications Committee Annual Report, 1968. Transcript at the American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives. Marquette University, Milwaukee.}

In a 1965 Publications Committee Report, it was stated that the Committee operated during the year without any funds from the Society since the budget request of 1964 was not granted. During that year, all office and postage expenses had to be met from different sources. As a side note, there were also no editorial meetings held that year. A graduate assistant from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Fordham University continued to do the editorial work for the Review. The committee renewed its budget request of $500 from the ACSS which consisted of $200 for postage and office supplies, $100 for editorial expenses (e.g. translations and publication rights) and $200 for editorial board meetings.\footnote{American Catholic Sociological Society Publications Committee Annual Report, 1965.}

In the annual report given in 1966, notice was given to the readers that the ACSS did grant $200 for postage and office supplies, and the other $300 was also granted for the specified use. The committee reported that it did not need to make use of these other funds but went on to request the
same financial backing for the next year. It was noted that Fordham would still continue to supply a half-time graduate assistant for the editorial work.\(^{70}\)

In 1968, there was a repeat of the request for the renewal of the $200 budget for postage and supplies. Fordham would also continue to supply the services of a graduate student for editorial purposes.

**Zahn Controversy**

In 1955, Gallagher’s tenure as Editor of the *Review* officially ended. He decided to remain active and involved in the publication by assuming the position of Managing Editor which he kept until 1958. It was in 1955 that the Editor’s position was passed on to Paul Mundy, also of Loyola University Chicago. Mundy received no directions prior to assuming this position as to the nuances of the job of editor of a church affiliated publication. As in a situation similar to the one encountered by Marguerite Reuss when writing the first news-sheet that never was published, Mundy had no advance knowledge of the intricacies of ecclesiastical approval and the implicit arrangements with the NCWC. Yet, it was the responsibility of the editor to  

\(^{70}\)American Catholic Sociological Society Publications Committee Annual Report, 1966. Transcript at the American Catholic Socioligical Society Collection, Marquette University Archives. Marquette University, Milwaukee.
accept or reject articles for publication.\textsuperscript{71}

Gordon Zahn was an Associate Professor of Sociology at Loyola University Chicago. After doing research in post-war Germany regarding the role of the German Catholic press under the Nazi regime, he wrote a lengthy paper presenting what he believed to be an accurate presentation of the situation. In 1958, Zahn sent a copy of his manuscript to his friend C.J. Nuesse for review. In a letter dated December 4, 1958, Zahn candidly explained the article and his concerns about it to Nuesse. He referred to the piece possibly being considered to be a "tract" based on content rather than rhetoric. He went on to say:

For my primary focus was not upon the bishops but upon Catholic behavior in general. The question I set for myself was not "Why did the Catholic bishops support Hitler's wars?" but rather "Why did Catholics in Germany support Hitler's wars?" And here, I think, the social control frame of reference does serve a purpose in that it becomes clear that one reason was the fact that their religious leaders declared it obligatory for them to do so. . . . Catholics in Germany (and apparently in the U.S. as well, if editorial prudence is an index) refuse to admit the fact; and when they are forced to face it, they advance a host of excuses and justifications. . . . The most vulnerable point of the whole paper, I think, is the assumption that Hitler's wars were unjust and that Catholics in general (and the bishops as well) had an opportunity to recognize this. The whole "value selection" frame of reference stands or falls on this point, and there is no objective evidence that can be advanced to support it.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{71}Mundy interview 10 November 1993.

\textsuperscript{72}Gordon Zahn, Chicago, to C. Joseph Nuesse, Washington, 4 December 1958, Transcript at Nuesse Collection, Catholic University of America Archives. Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
Zahn knew well that his paper would be a cause for controversy. He was expecting to be challenged on his interpretations of the information he gathered. He went on to say:

I think I can hold for the validity of my interpretations on this score, but I would be hard pressed to offer any empirical bases of support for them. Unless I miss my guess, this is the point that my ex-major-professor will strike the hardest.\(^{73}\)

He felt compelled to write the article based, not only on his research of the events of World War II, but also on his current observations. Zahn felt that there was a disturbing trend developing among contemporary theologians regarding pacifism. He refers to a group of German theologians, including Fleckenstein, a friend, and Hirschmann, who had recently gone on record as upholding the legitimacy of nuclear defense. He cites Bishop Wright as speaking out against pacifism. John Cogley is referred to as suggesting that, even though modern wars can not meet the conditions of a just war, efforts should be devoted to reducing the likelihood of future wars rather than concerning ourselves about this point. Zahn proposed these actions as having one thing in common, "... the obsessive fear that Catholics will somehow become too extreme in their opposition to war or will be misled into an imprudent commitment to peace."

Zahn went on to enforce his stand by saying:

I fear that Catholics will become too extreme in their

\(^{73}\)Ibid., 4 December 1958.
commitment to collective security based on military power and that they will be misled into a "prudent" acceptance of immoral means of warfare because "there is nothing else we (like the German bishops) can do." And I have history on my side because this is precisely what happened in World War II. I believe that it happened on both sides of the conflict, but its outlines are far less disputable with reference to the German side than with reference to the Allied side.

If we are obliged to take a risk -- and I think the Christian in a secular-oriented world always has to do so -- I would think it preferable to risk erring on the side of pacifist "imprudence" than on the side of a too-worldly "prudence" that tends to produce an absolute identification of the interests of the Church with those of the national state. This happened in Germany in World War II; it is happening there today; it is happening here today.\footnote{rbid., 4 December 1958.}

It was obvious from the length and the tone of this letter that Zahn saw this as a priority. He observed and disagreed with those theologians tending toward peace at all costs, even if that meant nuclear build up and the use of massive military preparations as a threat. Nuesse returned his comments and suggested that there were some areas of the paper that he felt might be vulnerable.

Zahn submitted the topic and read his paper in September at the Political Sociology section of the 1959 ACSS meeting. He also submitted the article for publication to Mundy, the ACSR outgoing editor, who accepted it for publication. As Zahn predicted, the paper received much publicity. From the start, the publicity from the Chicago secular press was positive. But, a few weeks later, there was a strong negative and biased attack on it especially...
from the Chicago Catholic press. Zahn stood firm regarding his conclusions and Mundy stood firm in his decision to print the paper. In 1959, Sylvester Sieber, S.V.D. took over the position of Editor of the ACSR. Zahn's paper was in the galley stage when he was notified by Sieber that the piece was being withdrawn from publication. Gallagher had dictated that it was not to be published until Sieber received contrary instruction. The implication was that these instructions would be a long time coming - if ever.

On May 14, 1960, a frustrated Zahn wrote to Dr. C.J. Nuesse regarding the decision to suppress his paper's publication. He was anticipating a formal request, possibly even an order from Loyola University that he withdraw the article completely. It was a delicate situation since he was teaching in the Sociology Department at Loyola along with Gallagher and Mundy. While Loyola housed the offices of the ACSS, it was supposedly not directly involved with the workings of the Society. Zahn was convinced that his paper not only had a right to be published based on prior commitment, but that also there was a need to defend himself and his paper. Zahn was receiving some very strong attacks from various members of the Catholic community. Since his paper was not being published by the ACSS and could not be published in toto any where else because of their hold on it, these attacks were based on reported accounts of what he said. The only way he could stop being quoted out of context
and having his message twisted was to have his paper published in its entirety. If necessary, his intention was to take his protest to the ACSS Board or even to the convention to get this accomplished. Zahn indicated that he was willing to take it that far only as a final measure. His reasons were clear:

Paul Mundy accepted the article (and my order for reprints) when he had full authority and responsibility as Editor of the ACSR; when he agreed to delay its publication -- at Fr. G's request in view of the "heat" Loyola was getting -- he stipulated that it would have to be published in some forthcoming issue. And Fr. G. agreed, thus committing himself as Exec. Secy. I feel the new editor (and the Society) has an obligation to respect Paul's editorial commitment and publish the article; . . . I would have no objections to accepting [John] Thomas's suggestion that a rejoinder be published either concurrently or as a "letter to the editor" in a succeeding issue.

My second reason is more personal. While the article is suppressed, Fittkau, Jordan and others continue to malign my competence and quality. . . . Now I have a letter from D. Day enclosing a 3-page attack upon me in protest to the CW article praising my paper. . . . He, Fittkau, refers to me as a "deceitful master" conducting a "brazen campaign" to spread my "monstrous thesis". He continues to insist that the paper has been universally denounced and disowned by historians and sociologists and that it was written "in defiance of basic rules of his profession and in disregard of the historic facts as well as of the simplest laws of honest logic and method by misinterpreting a number of quotations out of their context and misrepresenting their significance."  

He went on to quote some additional very strong attacks on his paper. The main purpose of this letter was not to complain about the attacks but to ask for Nuesse's
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75Gordon Zahn, Chicago, to C. Joseph Nuesse, Washington, 14 May 1960, Transcript at Nuesse Collection, Catholic University of America Archives, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
assistance by way of support. Nuesse was the chairperson of the panel during which Zahn's paper was presented to the Society besides reading it prior to its presentation. Zahn stressed to Nuesse that he did not expect Nuesse in any way to support the thesis presented but:

... merely my right to call upon the ACSR to (a) live up to the commitment made by its former editor at the time he had full authority and (b) make it possible for me to defend my scholarly reputation by bringing the text of the controverted paper before my academic peers in the ACSS.\textsuperscript{76}

Zahn was not expecting to use this letter of support unless the situation finally called for a "competent scholarly opinion to support my claims." He ended by stating that he felt the "quietest solution" would be to just print the article since by then it would probably be "old stuff" and not get much reaction except "on the part of professional reactors". Even with this, he did not let go of the threat of bringing it to the convention, and, thereby, possibly giving the whole issue nation-wide attention. His final statement summed up some of the underlying feelings that had already begun to circulate through the ACSS having to do with the power and control being held by a select few. He questioned:

... But clerical prerogative is at stake, in more ways than one. A neat question: to what extent can the German bishops, the St. Bonificae Society, Loyola University, or even Sieber's provincial be permitted to decide what

\textsuperscript{76}Ibid., 14 May 1960.
a scholarly journal may publish -- or when?\textsuperscript{77}

On May 17, 1960, Nuesse responded to Zahn's request. Nuesse was not clear on what form Zahn was expecting him to use, but he suggested that his letter could be used privately for support. Nuesse agreed, "... that commitments previously made for publication should be honored, so that the paper will be available for reference in any further discussion."\textsuperscript{78} He went on to suggest that the paper be published with a rejoinder. Because of the emotional response to the paper, Nuesse suggested that any published response to the article should be "rigorously scientific" in nature. In an attempt to temper his approval, Nuesse suggested to Zahn that he also did feel that it was an editor's privilege to change his mind. He even questioned the precedent of a current editor being bound to the commitments of the past editor and suggested that Zahn look into the manner in which some other scholarly journal would handle such a situation. Nuesse strongly indicated that his support was with the issue of publication and should not be considered as an endorsement of Zahn's thesis. He based his opinion on his initial reading of the paper and his original comments about it in which he suggested that Zahn was

\textsuperscript{77}Ibid., 14 May 1960.

\textsuperscript{78}C. Joseph Nuesse, Washington, to Gordon Zahn, Chicago, 17 May 1969, Transcript at Nuesse Collection, Catholic University of America Archives. Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
vulnerable on some crucial points in his presentation.

On June 8, 1960, Zahn responded to Nuesse and thanked him for the previous letter. Still quite adamant about the topic and its publication, he wrote:

... I am quite agreeable to publication of the paper with a concurrent or subsequent rejoinder. This does not mean that I agree that it is at all "vulnerable" in any substantive sense. As far as the critical point is concerned -- the fact that Catholics were encouraged by their bishops and their press to support Hitler's war effort -- I feel my position is beyond challenge. Certainly interpretations and explanations of this critical fact leave much room for discussion and even controversy, and if that is what you mean by "vulnerable", I would agree to that. 79

Zahn went on to suggest that Nuesse volunteer to write the rejoinder since he, Nuesse, had spent time abroad and had the experience necessary to do an "eminently fair job."

Mundy took the issue of the right to publish this article to Msgr. John Egan, who in turn spoke to Albert Cardinal Stritch. Stritch, Cardinal of the Archdiocese of Chicago, had his chancellor call and discuss the publication with Mundy. The chancellor allowed two letters, one by Mundy and one by Zahn, to be published in the "New World", the Chicago Catholic newspaper, discussing the contents of the paper from their points of view. This, in Zahn's perspective, was not a viable solution to the situation. 80

79 Gordon Zahn, Chicago, to C. Joseph Nuesse, Washington, 8 June 1960, Transcripts at Nuesse Collection, Catholic University of America Archives. Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

80 Mundy interview 10 November 1993.
By July 9, 1960, the issue was still one that Gallagher was not ready to see dropped nor was he willing to allow the publication of the paper. He wrote a letter to Dr. John Kane, a member of the editorial board of the ACSR, and included with it a copy of Zahn’s paper. Gallagher asked that the paper be returned to him as soon as possible with comments. While not stating openly that the paper should be pulled, his implication was obvious. He stated:

Father Sylvester A. Sieber, S.V.D., the new editor of The American Catholic Sociological Review, should not be burdened with the decision in this controversial matter; the question rests with you and the other members of the editorial board. The paper is not being held up; it must take its ordinary place. Other articles in the files of the former editor have been sent to you and other members of the board.

Dr. Zahn’s paper is controversial. The ACSS must not get involved because of the opinions and research of one of its members. This is a question of prudence and loyalty and not one of academic freedom. The ACSS stands approved by the Social Action Department of the N.C.W.C. (Because of conditions in Germany at present the representatives of the Holy See and the hierarchy do not think this is the opportune time to publish the article. The paper will lead to a long controversy.)

We would like to have your honest, objective opinion in this matter. Remember the ACSR is not forced to publish any article; it is free. The present editor is not bound by any promise of a former editor. You, the editor and the managing editor have the final say.\footnote{Ralph Gallagher, Chicago, to John Kane, Notre Dame, Indiana, 9 July 1960.}

Gallagher went on to sign the letter and used his title as "Managing Editor, THE ASCR". There was also a post script that stated that the part within the brackets was "approved 100% by Father Dollard" while also stating that Father Mulligan is doubtful. Gallagher and Sieber were the only two
people on the ACSS editorial board from Loyola, and while the ACSS mailing address was that of Loyola University in Chicago, Gallagher stated that this affair did not involve Loyola. He finished by asking if he had Kane's approval and stated "this is rather urgent".

On August 15, 1960, Zahn wrote a letter to the Editorial Board to the ACSR and the Executive Council of the ACSS (see appendix 11). When he wrote it, it was with little hope of the issue being solved before the convention. His intention was clearly stated. He wanted his article published based on the past promises of Paul Mundy and Ralph Gallagher. Taking a stance unique for the time, he called into question the issue of academic freedom and editorial integrity. His arguments rested solidly on the fact that as long as the ACSS held his paper, he was not at liberty to publish parts of it or the whole piece anywhere else. It is unclear if he ever saw any of the German bishops' criticisms or was just told of them by Gallagher.

Zahn's arguments about publication rights and academic freedom point to one of the major problems within the society - who was in control? Was the group being dictated to by a few powerful leaders either overtly or in quiet control, or were the members accepted on their merit? Zahn
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82 Gordon Zahn, Chicago, to Editorial Board of the American Catholic Sociological Review, 15 August 1960, Transcript at Nuesse Collection, Catholic University of America Archives. Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
was well aware that his paper did nothing to cover up or ease what his research proved to be the shocking realities of the times. He did not feel that, if the research was valid and the documentation was solid, anyone had a right to suppress the paper simply because it might offend a certain person or group. He questioned if anyone within or without the Society should be allowed to censor what was published by a member of the Society within the Society’s official publication.

Loretta Morris, while a graduate student at Catholic University’s Sociology Department, prepared to attend the 1960 convention in New York with a number of other students. Paul Furfey and Thomas Harte, C.Ss.R., professors at the Catholic University, encouraged these graduate students to join the ACSS. As members, these students would be allowed to cast votes at the convention. She wrote:

We were not quite sure what was going on in the sociological stratosphere; but we did know that our two mentors anticipated a bitter floor-fight at Fordham over the Zahn Affair, and were as mad as hell. If it came to a vote, we knew who should prevail: we were for Zahn. 83

The floor fight never came to be. Zahn’s letter caused a discussion and vote within the Executive Council. The Council voted to accept the commitment made by Mundy as binding. In a majority vote, the Executive Council directed Sieber, the current editor, to publish the Zahn article.

83 Morris, 345.
Sieber refused the mandate and resigned his position. This was the only instance during his tenure that Dr. Paul Mundy remembered of censorship and criticism of any article.84

The irony of the situation lies in the fact that the ACSR never published Zahn's article. He went on to expand it and have it published as a book by Sheed and Ward Publishers. In Volume XIII, Number I, Spring 1962 issue of the ASCR, the book, German Catholics and Hitler's Wars was reviewed by Sylvester Theisen of St. John's University in Minnesota. His review was very positive and his final paragraph reads:

This book is not a restatement or synthesis of previous studies; it is an original contribution. While Dr. Zahn obviously has a deep personal concern about the problems raised, he has written a serene, scholarly work which is a remarkable milestone in social science scholarship by Catholics. It will not be ignored.85

Notifications to Contributors

Information that was noticeably lacking throughout the journal was directions to potential contributors as to the type of paper that the Review would publish or the procedures that would have to be followed to get a paper published. In 1940, a brief notice "TO THE MEMBERS OF THE

84 Mundy interview 10 November 1993.

"ACSS AND READERS" was published in the first issue. It read:

This quarterly is designed to serve your interests and to provide a medium and a forum for the expression of Catholic social thought. The editorial board would appreciate any suggestions you might have to offer. Articles are also accepted for the REVIEW. Communications may be mailed to

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW
Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois

This notice was no longer published as of March 1949. At that time, the statement was changed to refer to the Review being indexed in the Catholic Periodical Index.

In 1947 a statement appeared which encouraged members who wished to review books to write to Miss Ross. The members were requested to state their special fields of interest or request specific books by title, author, and publisher. The only stipulation placed on the books requested was that they should be of recent publication and within the scope of sociology or a closely allied subject. Dr. Franz Mueller often requested to review a specific book. Since the book would be sent free of charge by the publisher to the reviewer, it became an invaluable way to build up his personal library. The format to be used or the length of the review were never discussed. This method for book reviews stayed basically the same throughout the publication

---


with only an occasional change in the book review editor to act as contact person.

In 1961, a new editorial board was appointed by the president and their first issue published an extensive notice to the prospective contributors. It detailed the mechanics to be followed for any paper submitted for publication and the appropriate format to be used for communication with the editor and for submissions to the "News and Announcements" section.89 This was the first time that any type of formal instructions were printed within the pages of the journal. By 1968, a second and much more extensive notice to contributors was printed. This one discussed the number of copies to be submitted down to the appropriate footnoting to be used for the various references.

Occasionally, directions would come in a direct personal format. In April 1946, Franz Mueller received a letter from C.J. Nuesse asking him to review an article for the journal. Nuesse had just been appointed editor of the "Periodical Review" section. Nuesse indicated that no formal policies had been established by the committee regarding this section nor had his own ideas been "crystallized." Two pages had been allotted to the department in the next issue. Nuesse suggested that the review:

(1) summarize as briefly as possible the content of the article, and (2) offer critical comments of a general nature, so that readers may have sufficient information on which to decide if they would profit by reading of the entire article. Two hundred words seems to me about the proper length, though the first reviews run a little longer than that.  

Nuesse went on to request that Mueller review an article by Abram Harris entitled "The Scholastic Revival: The Economics of Heinrich Pesch." Nuesse selected Mueller to review this article because of his personal study of Pesch. Nuesse asked for the review to be returned to him by May 15.

The Change to Sociological Analysis

Original feelings of a narrowing of focus for the Review became apparent in the Editor’s Preface written by Thomas J. Harte, C.Ss.R., Ph.D., in 1954. In it he said:

The publication of a special issue of the REVIEW devoted exclusively to the sociology of religion hardly needs special justification for the American Catholic sociologists. The subject is one which has been a major scientific and apostolic concern to members of the American Catholic Sociological Society for some time. . . . Certain questions necessarily arise for the sociologist apropos scientific theories and procedures in the sociology of religion. Is it possible, for example, to determine precisely the scope and potential of empirical science in the study of religious institutions and processes? Why is it that the contributions of the sociology of religion to valid scientific knowledge are in no way commensurate with its accomplishments of a practical, pastoral order? What are the basic methodological weaknesses of the standard approaches of socio-religious problems, weaknesses which

must be corrected if further progress is to be made in the development of the science? . . . This special issue of the REVIEW is presented to its readers with many misgivings. {too ambitious an undertaking, and scope too restricted to be completely satisfactory to the professional sociologist} Didn't quite match what we had in mind.

Thomas J. Harte, C.Ss.R.\textsuperscript{91}

At the Business meeting held on September 1, 1962, much time was devoted to the discussion of the Review. The Finance Committee was the first to report. Donald Barrett reported that the double function of his committee was auditing and budgeting. All appeared to be in order but no budget could be offered until the receipts of the last year were all in. The final line of the report reads, "The Finance Chairman voiced the hope that ACSS could give some realistic thoughts to some professional interests over and above the Review."

The Publications Committee was next. The annual report had been made available prior to this meeting and much of it centered around the need for a change in title for the Review. This had already been brought up to the Executive Council who deferred it to the Convention Business Meeting. Paul Reiss noted that the title as it stood, "did not coincide with the subject matter of the Review, that it does not attract articles written by non-Catholics nor those of Catholics who wish to write articles for non-sectarian

\textsuperscript{91}American Catholic Sociological Review, Vol. XV, No. 2 (June 1954): 70-72.
periodicals." The editor moved that the title therefore be changed to **Sociological Analysis**. This new title would not identify the journal as sectarian but "giving it a significant title not yet preempted." The motion was seconded by Dr. Anthony Ostric.

Questions were raised considering this new title and possible alternative titles. Some consideration was given to the question of this title being too restrictive in terms of the possible new directions. Clarification was sought as to whether this publication would be another journal of general sociological scope or whether it was intended to have some distinctive relationship to the ACSS such as "Religion and Society." The motion on the new title was tabled until the next annual meeting to allow more time for discussion.

The discussion changed topics with the purposes of discussing a statement that was necessary for tax-exemption purposes. The discussion to eliminate the title from the proposal was passed. Fr. Paul Busanceney then moved that the word "official" be deleted from the same statement. His reasoning was that the Society might want to publish a journal which might not be the official voice of the membership but nevertheless a publishing venture under the

---

92 American Catholic Sociological Society Executive Council Meeting minutes, 31 August 1962. American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

93 Ibid., 31 August 1962.
jurisdiction of the Society. This motion was seconded and passed. The amendment finally read:

As one means of achieving its purposes, the Society shall publish a journal. Through its publication of articles, book reviews, news and announcements, the journal shall serve as a medium of communication among the membership of the Society and other interested readers on professional and sociological matters. 94

The discussion continued with Dr. Paul Reiss raising the issue of what function the Review should serve. He also questioned what the Society should be. Numerous comments from the floor highlighted the problem of raising the standards of sociology in our own Catholic colleges, of obtaining enough articles of stature to print and of the relation of a Journal of Religious Sociology which focus some members of the Society wanted to pursue. Comparative religion in a sociological sense was suggested as the raison d'être. Paul Mundy, past editor, stated that the biggest problem was the submission of articles of quality and that the focus of comparative religion would not help the situation at all. He felt that a general title would provided a better calling card for articles. He cited a journal edited by The University of Notre Dame and suggested the ACSS take the same procedures to improve. A motion was passed that required the membership to be polled on the matter. It was to be handled through a "letter to the editor" column to put the various opinions to the

94 Ibid., 31 August 1962
membership. The executive council was to appoint a committee representing the varying views to discuss the question of changing the name of the Review, to present these views to the membership as well as to explain the issue of the change of name.\(^95\)

The next day, September 1, 1962, at the Executive Council Meeting, the topic of the name change was immediately brought back into discussion. It was indicated that all of the members of the editorial board were in favor, though not in agreement, of a name change. A committee including: Donald Barrett, John Donovan, Paul Reiss, Paul Mundy, C. J. Nuesse, with John Hughes as Chair, was elected. The goal of this committee was to develop the different types of opinion, make a list of possible titles, and discuss the timing of the issues involved. Their task was to determine what the name of the Review should be and to prepare a questionnaire to be used in surveying the opinions of the membership. These materials were to be presented to the Executive Committee before the next meeting. At the same time, the Advertising Chair indicated that forty publishers were contacted seeking ads in the ACSR. Discounts were offered if they placed ads in more than one issue.\(^96\) The questionnaire was prepared and sent out to the membership. It included a cover letter (see appendix 10)

\(^{95}\)Ibid., 31 August 1962.

\(^{96}\)Ibid., 31 August 1962 and 1 September 1962.
signed by all the members of the Executive Council present at the Business Meeting held December 8-9, 1962. This included: John Hughes, president, Rev. Paul Facey, president-elect, John Martin, vice-president, Sr. Frances Jerome, immediate past-president, Sr. Aquinice, executive secretary, and eight other members. The group reevaluated the purposes of the Society and agreed that there was a continuing need for the Society to:

1) to serve as a source of stimulation for its members;
2) to serve as a channel for production of work characteristic of shared interests of members;
3) to provide a channel of communication to persons outside the society who share the same interests.  

The name change, therefore, had been suggested to meet the changing focus of interest of the membership. They suggested the possibility of the Society heading toward some degree of specialization in the future. The letter ended with the assurance that no matter what name the journal is published under, it would still be "owned and controlled" by the ACSS. It was their intent that this fact would be clearly indicated on the cover of the journal.  

In 1964 with issue Number 1 of Volume 25, Sociological Analysis was born. Within the opening lines introducing the journal, the change was explained as an evolution rather
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97 American Catholic Sociological Society Executive Council letter to general membership after 8-9 December 1962 meeting. Transcript at American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee.

than a revolution going on within the Society. The reasoning was that many Catholic sociologists' interests were best served by meeting with their non-Catholic colleagues in their common specialization. At the same time, there was a movement on the part of a significant numbers of Catholic sociologists to look at the sociological analysis of religion and particularly Catholicism. This trend supported in large part by the topics at the recent convention and papers submitted for publication led to the change in title, focus, and editorial policy. The scope of the journal would now encompass:

1. Sociological theory and methodology for the study of religion.
2. The comparative study of religious institutions and their functional equivalents.
3. The study of religious beliefs and values together with their variable expressions.
4. The relationship of religion to cultural values, ideologies and conflict.
5. The relationship of religion to social structure and social change including religion as a factor in social innovation and integration.
6. The social consequences of religious belief in and on social institutions including political and economic institutions, the family, education, and science.
7. The effect upon religious systems of various social forces.
8. The internal structure of religious organizations including religious group-communities, associations and interest groups, and religious roles and statuses; social processes in religious organizations including communication, stratification, mobility, leadership, social control, social movements and socialization.  

Manuscripts from all scholars would be accepted and the hope

was to expand this to an international community from a variety of religious backgrounds.

Even though the new direction seemed to be a positive move, not everyone agreed with the change. (see chapter 2) Many, like Clement Mihanovich, were so opposed that they cancelled their membership. Others simply had no interest in that form of sociological analysis.

At the 1965 Executive Council meeting, there was a positive discussion concerning establishing closer professional contact with the Review of Religious Research and the Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion. It was recommended that these relationships and possibly other learned societies be established in order to clarify "our raison d'etre." It was suggested that a poll of the membership be taken in reference to affiliation with the ASA. Also mentioned was the fact that there had been a definite increase in articles received for publication. As of August 28, 1965, the editor had the contents for the next two issues ready for publication.100

At the August 25, 1966 business meeting, the poll results regarding the ASA were announced: 325 were in favor, five were against, and nine agreed but with some

100American Catholic Sociological Society Executive Council Meeting minutes, 27 August 1965. transcript at American Catholic Socioligcal Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
reservations. Based on the results, it was suggested that a letter to Wilbert Moore of the ASA be drafted and sent.\textsuperscript{101} They were to find out in 1968 that due to the restructuring of the ASA, this type of affiliation was no longer available. During the August 29th meeting, a discussion regarding the subtitle for the journal was discussed. It was voted on that the editor should make suggestion for the subtitle and submit them to the Executive Council by January 1967.\textsuperscript{102} At that January meeting the subtitle was discussed. It was suggested that Paul Reiss canvas the members of the Executive Council for their suggestions. It was felt that the subtitle should "... contain the word religion, or value, or some word to give that idea."\textsuperscript{103}

In the August 27, 1967 Business Meeting minutes, the publications committee report was not as hopeful as in the previous year. Paul Reiss indicated that the committee was

\textsuperscript{101}American Catholic Sociological Society General Business Meeting minutes, 25 August 1966 American Catholic Socioligical Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

\textsuperscript{102}American Catholic Sociological Society Executive Council Meeting minutes, 29 August 1966. transcript at American Catholic Socioligical Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

\textsuperscript{103}American Catholic Sociological Society Executive Council Meeting minutes, 21 January 1967.transcript at American Catholic Socioligical Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
soliciting bids from various publishers in an attempt to lower the cost of the journal. The group was also attempting to increase the amount of advertising. He reported that currently, there were forty-seven pages of articles and thirteen pages of book reviews. Of the total amount of articles submitted for publication, 30% were accepted and 70% rejected. The subtitle had also been agreed upon. It would be "A Journal in the Sociology of Religion."

In an interesting twist at the August 1966 meeting, discussions were held concerning the indication that ACSS members would give support to the AAUP's expression of the principle of academic freedom. The question was referred to a committee to be appointed by Dr. Donald Barnett. It was brought up over the next two years and in 1968 a report was made to the Executive Council by the chairperson of the committee, Gordon Zahn. Zahn and his committee members, Fr. Joseph Fichter and Dr. Robert Hassenger, suggested that the AAUP's principles of academic freedom could be endorsed without prejudice to the Society. They also suggested that

---

104 American Catholic Sociological Society Business Meeting minutes, 27 August 1967. transcript at American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

105 American Association of University Professors

106 American Catholic Sociological Society General Business Meeting minutes, 27 August 1967.
no formal statements should be issued in the name of the Society. It would be possible for a person or group making a statement to identify themselves as a member of the ACSS but they should not presume to speak for the Society. They went on to say:

Having said this, the committee must also recognize the possibility that some social or political issue would arise which would bear so directly on our professional competence (or our professional status) that it would be perfectly proper, in one sense even obligatory, for the ACSS to consider taking a formal and public stand. 107

The report was passed unanimously. Zahn notified the AAUP of the ACSS’s support and added their name as a signer of the statement on Academic Freedom.

The Executive Council report of August 1968 showed the Society to have 534 members and 725 subscribers to Sociological Analysis. Paul Reiss reported that the journal published within its last four issues nineteen articles and research reports and nineteen book reviews. Forty-eight articles were submitted, twenty-one accepted and twenty-seven were rejected. 108 The reports were looked upon favorably and the change in focus was considered to be a success.

107 Ibid., minutes 27 August 1967.

108 American Catholic Sociological Society Executive Council Meeting minutes, 24 August 1968. transcript at American Catholic Sociological Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
The next two chapters will provide an analysis of the contents of the Review. They will cover the years 1940 through 1952 and 1953 through 1968 respectively. Significant topical trends and discussions will be addressed. The chapters will also examine the Review's role as official publication of the ACSS and its ability to reflect this role by examining the articles published in the light of the ACSS stated goals.
CHAPTER 4

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE CONTENTS OF THE REVIEW:
VOLUME 1 (1940) THROUGH VOLUME 13 (1952)

The intent of this chapter is to examine the structure and contents of the first thirteen volumes of the American Catholic Sociological Review.¹ These volumes cover the fifty-two issues published from 1940 through 1952. In order to analyze the development of subject matter and allow for the comparison of other significant trends in these volumes, this section has been divided into four periods. (1940-1942, 1943-1945, 1946-1948, and 1949-52)²

In the opening pages of the first issue of Volume 1, Paul Mundie wrote:

The REVIEW is intended to further the exchange of knowledge and to promote research among Catholic sociologists. . . . It is expected that the REVIEW will not only publish the papers of the annual conventions, but will serve also in publishing research articles and book reviews. Thus, we launch the quarterly in high hopes for its success as a scholarly and scientific

¹For the sake of brevity The American Catholic Sociological Review will be referred to as the Review or journal throughout the rest of this chapter.

²This is an arbitrary division of the years covered. This division, while not based on any significant trends, does have an historical bent (ie 1940-42 are pre-war years, 1943-45 are war years, etc.). The division was made to deal with a manageable period of time to look at trends, etc.
contribution to sociology.\textsuperscript{3}

To that end, over the original thirteen year span, 219 articles were published and nineteen doctoral dissertations, 127 periodical articles and a total of 1,093 books were reviewed.

In order to accomplish this task, the first issue of the \textit{Review} provided the format that would be followed during the subsequent years. Each issue divided material into three major subdivisions: the publication of original articles; reviews of current literature in the field; and a miscellaneous category which included various limited and sporadic publication features such as lists of members, current news items about members or institutions, and tentative convention agendas. While the article section did not change in format, the space devoted to it and the quantity of articles presented per issue varied greatly over the years. The literature review section underwent the most dramatic change both in format and space. The miscellaneous category remained loosely structured and occupied approximately the same percentage of pages throughout from 1940 through 1952.

\textbf{General Publication Information}

One of the main reasons cited for the establishment of

a Catholic journal was its potential as a forum for Catholic sociological thought. While the content of the articles will be examined later in this chapter, it is the number of articles that point most significantly to the physical layout changes in the journal. (see table 1) During the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Book Reviews</th>
<th>Short Notices</th>
<th>Total Book Reviews</th>
<th>Periodicals</th>
<th>Ph.D. Dissertations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

original thirteen year time span of publication, 219 articles were published. From 1940 until 1942, sixty-five articles were printed. From 1943 until 1945, fifty-five articles were published. Fifty-one articles were published
from 1946 through 1948 and only forty-eight were printed during the years 1949 through 1952. The fact that the articles published in the later years were longer than the ones in the earlier issues does not compensate for the decline in number of articles. (see table 2) As the number of articles published declined, there was also a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Article pages</th>
<th>Review pages</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>160 (70)</td>
<td>17 (07)</td>
<td>51 (22)</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>177 (66)</td>
<td>34 (13)</td>
<td>57 (21)</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>194 (72)</td>
<td>39 (15)</td>
<td>35 (13)</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>531 (70)</td>
<td>90 (12)</td>
<td>143 (19)</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>142 (58)</td>
<td>49 (20)</td>
<td>55 (22)</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>163 (61)</td>
<td>65 (24)</td>
<td>40 (15)</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>152 (56)</td>
<td>66 (24)</td>
<td>52 (19)</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>457 (58)</td>
<td>180 (23)</td>
<td>147 (19)</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>186 (60)</td>
<td>93 (30)</td>
<td>31 (10)</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>163 (50)</td>
<td>110 (34)</td>
<td>51 (16)</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>180 (57)</td>
<td>113 (36)</td>
<td>23 (07)</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 3</td>
<td>529 (56)</td>
<td>316 (33)</td>
<td>105 (11)</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>155 (51)</td>
<td>123 (41)</td>
<td>23 (08)</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>130 (44)</td>
<td>137 (47)</td>
<td>27 (09)</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>113 (40)</td>
<td>139 (50)</td>
<td>28 (10)</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>114 (39)</td>
<td>134 (46)</td>
<td>46 (16)</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 4</td>
<td>512 (44)</td>
<td>533 (46)</td>
<td>124 (11)</td>
<td>1169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The pages listed in the Other category are a composite of pages devoted in each journal to a random collection of entries such as: the Table of Contents, Convention agenda, News and Notes of Sociological Interest, advertisements, lists of members, etc. The numbers that appear in parentheses indicate the percentage of pages devoted to that particular category.

4Reference these and following statistics to Appendix 12.
corresponding decline in the number of pages devoted exclusively to this feature. During 1940 through 1942, 70 percent of the pages were devoted to article publication. This number dropped consistently over the next ten years. From 1943 through 1945, 58 percent of the text were articles while in 1946 through 1948, 56 percent was devoted to articles. Finally from 1949 through 1952, only 44 percent of the Review was given to article production. This period shows the most dramatic decrease in the number of articles printed. In Volume 10 Number 4 (1949), only two articles were printed. The same occurred in Issue 4 of Volume 12 (1951) and Issue 2 of Volume 13 (1952). These particular articles were not conspicuous enough in length to warrant the limited number of offerings. With the exception of the three issues mentioned, the average number of articles found in the other issues of this period was slightly more than three as opposed to almost five and one half found in the original period (1940-1942). The number of pages devoted to articles tended to support Gallagher's comments regarding a lack of material from which to choose. The pages run from a high in 1942 (Volume 3) of 194 to a low in 1951 (Volume 12) of 113.

The decline in the printed space consumed by the articles meant that the journal needed to increase the size and structure of the other sections in order to: keep sociologists interested in the publication, justify not only
the cost but the very continuation of the journal itself, and to fill the fifty plus pages needed for each issue. The printing costs would have made the publication of the journal prohibitive if it was allowed to fall under the fifty page mark.\(^5\) By looking at the percentages that correspond to the miscellaneous topics printed in the Review, it was apparent that the editors did not view them as a significant or a constant enough source by which to pick up the extra space generated by the decrease in the article section. (see table 2) It was further noted that this section itself remained at a constant 19 percent of the total pages of the volumes for the first six years but dropped to 11 percent during the last two periods respectively. This represents a difference of approximately twenty pages in total over the twelve issues published within a time period which does not prove to be a very significant number. It does reinforce the notion that, even though original organizational conversations strongly supported the need for a means to share common interests and news, this section was not as easy to control or expand as the literature review section. The decrease in page usage by the miscellaneous items also generated a need for publication of additional material. The literature review section was the only other option available for filling the empty pages.

During the initial discussions regarding the establishment of a journal, a common theme expressed was interest of the membership in having a section of the Review devoted to the dissemination of information regarding current texts, books, and curricula available to and appropriate for the Catholic sociologist. By increasing the numbers of books reviewed, the editors were fulfilling a dual purpose. First, they were addressing an expressed need from the membership. Secondly, they were filling empty pages.

The decrease in articles and the increase in reviews was a trend that started with the very first volume and continued throughout the thirteen years. In an attempt to adjust the layout of the Review to meet publication needs, the literature review section was expanded to fill the space. In Period 1 (1940 through 1942), approximately 12 percent of publication space was devoted to literature reviews. During 1943 through 1945, that number increased to 23 percent. By Period 3, 33 percent of the average issue was devoted to these reviews. During the last period, from 1949 through 1952, the average space allotted to reviews grew to 46 percent. It was during this period that the highest percentage was reached when in 1951, 50 percent of the publication was devoted to the reviews.

Within the first three year period (1940-1942), the most dramatic increase in literature review section
occurred. In the first volume (1940) of the journal, 7 percent of the printed pages were devoted to reviews. By the second year, that number jumped to 13 percent. While this rapid rate of increase did not remain constant during the following years, the trend to increase this section annually was constant. Within the next three years (1943-1945), this section split and offered both long and short reviews of books. No explanation was offered in print as to the editorial determination as to which books received a short review and others a more extensive review. The general practice had been that the members who wished to review a particular work would notify the Book Review Editor, request a copy of the desired work, and then submit the review. The length of the review was based on the submission received from the reviewer and not by any direction offered from the Editor. This practice continued even after the split in the types of reviews occurred.

During the next three year period (1946-1948), a Periodical Review section was added which covered articles in the field published in other venues. In Volume 7 Number 1, published in 1946, the Periodical Review section appears for the first time. It was initiated to review various journal "articles that deal with specifically sociological

---

6 Mueller interview 13 October 1992
subjects which had special pertinence for Catholics." As an introduction to this new format, the Periodical Editor C.J. Nuesse wrote:

While sociological research and theoretical developments are well reported in other journals, the progress of the REVIEW has demonstrated that Catholic sociologists require an organ to serve their own peculiar needs. Through it they can make available the results of their own investigations, as well as critical evaluations of sociological literature undertaken from a point of view consistent with sound philosophy and theological principles. They can also find in it a medium for contacts with other students of social science or social action who share the Catholic tradition.8

During the same period, descriptions of Doctoral Dissertations of sociological interest were also included.9 Appearing originally in 1947, these notices were contained within the Short Notice section under a separate subheading. Included with the descriptions of the topics that these dissertations dealt with was information on obtaining reprints of them. The last period (1949-1952) continued with the long and short reviews and the periodical reviews, but by 1950, the Doctoral Dissertations were eliminated. (see table 1)

It is in looking at the yearly totals in these various categories that a question arose regarding the purpose of the journal itself. Based on sheer quantity of material

---

8Ibid.
9The reader might find it helpful to refer to Appendix 12 to see the actual counts.
presented, the focus of the journal seemed to switch rather subtly from dissemination of membership research and original articles to simply reviewing current publications that could be found elsewhere. The switch was subtle enough to indicate that it was done as a matter of survival rather than some ruse to be foisted upon the membership.

Articles by Editorial Board Members

As with the publication of any quarterly journal, there was always a concern for the editors over the timely availability of publishable articles sufficient to meet the needs of space requirements. The American Catholic Sociological Review was no exception. As discussed in the previous chapter, Ralph Gallagher was most concerned with making the Society and the Review successful and, therefore, concerned with the quantity and quality of articles presented for publication. In a letter to Paul Mundie, Gallagher expressed his frustration over the insufficient quantity of articles he received quarterly from which he was to choose for publication. He strongly believed that the members of the editorial board (see appendix 13), well aware of the situation, compounded this problem by their seeming lack of interest in writing specifically for the Review.10

All the members of the Board had been hand picked by

10Rosenfelder, 111.
Gallagher and were selected because of their Catholic backgrounds, interest in Sociology, and their professional qualifications. Gallagher felt that he had every right to look upon this specific group as a substantial, and seemingly prolific,\(^{11}\) pool of support and production. While not making production of articles a requirement for Board membership, Gallagher had expected a more tangible and visible form of support from these members than the general membership. While never taking action on this comment, his frustration with the majority of the board members apparent lack of concern about submitting articles prompted Gallagher to suggest to Ross that members of the Editorial Board who did not submit at least one article annually for publication should be dismissed from the Board.\(^{12}\) A look at the publication statistics of these individuals indicate that Gallagher's frustration was well grounded.

In the fifty-two issues published by the Review from 1940 through 1952, Volumes 1 through 13, thirty-one names appear in the lists of the Editorial Board membership. Neither the position held by these members nor the inherent demands of that position influenced Gallagher in his expectations regarding article production. His view was that

\(^{11}\) Of the nineteen members who came on the Board after 1940, thirteen had already had articles printed in the journal. These thirteen members produced twenty-two articles prior to their tenures on the Board.

\(^{12}\) Rosenfelder, 110-111.
a general board member as well as a member maintaining a specific position (e.g. editor, book or periodical review editor, or director of research) should have the same responsibility regarding annual article production.\textsuperscript{13} Gallagher's expectation was that anyone who agreed to be on the board would understand that the position required specific assigned work as well as submitting articles for publication.\textsuperscript{14} Based on Gallagher's expectations, no differentiation is made in the following publication statistics in regards to the specific position held by these Board members at the time of the publications. Their various length of service does add a different perspective to the significance of the statistics and is therefore noted.

During the span of years from 1940 through 1952,\textsuperscript{15} the length of tenure of the board members, with the exception of

\textsuperscript{13}The listing of Editorial Board members appeared consistently from 1940 through 1948. There is little other documentation as to this membership that appears either in the pages of the journal or in minutes.

\textsuperscript{14}Mundy interview 10 November 1993.

\textsuperscript{15}Listings of the Editorial Board members were published in the Review from 1940 through March of 1948 [Volume 9 Issue 1]. While not appearing on the roster of Board Members published on the frontpiece of each issue, C. J. Nuesse (1946-50) and Gordon Zahn (1951-52) are listed as Periodical Editors in the masthead for that section. Br. Gerald Schnepp is listed as Book Review Editor for 1951-52. For this reason, their service in these capacities has been noted and counted in this section.
Gallagher, ranges from one year to eleven years. Of the thirty-one Board Members named during this period, only three people served a term of one year. These members were: Thomas Wiley (1940), Sr. Leo Marie (1943), Sr. M. Liguori (1944). No explanation is given as to the circumstances surrounding these members’ short tenures on the Board. Five members served for two years. Both Frank Flynn and Helen Toole served from 1940 through 1941, while Paul Mundie served from 1941 through 1942. John Coogan and Louis Ryan are both listed as serving in 1947 and 1948. On the other end of the spectrum of service is Eva Ross who gave eleven years of service between 1940 and 1950 serving as the Book Review Editor from 1944 through 1950. Br. Gerald Schnepp had a Board membership tenure of twelve years, nine of which are covered in this chapter. A member of the Board between 1942 and 1948, Schnepp then served as Book Review Editor between 1951 and 1955. Others who carry unusually long tenures on the board are Rev. Paul Hanly Furfey and Franz Mueller both of whom served nine years between 1940 and 1948. The rest of

16 Due to Gallagher’s continuous involvement on the Board in a variety of capacities throughout the years, he is included as a board member in all statistics save this one. Those other figures are adjusted accordingly.

17 All listing of Editorial Board membership stopped being published in 1948. Only Book and Periodical Review Editors are listed under their respective mastheads for the period covering 1948 through 1952. For the purposes of this study and because no other written documentation of Board Membership could be found, membership on the board from 1948 to 1952 will not be included.
the members served between three and six years.¹⁸ Five members served three years, five served four years, five served for five years, and two served for six years.

During the entire thirteen year span from 1940 through 1952, these thirty-one Board members were responsible for producing a total of 100 of the 219 articles published. In the years from 1940 through 1948, the thirty board members produced ninety-one of the 171 articles published.¹⁹ When considering only those articles published during the time these members served on the Editorial Board, the number of articles drop by almost one third which results in a total of sixty-four articles. Of the subtracted twenty-seven articles, twenty-two were produced by thirteen of the members prior to their service on the Board.

These figures indicate that the Board as a specific sub-group was responsible for producing 53 percent of the total number of articles published from 1940 through 1948.

¹⁸The discrepancy in these numbers is due to the elimination of Ralph Gallagher and Gordon Zahn from the original list of thirty-one. Zahn is listed as serving from 1951 through 1955 as Periodical Editor. Since the statistics on Board members cover the years from 1940 through 1948 due to the sparse information from years 1949 through 1952, this eliminates the use of statistics on Zahn.

¹⁹The change of board membership from thirty-one to thirty is based on the numbers obtained from the published membership lists from 1940 through 1948. Since Gordon Zahn is listed as Periodical Editor only for 1951-52, the years of his service have been excluded from the statistics. He produced no articles published in the journal. Also, since C.J. Nuesse is listed as Periodical Editor from 1946-50, the data includes his publications up to 1948.
When taking into account only those articles published while they were in office, the members then produced 37 percent of the total. While these figures appeared to be strong, in actuality, they were very misleading.

The data showed that the thirty board members\textsuperscript{20} served a total of 125 years during this time span creating an average tenure of four years. During this time, as a group, they produced sixty-four articles which averaged only two articles per member per tenure. Put in Gallagher's terms, that would be one article produced every other year rather than annually as he had expected. The further reality of the situation was that thirty-five of these sixty-four articles were produced by only four members of the Board. N. S. Timasheff contributed seven articles during his six years on the Board. Franz Mueller had eight articles published during his nine years. Eva Ross contributed eight articles in nine years\textsuperscript{21} while Rev. Paul Hanly Furfey contributed twelve during his nine year membership. This resulted in only twenty-nine articles being contributed by the remaining twenty-six Board members. The average would then appear to be one article per member per tenure. It was significant to

\textsuperscript{20}These are the names that show service between 1940 and 1948.

\textsuperscript{21}Eva Ross' tenure on the board is the only one of this group that extended past 1948. During the period from 1949-52, she had published two articles which would bring this total to ten published during the total thirteen years. It also increases the total of Board produced articles to thirty-seven.
note that of this group of twenty-six, eleven members produced no articles for the journal while they served on the Board.\textsuperscript{22} When taking either the average of one article per four years for these twenty-six members or two per tenure for only those who published, it was evident that these numbers fall far short of Gallagher's expectations. 

Three major points became apparent while examining these details of the publication. The first was the issue of article production. The Board members were hand picked by Gallagher because of their potential and interest in the study of Sociology. Many of them had proven this interest by writing articles for the \textit{Review} prior to being asked to serve on the board.\textsuperscript{23} The three of the four most prolific authors, Ross, Mueller, and Furfey, who were also three of the longest serving members of the Board, represented the three major factions within the Society. Ross supported the concept of Catholic sociology while Mueller took an opposing stance. Furfey was actively involved in promoting the ideas of Catholic social action as stressed in the encyclicals. Their articles were not rebuttals of each other's positions but rather statements of their own perspectives. They understood that the more articles they were able to publish,

\textsuperscript{22}Four of these eleven members never had any articles published by the \textit{Review}.

\textsuperscript{23}Thirteen of the thirty-one Board members named were responsible for producing twenty-two articles prior to their tenure on the Board.
the more awareness and possible support of their respective opinions would be generated. These three, by using the Review to generate this interest and fulfill one of the major arguments for the establishment of the Review, more than fulfilled the expectation that Gallagher held for all members and especially the Editorial Board. They were living proof to Gallagher that his expectations for publications were not out of line.\textsuperscript{24}

The second issue dealt with one of the original discussion points regarding the need for such a journal. It had been stated previously in Chapter 3 that the secular Catholic sociologists needed and wanted a vehicle for publication to both showcase professional ability and lend academic credibility to their work. With the establishment of the Review, the members of the ACSS were given the vehicle they had requested and control over its content. It appeared that the membership choose not to use this vehicle at their disposal. If the need to publish was as strong as originally indicated, the statistics did not support the verbiage.

The Editorial Board could be looked at as a microcosm of the Society in general. Of the original thirty Board members,\textsuperscript{25} fourteen belonged to a religious order while sixteen were secular. These fourteen religious members could

\textsuperscript{24}Mundy interview 10 November 1993.

\textsuperscript{25}Membership as listed from 1940 through 1948.
be removed from consideration due to the general lack of pressure placed upon them by their respective institutions and/or their Orders to publish their work in order to maintain their academic position or rank. Of the sixteen secular members, Ross, Mueller, and Timasheff were the most prolific producing thirty articles in toto between them. The other thirteen lay members produced only twenty-eight articles in total with eighteen of these articles produced while the members served on the board. Five of these fifteen lay members produced no articles at all during their tenures. If they were interested in using the Review to secure their academic standing or promote their research, their actions did not prove it. At the same time, many of these authors did have articles published in a variety of other publications. Callahan listed all of the contributing members to the journal in his appendix. The list includes all of the articles published in the journal and partial reference to their publication in other venues. This list covered twenty-nine pages.

This lack of participation, though apparent from the very beginning of the journal’s publication history, was not easily explainable. It did not begin to take place after numerous articles had been rejected or a negative reputation

26 Of these five, Art Donohue, Thomas Wiley, and Andrew Kress never had an article published in the journal.

27 Callahan, Appendix IV, 122-151.
on the part of the selection process had been established.\textsuperscript{28} The journal also did not show partiality to any one particular point of view or trend which was evident in the frequency of publications from Ross, Mueller, and Furfey. What seems to appear was a general lack of interest by the membership to use the \textit{Review} as a primary vehicle of publication. While the reasons for not submitting articles were generally not verbalized, many of the members attempted to first have their articles published in the larger and more generally known publications such as \textit{The American Journal of Sociology}.\textsuperscript{29} This was supported by the fact that ninety-five of the 219 articles published in the \textit{Review} from 1940 through 1952 were produced by authors whose names only appear once and a majority of these were reprints from convention speeches.

The third point deals with the reoccurring issue of leadership. There is no questioning the fact that Gallagher’s opinions exerted control over the Society and the \textit{Review}, especially during the thirteen years this chapter covers. During this time, Gallagher served on the Editorial Board and was the leader of the Society. He was known in many circles as a forceful speaker, prolific author, and even presented a few talks at ACSS conventions.

\textsuperscript{28}The only major issue regarding a publication surrounded Zahn's article in 1959. (see chapter 3)

\textsuperscript{29}Mundy interview 10 November 1993.
From the very beginning efforts of the journal, he complained strongly about the lack of contributions from all board members. The irony of the situation was that Gallagher himself never submitted nor had an article published in the journal. He could not fall back on his own contributions as a standard by which other contributor could and should be measured. It is another case where the Society was lead by talk instead of example.

Contents of the Review

In the early years of the Review's publication, approximately half of the articles published came from the papers which had been read at the ACSS convention the previous year. The first issue of Volume 1 contained six articles, most which were reprints of papers read at the first convention which was held in 1939. The program for the December 1940 convention listed twenty-nine papers presented.30 Of those papers, eleven were printed as articles in the 1941 edition of the journal. The June 1941 issue also included a panel discussion from that convention on the Introductory Course in Sociology which was summarized and presented as a paper for the publication. These twelve articles comprised slightly more than half of the twenty-one articles printed in that volume.

The same pattern held true of the years between 1941 through 1952. At the convention of 1941, twenty-three papers were presented and Volume 3, subsequently published in 1942, reprinted fifteen of those as part of the twenty-two articles published. Seventeen papers were presented in 1942 and of the sixteen articles published in 1943, five were reprints of those presentations. During the next few years, due to travel restrictions imposed by World War II rationing, no national conventions were held. The pattern became evident again with the Ninth convention held in late January of 1948. Twenty papers were presented and nine were reprinted in Volume 9 (1948). At the convention held in December 1950, fifteen papers were presented. Six of the total twelve articles in Volume 12 (1951) were reprinted from those talks. In the nine talks given at the 1951 convention, including the Presidential address, six were accepted for publication as part of the total eleven articles printed in 1952.

These facts indicated that half of the papers presented at the conventions were reprinted in the journal. Those papers which were published constituted approximately half of the 219 articles printed during the first thirteen years. Many of the convention presentations that were not reprinted were withdrawn for a variety of reasons. Often the author withheld the piece in order to expand the work or attempt to
have it published in another venue.\textsuperscript{31}

The entire body of 219 articles was the work of 131 different authors. Ninety-three people, which represents seventy-one percent of the total number of authors, were represented by single entries in the Review. Twenty authors (15 percent) contributed two articles each. A majority of articles from these two groups were reprints of convention talks and not original works written specifically for the journal. When broken down by time periods, an interesting pattern was noted (see table 3). Fifty-two percent of the sixty-five articles found in the first three years were produced by authors who only submitted one article. This figure drops to 29 percent during the next three years. It was possible that these authors were anxious to have their work published, and since the journal was new and seeking articles, it was to their benefit to submit entries both to the conventions and journal. The other consideration is that once these authors were published, they found that the Review did not offer the type of topic or format that these authors were interested in being associated with.

During the third period, the percentage rises slightly to thirty-three or seventeen articles. It is during the last four year period, that there is a dramatic increase in single submissions. Twenty-six of the forty-eight articles were submitted by authors whose names only appear once.

\textsuperscript{31}Mueller interview 13 October 1992.
TABLE 3
ARTICLES BY SINGLE SUBMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>No. of Articles</th>
<th>Single submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>93 (42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers in parentheses indicate the percentage of the total numbers of articles published in that period.

These articles were the work of many new, post-war trained, sociologists who were also eager to find a vehicle in which to publish their research. Of the total 219 articles published during the first thirteen years, ninety-three were by authors whose names only appear once in the journal.

During the entire thirteen year span, only seven of the 219 articles were the work of co-authors. The first of these appeared in the third issue of the 1942 publications. It was

---

32Mundy interview 10 November 1993.
a comment to a talk given at the convention by Francis Friedel, S.M. entitled "Catholic Sociological Research". This response was written by Sr. Liguori, Franz Mueller, Eva Ross, and Walter Willigan. The next co-authored article does not appeared until Volume 5, Issue 3 (October 1944). It was a symposium of three papers by N. S. Timasheff, Friedrich Baerwald, and Leo Martin, S.J. which attempted "to evaluate the social experimentation and experience in Communist, National Socialist, and Liberal society." This was the result of a summary of the three papers which they had presented respectively at the February 26, 1944 ACSS convention. In the October 1946 issue, Clement Mihanovich and Eugene Janson, S.M. co-authored a piece entitled "Social Attitudes of Catholic High School Seniors." It was not until 1951 that any other multiple author pieces appeared. In the October issue, Sr. M. Margaret Johnson, O.S.B. and Br. Gerald Schnepp, S.M. published an article entitled "New Tools For Marriage Counselors." It is a description of a prediction test for marital happiness based on religious background factors developed by the sociology department of St. Louis University and an associated study of a sample group of couples to which it was administered. In the December issue of that same year, Frederick Dougherty and C. J. Nuesse co-authored an article entitle "Differentials in

Catholic Opinion on the Admission of Displaced Persons." It was a partial report of a Catholic opinion survey initiated by the sociology department of the Catholic University of America. Nuesse chaired the committee that did the survey and the complete tabulations on the topic were the basis for Dougherty's Master's dissertation. In the March 1952 issue, an article entitled "Sociology at the Major Seminary" was a reprint of a convention talks given by Joseph Kerins, C.Ss.R. and Herman Doerr, O.F.M.. In December 1952, Russell Barta and Charles O'Reilly published the results of a study they did entitled "Some Dating Patterns and Attitudes Toward Marriage of 174 Catholic College Students." Other than the fact that most of these co-authored articles were the result of joint talks given at the ACSS conventions, there is little that these articles have in common. The infrequency with which the co-authored pieces occur seems to suggest that the Catholic writer was not necessarily comfortable with this style of authorship. All of the authors involved with these articles were members of the ACSS. It does not appear that the members submitted articles in which only one author was a member which suggests that this was not a widely used style by the members. Due to the infrequency of this style, few assumptions could be made regarding it.

Of the 131 authors represented in the first thirteen years, 107 were men while twenty-four were female. Fifty-eight of the male contributors were members of the Catholic
clergy while forty-nine were laymen. Of the female authors, thirteen were members of a Catholic religious order while eleven were lay women. Some of the contributors who were lay were not necessarily Catholic. There is no indication of religious background of these members.

In examining the Table of Contents for the first thirteen years of publication, it was possible to break the various offerings down into ten separate categories. This breakdown signifies the distinct types of material covered in the various issues. (see table 4) In this table, all entries were listed according to their appearance per issue.34 The variety of topics covered by the articles required that the articles be listed as individual item-entries as opposed to grouping all articles per issue as a single entry. A majority of the different types of entries were self explanatory. But, there were two which sound similar but performed a very different function. The section entitled "News of Sociological Interest" included tidbits of information on a social level regarding topics such as other societies' conventions, institutional or departmental updates, various studies or works recently completed by the members, awards and grants either awarded or available, etc.

34 Rather than listing the exact number of long and short book reviews per issue, the fact that the reviews appear in an issue counts as one entry. This distinction is made in order to use the categories listed in Ethel Shanas's article for further analysis of the contents. It is also necessary to list each article as a separate entry in order to fulfill the same purpose.
In October 1944, a section was added that was entitled "Notes of Sociological Interest." This section included single topic instructional discussions on various themes of interest to sociologists. Such topics as the methods used in teaching introductory courses in sociology or the procedures used in developing a particular type of study were discussed. This section was more of a method oriented "how-to" piece for the working sociologist. When comparing the contents of Table 4 with the listings found in Table 2, items four through ten of Table 4 were those topics which would be included in the "Other" section of Table 2. In looking at the percentages of space allotment to these item-entries, it became apparent that while they appeared with some frequency they did not require a large amount of space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4</th>
<th>TOTALS OF ITEM-ENTRY CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Articles</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Book Reviews</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Periodical Reviews</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. News of Sociological Interest</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reporting on the Annual Conventions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reporting on Round Tables, Symposia, Tributes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rosters or Listing of ACSS membership, or Who's Who Among Catholic Sociologists</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Index to Volume</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Notes of Sociological Interest</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Communications</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of Item Entries 400

In 1945, Ethel Shanas published an article in The American Journal of Sociology entitled "The American Journal
of Sociology Through Fifty Years.\textsuperscript{35} Shanas' article covers the issues of The American Journal of Sociology published from 1895 through 1944 and classifies into sixteen categories the various item-entry articles found in that journal. Her scheme "grew out of a study of the content of the Journal's articles and is designed to reflect the sense of those articles."\textsuperscript{36} While she did not define the nature of each category, she did offer brief descriptions of some and the topics were for the most part self-explanatory. Since a portion of time period covered by her analysis coincides with the beginnings of the American Catholic Sociological Review, the categories were adaptable to the contents of the Review. Also, since many of the Catholic sociologists were also members of the American Sociological Society, they were familiar with and interested in the same types of topics covered in that journal. The members' tendency would be to write along the lines of those topics that were both popular and familiar, and publishable in both sociological journals. Fr. Gilbert Callahan used the categories listed in this article as the basis for classification of the articles.

\textsuperscript{35}The American Journal of Sociology, Volume L (July 1944-May 1945): 522-533.

found in the *American Catholic Sociological Review*.\(^{37}\) That comparison will be continued in this paper.

Shanas's categorization was divided into fifteen categories plus a Miscellaneous grouping. The list includes:

1. Theory and History
2. Social Institutions and Organization
3. Social Pathology
4. Social Psychology
5. Human Ecology
6. Population
7. Race and Nationalities
8. Methods of Research
9. Sociology Elsewhere
10. Other Social Sciences
11. Social Reform
12. Sociological "Shop-Talk"
13. Student Dissertations
14. Special Bibliographies
15. Social Survey
16. Miscellaneous\(^{38}\)

While it would seem imperative that a list analyzing a Catholic journal should have a division for Catholic/Christian papers, in this situation, it was not necessary nor recommended. This category would become an artificial category since most of the work published in the *Review* would have some form of religious overtones, all the articles would thereby fit into that category. This would create a twofold classification for each article which would in effect skew the analysis of the various topics. It is acknowledged that the *Review* was the work of a religious

\[^{37}\text{Callahan's thesis covers the years 1940 through 1954. Callahan's thesis and Shanas's categories are the basis for this portion of the dissertation.}\]

\[^{38}\text{Shanas, 524.}\]
based group. The analysis of their works centered around the classification of their articles from a larger sociological perspective. It was interesting to note that Shanas stated that the first issue published in July, 1895 of *The American Journal of Sociology* did contain two papers on Christian sociology. There was not sufficient representation past the first five years of publication for this topic to support a listing of it as a separate category throughout her fifty year survey.\(^{39}\)

Callahan had assigned each of the articles of *The American Catholic Sociological Review* into one of Shanas's categories.\(^ {40}\) The classification and subsequent charting of these articles gave a clear picture of the relevant trends and ebb and flow of the various sociological topics of interest to the members of the society during the first fifteen years of the Review. The reader should bear in mind that while many of the articles could possibly fit into two or more categories, the decision for placement was made

\(^{39}\text{Ibid, 523.}\)

\(^{40}\text{Both Shanas and Callahan point out to the reader that the classifications used are neither objective nor rigidly exclusive to one category. The classification of the single articles must therefore be subjective. In review of Callahan's classification of items, this author does not agree completely with his labeling. I have chosen to complete the analysis based on my classification of the articles.}\)
based on the most prominent aspect of the item.\textsuperscript{41} (see table 5)

The express purpose for the establishment of the Review was for it to serve as a forum for Catholic social thought. This social thought incorporated a philosophy and theology that were unique and inherent to the Catholic faith. Therefore, it was understandable that the first category which deals with "Theory and History" would be decidedly more active than many of the other categories. This category is only comprised of articles such as Eva Ross's "Sociology and the Catholic" (March 1940), "The Principle of Subsidiarity in the Christian Tradition" by Franz Mueller (October 1943), and "The Sociology of Jose Medina Echavarria" by Stuart Queen (March 1948). The initial period of publication covering 1940 through 1942 contained eighteen out of the fifty-two articles \textit{in toto} in this category. This represented 28 percent of the total articles published during that time frame. While the first period contained the greatest amount of articles published in this category, the percentage of the publication devoted to this topic holds relatively true through the thirteen years under study. While it dipped to 18 percent during 1943-1945 period, it

\textsuperscript{41}The greatest deviation between Callahan's classifications and this author's is that in this work the Book and Periodical Reviews were assigned to "#19 Miscellaneous" rather than #2 or #12 as Callahan had done. Since the Doctoral Dissertations were part of the Book Review section they were not separated out for this analysis. Therefore, category #13 stands empty.
came back up to 25 percent in 1946 through 1948. During the last four year period, it retained 23 percent of the article topics presented. While the totals by time period were relatively steady, this topic did have some large fluctuations in numbers when looked at annually.\(^{42}\) This was in part due to some holding over of articles by the Editorial Board to help round out the publication.

The second category entitled "Social Institutions and Organizations" contained such articles as "The Family Under the National Defense Program" by Edwin Mulligan, S.J. (March 1942) and "Industrial Democracy in Belgium" by William Clarke, S.J. (December 1949). This category is the largest group consisting solely of articles. Again, the first time period (1940 through 1942) offered the most articles published about this topic. Eighteen articles are presented which accounts for another 28 percent of the total articles during this period. The second period (1943-1945) showed a slight increase to 29 percent of the articles published even though the actual number of articles in this topic dropped to sixteen. In the post-war years of 1946 through 1948, this figure dropped to eleven articles lowering the percentage to twenty-two. From 1949 through 1952, the number of articles increased to fifteen which actually represented a high of 31

\(^{42}\)In the period from 1946 through 1948, Volume 7 contained seven articles, Volume 8 contained one article, and Volume 9 contained five articles. These fluctuations do not effect the overall pattern.
percent.

The third category entitled "Social Pathology" contained only two articles throughout the thirteen year span which were both printed during the war years of 1943 through 1945. "The Social Worker and Postwar Reconstruction" by Lucian Lauerman and "Steam Power: A Study in the Sociology of Invention" by Paul Hanly Furfey both appeared in Volume 5 Issues 2 and 3, respectively. It was the focus of these two articles to look for a cure for social ills, Lauerman on the devastating effects of war on society and Furfey on the intrusion of technology into human lives, that caused them to be placed in this category. While other articles might arguably be placed in this section, these two project the most straightforward approach to finding cures for societal ills and, therefore, stand alone.

Under the heading of "Social Psychology" were grouped such articles as "On Propaganda" by N. S. Timasheff (March 1943), "Sociological Implications of UNESCO" by John Donovan (March 1947), and "The Leader's Skill in Group Discussion" by Charles Curran (December 1950). Again this category was comprised solely of articles published during the thirteen years. While the first two time periods offered three and four articles respectively, which constitutes 5 and 7 percent of the total articles published, both the last periods contain five articles each. These articles represented 10 percent of the total article production for
each of those periods. With different cultural patterns emerging after the War, the language and function of this topic became more important and common. It was no longer merely theoretical work as it had been originally.\textsuperscript{43} The need for a greater understanding of the topic was apparent.

The "Human Ecology" section dealt mainly with urban and rural sociology. This category was represented during the first three time periods only by fifteen article entries. One of the most representative articles appeared in Volume 1 Issue 1 and was entitled "A Manifesto on Rural Life" and was written by James Byrnes. Much discussion was directed over the years to the dignity that should be afforded to labor and the less complicated life style. Discussions regarding the effects of the stress and impact of urban existence could be seen in articles like "The Social Question of Shop" written by Franz Mueller (June 1948). Many of these articles discussed the problems associated with the resettlement and readjustment of the individual and the family unit into a new social order which might include new family roles, new living arrangements, different location, and possibly the introduction to a new value structure. Each of these time periods offered four, five, and six articles respectively. This represented 6, 9, and 12 percent of the articles published during those periods respectively. The frequency of their appearance indicated the importance of these issues

\textsuperscript{43}Shanas, 523.
The topic of "Population" did not appear until the 1943-1945 period and after that only ten articles on the topic were published. It was addressed strongly during the 1943-1945 and 1946-1948 time periods. Only one article on this topic appeared in the 1949-1952 time frame. These articles included such topics as "Recent Trends in American Child-Bearing" by Bernard Mulvaney, C.S.V. (March 1943) and Paul Mundy's article entitled "Fertility Variations With Education" (June 1946). The indication was that the Catholic authors were using more empirical sociological methods to gain data. The last article of this style to appear was written by Sr. M. Canisia, S.S.N.D. entitled "Family Size of Catholic Graduates" (June 1949). While this method was useful and carried with it a great potential for research, it appeared to have run its course within the six year between 1943 and 1948.

Sixteen articles addressed the topic of "Races and Nationalities." Only one article appeared in the first three year period and three during the second three years. This topic was most prominent in the post-war years of 1946 through 1948. During that period, nine articles appeared which constitutes 18 percent of the articles published. When looking at this period historically, many nationalistic and social pressures were apparent. Nationally, an unusually high number of immigrants and "displaced" persons entered a
society that was itself coming to grips with new direction and values. Coupled with this, and based on war experiences, was an increasing need for racial justice, and stronger and better racial relationships. More than demographics was needed to develop and understand these new relationships and the authors offered two different types of articles to address the topic. The first, in an attempt at promoting understanding, the authors attempted to offer a description of the Black culture with such articles as "Characteristics of the Negro Family in St. Louis, MO." by Clement Mihanovich (March 1946) and "The 'Tops and Bottoms': A Study of Negro Gangs in West Philadelphia" by John Kane (June 1948). Only one article, "Anti-Semitism Among Catholic College Students" by John Kane (October 1947) deals with the Jewish relationship. No articles appeared that deal with any other minority group. The second type of article discussed the negative results of racism. Erik R. V. Kuehnelt-Leddihn's "An Anatomy of Racial Intolerance" (March 1946) is an example of this type of article. In the final time period (1949-1952), three articles were published dealing with the topic of "Races and Nationalities".

In the early days of the ACSS, the Catholic trained sociologist was not noted for the use of research techniques. Even though there was a slight increase in the type of article that used statistics, there was little written work regarding new or different types of research
methods. The eighth category contained only ten entries on the subject, only one of which comes from the Notes of Sociological Interest section. During the first three years, Edward Marciniak wrote "An Appraisal of Research Methods in the Study of Southern Communities" (March 1943). During the second period, three articles appeared while two were published during the next three year period. Four appear during the last period and significant among them was a two part article written by Elizabeth R. Smith entitled, "Introduction to Sociometrics" (December 1950 and March 1951). While this was an area of acknowledged weakness for some of the members of the Society, there was little concerted action on the part of the Board to make sure that the membership received information and instruction. By not using the "Notes" section or the "News of Sociological Interest" to disseminate this type of information, the Board passed up an opportunity to use the journal as an effective teaching tool.

Throughout the early years of the Society and the Review, much time and effort was put into establishing their own identity within the American culture. This lack of outward vision is evident within the section entitled "Sociology Elsewhere". No articles on this topic appear for the first six years of publication. The two entries that appeared in the third time period were not articles but were found in the "Notes of Sociological Interest" sections of
1946 (December) and 1947 (October) respectively. Neither was lengthy or involved. The last time period contained two articles on this topic. Eva Ross wrote an article entitled "The Sociology of Religion in France Today" (March 1950). A joint article by Fr. Joseph Kerins and Fr. Herman Doerr on "Sociology in the Major Seminary" appeared in the March 1952 issue.

The section entitled "Other Social Sciences" was composed of nineteen articles. The first six years of the journal showed the strongest interest in this topic. Seven articles, or 11 percent of the publication, was devoted to it. From 1943 through 1945, another six articles were printed. They included such articles as "A Catholic Approach to Anthropology" by Albert Muntsch, S.J. (June 1943) and "The Formal Object of the Social Sciences" by Francis Friedel, S.M.. As with the attempt to define Catholic sociology, many of these early articles deal with a markedly Catholic approach to the other Social Sciences. The last six years show less of a representation in this field. From 1946 through 1948 only two articles were published and from 1949 through 1952, four were published. The articles published in the last seven years take a on a different tone as was evident by the title of Joseph Fitzpatrick, S.J. article, "Industrial Sociology: Contribution and Confusions" (October 1951).

The papal encyclicals demanded that Catholics be
actively involved in social reform through social action. The first six years indicated this commitment to cure societal ills by the Catholic sociologist. In the first three years, five articles could be included in this category. This included such articles as "Social Aspects of Recent Labor Legislation" by William Conley (June 1940) and "The Modern State and Public Welfare" by Wilfred Parsons, S.J. (June 1942). The next period produced only three articles deal with the issue of social cooperatives. Within the third time frame, there were no articles which are classifiable under this category. The last period offered two, for a total of ten articles.

The second largest category was devoted to "Sociological 'Shop-Talk'". This section include seventy-nine items, most of which were a result of the "News of Sociological Interest" being included in this section. This section also included the membership research census lists, and a few of the "Notes of Sociological Interest". The eight articles included in this section dealt mainly with curriculum matters such as "Courses on Race Relations in Catholic Colleges" by Mary Elizabeth Walsh (March 1941) or "The Introductory Course in Sociology" (March 1941). A majority of these articles were found within the first three year period.

The category on student dissertations had no item entries. While there were nineteen summaries of
dissertations found in the journal and references found in some articles that a Master's thesis either completed the work or contributed to it, the decision was made to not separate them from another category simply to recognize their existence in this category. The summaries were part of the Book Review section and are therefore counted in the Miscellaneous category. The articles with reference to other works, were counted in other topic headings.

TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1940-1942</th>
<th>1943-1945</th>
<th>1946-1948</th>
<th>1949-1952</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Theory &amp; History</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Inst. &amp; Organiz.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social Pathology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Human Ecology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Population</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Races &amp; Nationalities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Methods of Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sociology Elsewhere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other Social Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Social Reform</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sociological &quot;Shop-Talk&quot;</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Student Dissertations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Special Bibliographies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Social Survey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the section for "Special Bibliographies" there was only one entry. It was found in the second time period. In the June 1945 issues, under the heading of "Notes of Sociological Interest", Edward Marciniak wrote a piece entitled "Books for a Sociology Library". It included a list of fifty books, suggested by the membership survey, that were considered to be indispensable for a sociology library. A second list was also included which list twenty books which should be found in a high school library.

In the fifteenth category, "Social Survey", there was only one entry. In the first year of publication Clement Mihanovich published an article entitled "The Mobility of Eminent Catholic Laymen" (June 1940).

The last category, "Miscellaneous", was by nature the largest with 104 entries. A majority of these entries came from the inclusion of the book and periodical reviews, membership rosters, and the indexes. Seven articles did appear throughout the thirteen year period. "The Sociologist as Teacher" by C. J. Nuesse (December 1944) was an example of one. While these articles' placement could possibly be argued to fit into other categories, their focus was not as strong as the other articles already placed in those categories. The subject matter that they cover was rather unique in interpretation and, therefore, their placement was best suited to this general category.

In looking at these categories, certain trends became
apparent. Throughout its history, the Society, reflected through the journal, was interested in promoting a sense of the Catholic self. To that end, the attention to theory, history, and the role of the Church and its related social institutions was continuous and dominant throughout the first thirteen years of publication. A second trend that dominated was that of social action. In the first six years, this topic took on the form of "Social Reform". It was open and blatant in its approach to the call of the encyclicals for social justice and concern for society. After the Second World War, this topic shifted focus and could now be found dealing with various racial problems and nationalities. The intent was the same which was to promote the social well being of all peoples and to actively seek ways to achieve social justice. A third trend was evident when combining the categories of "Population" and "Methods of Research". Using or reading about various forms of empirical methodology did not seem to be a high priority to the contributors of the journal. This might be due in large extent to the more theoretical rather than methodological training received by many of the Catholic institution trained members.

Content Analysis Based on the ACSS Stated Goals

The Review was established under the auspices and leadership of the American Catholic Sociological Society. As an official organ of that society, it had a responsibility


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>1940-42</th>
<th>1943-45</th>
<th>1946-48</th>
<th>1949-52</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics in the field of sociology</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To create a sense of solidarity among Catholic Sociologists</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To unearth and disseminate the sociological implications of the Catholic thought pattern</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unclassifiable according to the Constitutional purposes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(219)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number indicate the total item count per goal during each period. The number in parenthesis indicates the number of articles that are coded into this category for each period. For example, the first goal during years 1940-1942 has twenty items. Of these, eighteen are articles.

to adhere to and promote the goals of this organization. The material published in the journal would be expected to fall into line with the three major goals as established by the Organizational Committee. Those goals were:

1. To stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics in the field of sociology
2. To create a sense of solidarity among Catholic Sociologists
3. To unearth and disseminate the sociological implications of the Catholic thought pattern

In an attempt to assess if the Review fulfilled its obligation to the society, the 400 item-entries (see table 4) have been classified according to the three stated goals. One additional section had been added for those items that were not classifiable by these three goals. It served as a miscellaneous category. The purpose of dividing them by the three year periods is to look for trends and emphasis within that period. (see table 6)

The first stated goal in the Constitution was, "To stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics in the field of sociology." This goal was addressed by 139 entries over the thirteen year span. Almost all of these entries were articles that had been published. Across the four time periods there was an increase in this category. The greatest increase came in the second period (1943-45) and coincided with the increase in the general categories of "Population" and "Methods of Research" found in Table 5. The increase was supported in the third time period (1946-1948) with the increase found of the seventh category entitled "Races and Nationalities". While the work done by the authors cannot be considered purely empirical in nature, it

44 The classification used by this author are in agreement with the classifications used by Callahan in his work.
could easily be included in this goal.

The second goal, "To create a sense of solidarity among Catholic Sociologists", had the highest number of items entries during the thirteen year period. Only forty-one of the 175 entries were articles. The first three year period actually carried the most articles and entries into this category. This may be easily understood by the fact that the Society and the journal were new and intent of building a solid and loyal membership base. The second three year period (1943-1945) was a time of disunity in the Society. Due to war related travel restrictions, the annual conventions were replaced by local meetings, committees postponed sessions, and less emphasis was placed on new membership. These circumstances would seem to make the time ripe for the editorial board to increase and expand this section in order to instill a sense of loyalty and camaraderie among the membership. By encouraging these feelings, the board would in effect insure the continuation of both the Society and the journal after the cessation of the war. But what was evident was that this goal actually suffered quite a drastic reduction in items especially in the number of articles published. There was another decrease in the items associated with this goal during the third period (the post-war years). No articles supporting this goal were published during that time. The fourth period witnessed a slight increase in items which mostly include
the consistent publication of "News of Sociological Interest", "Notes of Sociological Interest", and book reviews. Only one article was published during this last period that addressed this goal.

Seventy-three items were associated with the third goal of "unearthing and disseminating the sociological implications of the Catholic thought pattern." Of these seventy-three items, forty-three were articles. Many of the articles found within the first three years that supported this goal were also associated with the first category (see table 5) entitled "Theory and History". The goal helped to provide the forum through which the idea of sociology, especially Catholic sociology, social action and reform, and the theories related to them could be spread. This goal remained fairly consistent throughout the thirteen year period as did the related categories of topics.

The fourth division, those items unclassifiable by goal, contained only thirteen entries in total. No articles fit into this section. The few items included are mostly due to the listing of the journal indexes in the item-entry notations. The lack of material in this section indicated the Board chose the material well when determining what was to be published.

It was evident from these four groupings that the editorial board of the journal was intent on meeting and supporting the goals of the Society. While not seeking out
specific items to fill in a grouping, their choices for publication were in line with the vision of the Society. The journal became a true reflection of the society, showing not only the interests of the members but their commitment to the goals. The positive and negatives aspects of establishing a society and a journal were evident within its pages.

The next chapter will continue this analysis of both the topical trends and the fulfillment of the goals of the ACSS. The chapter will cover the period from 1953 through 1968.
The purpose of this chapter is to continue the analysis of the *American Catholic Sociological Review* begun in Chapter 4. This examination will continue to examine the structure and contents of the next sixteen years of publication, the first eleven of which continue under the title of the *Review* and the next five under the new title, *Sociological Analysis*. The sixty-four issues published from 1953 through 1968 under these two titles form the basis for this part of the study. In order to track the development of subject matter and compare significant trends, this section has grouped the sixteen years into five periods for analysis. (1953-1955, 1956-1958, 1959-1961, 1962-1964, and 1965-1969) The analysis of contents will again be examined according to the sixteen categories offered by Shanas and

---

*1* For sake of brevity, the *American Catholic Sociological Review* will be referred to during the rest of this chapter as the *Review* or the journal. For the sake of uniformity, this reference will also hold during the period from 1964 through 1968 when the *Review* officially changes its name to *Sociological Analysis*.

*2* The division into three year segments is in agreement with the time periods established in the previous chapter and is an arbitrary division.
the three original goals of the organization.\textsuperscript{3}

During this sixteen year period, there was little change to the established structure found in the original thirteen years. The format of each issue continued to revolve around the same three major subdivisions: the publication of original articles; reviews of current literature; and a miscellaneous section. There were three noticeable features which had become standard over the years that were unceremoniously discontinued during this time. They were: (1) as of Issue 2 of 1958, the elimination of the periodical reviews; (2) as Issue 4 of 1960, the "Short Notice" division of the book reviews was virtually eliminated; and (3) as of 1965, the "News and Announcement" feature was discontinued. The elimination of these features affected the space devoted to the two subdivisions involved but did not offer sufficient grounds to discontinue the entire subdivision.

It was important to note that the Review officially became \textit{Sociological Analysis} as of the first issue published in 1964. This change brought about a new direction and intent on the part of the Editorial Board to focus on the specific topic of sociology of religion.\textsuperscript{4} The actual format of the journal did not change with the redirection of

\textsuperscript{3}The reader may want to reference Chapter 4 for these lists.

\textsuperscript{4}This content change will be discussed later in this chapter.
content. With the exception of the three features listed above, the three major subdivisions were still intact.

**Content of the Review**

During the sixteen year span covering 1953 through 1968, 282 articles were published. (see table 7) As the result of the use of both long and short reviews, 1,584 books were reviewed. Eighty-two periodical articles were also reviewed. The issues from 1957 through 1961 carried listings of additional book that were presented under the masthead "Publications Received". This was followed by the statement, "Listing of a publication below does not preclude its subsequent review." Instead of reviews, a listing of basic publication information was given for these entries. These listings provided the titles of an additional 337 books. In Issue 3 of 1959, there was also a listing of an additional twelve books whose reviews were lost in the fire at the Techny printing house and could not be replaced. With the exclusion of the twenty-two books later reviewed, the total reference to other published works of possible

---


6 This information included author, publication information, number of pages, and cost.

7 Of this group, only twenty-two books were ever reviewed. Ten were reviewed during 1960 and another ten were review during 1961.
interest involved 327 items. During this sixteen year period, the readers of the journal were eventually

**TABLE 7**
ITEM-ENTRY CATEGORIES, 1953 - 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Book Reviews</th>
<th>Short Notices</th>
<th>Total Book Reviews</th>
<th>Periodicals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 1964, the American Catholic Sociological Review officially changed its title to Sociological Analysis.

offered 1,911 different titles to consider. The number of books actually reviewed during this time was approximately fifty percent higher than found in the original thirteen years and the addition of the supplementary lists almost
doubled the number of titles that had been made available during the original period. While these numbers were formidable, they did not indicate any intent on the part of the editorial staff to refocus the journal's direction towards becoming a source of sociological book titles as opposed to original articles. This increase could be attributed to a growing number of books being published in the field and a growing number of reviewers. The number of offerings in this section peaked during the 1952 through 1955 period and gradually deceased while, at the same time, a gradual increase in the number of articles presented became apparent.

From 1953 through 1955, forty-two articles were presented which represents a slight decrease from the forty-eight published in the four years prior. The period covering 1956 through 1958 began the trend to increase the volume of this section. The number of articles increased in the 1956 through 1958 period to forty-seven. From 1959 through 1961, there was an increase to fifty-seven articles. The period from 1962 through 1964 has sixty articles while the final period, 1965 through 1968 offered seventy-six articles.

Corresponding to the increase in articles was an increase in the number of pages devoted to their publication. (see table 8) At 49 percent, the period from 1953 through 1955 contained the fewest pages devoted to articles. Period 6, 1956 through 1958, showed an increase to
50 percent while 1959 through 1961 had 54 percent of the issues devoted to articles. The period from 1962 through 1964 posted a dramatic increase to 68 percent. This was in large part due to the switch in editorial leadership that occurred in 1964 with the change to Sociological Analysis. While the pages devoted to articles in 1962 and 1963 (62 and 64 percent respectively), were slightly higher than the previous years, the editorial switch caused this statistic to increase dramatically to 83 percent in 1964. During the period 1965 through 1968, 79 percent of the pages were devoted to article publication. In order to compensate for the increase in pages devoted to articles, there was a marked decline in the number of pages devoted to both the book reviews and miscellaneous section.

The highest number of books (480) were reviewed from 1953 through 1955. (see table 7) The number of books reviewed and the corresponding printed page percentages decreased during each subsequent period until the low of eighty-three books were reviewed from 1965 through 1968. One of the most noticeable changes in this feature was apparent in the statistics found in the period covering 1962 through 1964. Both 1962 and 1964 offered no short book reviews and only eleven were published in 1963. The initial two years of this period, 1962 and 1963, published a total of sixty-eight and sixty-four reviews respectively. The first year of Sociological Analysis (1964) saw this total plunge to a mere
four books reviewed. The next four years carried an average of twenty-one books reviewed annually. The percentage of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Article pages</th>
<th>Review pages</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>125 (43)</td>
<td>126 (44)</td>
<td>37 (13)</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>210 (55)</td>
<td>135 (35)</td>
<td>39 (10)</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>172 (47)</td>
<td>150 (41)</td>
<td>42 (12)</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 5</td>
<td>507 (49)</td>
<td>411 (40)</td>
<td>118 (11)</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>198 (52)</td>
<td>148 (39)</td>
<td>38 (10)</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>160 (46)</td>
<td>143 (41)</td>
<td>47 (13)</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>200 (52)</td>
<td>137 (36)</td>
<td>45 (12)</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 6</td>
<td>558 (50)</td>
<td>428 (38)</td>
<td>130 (12)</td>
<td>1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>172 (45)</td>
<td>150 (39)</td>
<td>62 (16)</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>218 (57)</td>
<td>138 (36)</td>
<td>28 (07)</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>225 (59)</td>
<td>103 (27)</td>
<td>51 (14)</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 7</td>
<td>615 (54)</td>
<td>391 (34)</td>
<td>141 (12)</td>
<td>1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>237 (62)</td>
<td>86 (22)</td>
<td>61 (16)</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>243 (64)</td>
<td>81 (21)</td>
<td>54 (14)</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964*</td>
<td>214 (83)</td>
<td>9 (04)</td>
<td>35 (14)</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 8</td>
<td>694 (68)</td>
<td>176 (17)</td>
<td>150 (15)</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>188 (80)</td>
<td>34 (14)</td>
<td>14 (06)</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>210 (82)</td>
<td>42 (16)</td>
<td>4 (02)</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>186 (78)</td>
<td>50 (21)</td>
<td>3 (01)</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>174 (77)</td>
<td>42 (19)</td>
<td>11 (05)</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 9</td>
<td>758 (79)</td>
<td>168 (18)</td>
<td>32 (03)</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3132 (59)</td>
<td>1574 (30)</td>
<td>571 (11)</td>
<td>5277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The pages listed in the Other category are a composite of pages devoted in each journal to a random collection of entries such as: the Table of Contents, Convention agenda, News and Notes of Sociological Interest, advertisements, lists of members, etc. The numbers that appear in parentheses indicate the percentage of pages devoted to that particular category.

* In 1964, the American Catholic Sociological Review officially changed its title to Sociological Analysis.

pages devoted to this section gradually decreased during each period from the high of 40 percent found during 1953
through 1955. (see table 8) These figures, which were at 38 percent during 1956 through 1958 and dropped to 34 percent during 1959 through 1961, verified the trend on the part of the board to decrease the size of this section. A portion of the decrease in the last period mentioned could be accounted for by the fact that the Periodical Review section was discontinued as of 1958. From 1962 through 1964, only 17 percentage of the published pages were devoted to book reviews. The decline was attributed to the changes that took place with the switch in format to Sociological Analysis. From 21 percent of Volume 24 (1963) being devoted to reviews, Volume 25 (1964) saw this number drop to 4 percent. During the last period, 1965 through 1968, 18 percent of the printed material was devoted to reviews. It was interesting to note that it took twenty-nine years for the journal to complete its bell curve and return to approximately the same allocation of article and book review percentages as found in original issues. (see table 9)

Another dramatic change took place in the actual length of each volume. Volume 14, published in 1952, was 288 pages in length. (see table 8) Volume 15 jumped to 384 pages. Every subsequent volume between 1955 and 1963 contained between 350 and 384 pages. In 1964, the initial publication of Sociological Analysis, the total number of pages of the

---

8Only one periodical review was published after 1958. It was published in 1960 and was written by Sylvester Sieber, S.V.D., Editor of the journal.
volume dropped to 258 and 1965 saw a further decline in size to 236 pages. The volumes stayed within this range for the

TABLE 9
ITEM TOTALS BY PERIODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Book Reviews</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>65 (70)</td>
<td>74 (12)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>55 (58)</td>
<td>193 (23)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 3</td>
<td>51 (56)</td>
<td>303 (33)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 4</td>
<td>48 (44)</td>
<td>529 (46)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 5</td>
<td>42 (49)</td>
<td>580 (40)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 6</td>
<td>47 (50)</td>
<td>466 (38)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 7</td>
<td>57 (54)</td>
<td>419 (34)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 8</td>
<td>60 (68)</td>
<td>136 (17)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 9</td>
<td>76 (79)</td>
<td>83 (18)</td>
<td>(03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numbers that appear in the parentheses indicate the percentage of pages devoted to that particular category.

next two years. By 1968, Volume 29 was only 227 pages in length. The number of pages per issue dropped from an average of eighty-six during the 1953 through 1955 period to an average of fifty-nine pages per issue during the last period covered, 1965 through 1968.

The 282 articles published during the years from 1953 through 1968 represented the work of 231 authors, which is seventy-five more names than appeared during the original thirteen year study. Only nineteen authors of the group of 231 had articles published in both the Review and

---

9The original thirteen years were produced by 131 authors. This sixteen year period contains 231 names which is a difference of 100 names. The difference in this figure comes from the fact that twenty-five names appear in both parts of the study.
Sociological Analysis. Anita Yourglich and Sr. Marie Augusta Neal, S.N.D. are the only two females whose names appear under both journal titles.

The profile of the second author group, which was composed of 197 males and thirty-four females, was very different from the group that published from 1940 through 1952. While the male-female ratio was approximately the same in both sections of the study, the data from the original period indicated that 54 percent of the authors were members of a religious order. (see table 10) During the second period (1953 through 1968), sixty-two authors were members of religious congregations which represented only 27 percent of the total author pool. Eighteen of these were women religious with the remaining forty-four authors being male religious. While the female religious percentage of the total author pool was approximately the same as the first group, there was a dramatic reduction in numbers of male

10 Of the total author pool from 1940 through 1968, only four authors who published during the first thirteen years continued to appear after the change to Sociological Analysis. They are Paul Facey, S.J., Joseph Fitzpatrick, S.J., Rudolph Morris, and Paul Mundy. Facey's and Mundy's contributions were their Presidential Addresses published in 1964 and 1965 respectively.

11 From 1940 through 1952, 107 authors were male [82 percent] while twenty-four were female [18 percent]. From 1953 through 1968, 197 authors were male [85 percent], while thirty-four were female [15 percent].

12 From 1940 through 1952, the female religious represented 10 percent of the authors. From 1953 through 1968, they represent 8 percent.
religious authors. From 1940 through 1952, the male religious represented 44 percent of the authors. During the second study period, the male religious author accounted for only 19 percent of the total group of authors. A marked decrease in their numbers was apparent after 1960. From 1953 through 1960, forty-four (46 percent) of the ninety-five names listed in the order in which they originally appeared in the table of contents belonged to religious authors. From 1961 through 1964, only eighteen (13 percent) of the 136 names listed belonged to members of religious groups. Six of these eighteen were female religious which brings the male religious representation down to 9 percent of the total author group for this period. Five of the religious authors who’s names appear between 1953 and 1961 also published between 1962 and 1968. In addition to this group, Paul W. Facey’s, S.J. contribution was his Presidential Address published in 1964 rather than an article.

From the total author pool, ninety-nine writers names appeared within the pages of *Sociological Analysis*. Of that number, eighty made their first appearance in the journal after the change in focus took place in 1964. Of these ninety-nine authors, only six were female. The authors published in *Sociological Analysis* contained a sub-group of seventeen writers who were affiliated with religious communities. Six members of religious congregations, five males and one female, had articles published under both
journal titles. Of the eleven religious who published only under the Sociological Analysis title, nine were males and two were females.

Within the total group of 231 authors, 175 names are mentioned only once. \(^{13}\) (see table 10) Seven members of this group did not have actual articles published but rather five were represented by the publication of their Presidential Addresses from the pervious years' conventions, one published a "Discussion", while one published a "Rejoinder". The five Presidential Addresses were: C. J. Nuesse's address from 1955, Allen Spitzer's address from 1958, Sr. M. Edward Healy's, C.S.J. address from 1960, Sr. Francis Jerome Woods', C.D.P. address from 1962, and Paul Mundy's address in 1965. In 1962, Issue 4, Pitirim Sorokin printed a discussion of Teilhard de Chardin's theory of evolution and of the phenomenon of man. This piece was followed by a rejoinder by Dr. Paul Chombart de Lauwe on the same issue. Out of the group of single entry authors, fifty names appear which are associated with talks given at an ACSS convention. Of the 175 authors named once, 108 had their work published during the eleven years span from 1953 through 1963 while the journal was still published under the title of the Review.

\(^{13}\) The period from 1940 through 1952 had 71 percent of the authors were those whose named appeared only once. From 1953 through 1968, 76 percent of the authors fall into this category.
One very obvious change appeared in the number of articles that were co-authored. In the original thirteen volumes, only seven of the articles that were published were the work of joint authors and none had more than two authors. This figure represents 3 percent of the total number of articles. During the sixteen years from 1953 through 1968, forty-two articles or 15 percent of the total were co-authored. Thirty-three were written by two authors, eight of these pieces were the work of three authors, and one was the work of four authors. Of these forty-two articles, thirteen were reprinted from convention talks. Five articles from this group fall into a slightly different category. "Anomie and the 'Quest for Community': The Formation of Sects Among the Puerto Ricans of New York" was written by Renato Poblete, S.J. and Thomas O'Dea (March 1960) but was a rewrite of a talk presented at the convention by O'Dea. The other four articles offered the same situation, a talk given by one author but the article co-authored with a non-speaker. One of this group offered an interesting situation. In 1968, Raymond Potvin and Thomas Burch published an article entitled "Fertility, Ideal Family-Size and Religious Orientation Among U. S. Catholics." (March 1968) The article is based on two talks

---

### TABLE 10
ARTICLE QUANTITY SUBMISSION BY AUTHOR TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>No. of Articles</th>
<th>Single Submissions</th>
<th>Religious Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>62 (82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The listing of a single author’s name does not necessarily indicate a one on one relationship with the production of an article. Thirty-nine of these names were involved with co-authored articles. The count simply indicates that the author’s name appeared once in the Table of Contents of the journal from 1953 through 1968.

Of the religious authors’ count, the base number indicates the first time the name appeared in the Table of Contents. The number in parenthesis indicates other religious who published during that year but whose names had appeared for the first time earlier in the journal. For example, Joseph Fitzpatrick’s, S.J. name first appeared in 1953. His name also appears in 1954, 1959, and 1964. Those entries are included in the appropriate parenthetical count.

Presented at the 1964 convention. One by Potvin and Charles Westoff entitled "Catholic Fertility Ideology" and the other
by Burch entitled "Catholicism and Fertility." (Spring 1964) The presentation of co-authored pieces was not confined to any particular time period but scattered throughout the issues.

During the first thirteen years, almost one half of the papers printed in the journal were reprints of convention talks. During the next sixteen years, 104 articles, or 37 percent of all articles published, were reprinted from convention talks. The program for the 1953 convention listed eight papers presented. Of that group, four articles were printed. 1954 listed seventeen talks with the result of seven papers printed in the journal. Of these seven articles, four were published within 1954 and three were published in 1956. Of the seventeen talks given in 1955, only three were reproduced as articles. The next three years, 1956 through 1958, has a dramatic increase in papers presented at the conventions and a decrease in resulting publications. In 1956, twenty-five papers were read but only produced four articles. 1957s convention had twenty-seven talks which resulted in twelve articles. Eight of these were published in 1958 and three were published in 1960. Raymond Potvin's article on Belgian Enterprise Council's was published prior to being presented at the 1957 convention.

In 1958, there were twenty-five talks and resulted in three published articles.

While there was no pattern to the number of convention presentations given during the remaining years, the trend towards low article production continued. Twenty-three presentations were given at the 1959 conventions which resulted in five published articles. One of which was not published until 1961. The 1960 convention hosted forty-five presentations and produced thirteen articles, twelve printed in 1961 and one printed in 1963. At the 1961 convention fourteen papers were presented and three articles were published. The 1962 convention presented twenty-three talks and resulted in seven papers while the 1963 convention had thirty-one talks and seven papers to its credit. With the beginning of *Sociological Analysis* in 1964, seventy-three presentations were scheduled for the convention. They produced thirteen papers. Also listed in the 1964 (Volume 25) edition of the journal was the program for the 1965 convention that included forty-two talks. Seven papers were subsequently published. Beginning with 1965, there was no published listing of the convention programs. The only indication of a convention talk reproduced as an article came in the form of a footnote at the beginning of the article noting that it was originally given at an ACSS convention and the year. This reference was found in four articles in Volume 27 (1966), seven in Volume 28 (1967), and
In the notations involving the articles found in *Sociological Analysis*, reference was made for the first time regarding the funding for the research involved, assistance with obtaining the necessary data, or the fact that the paper was originally presented at another learned society meeting. Typical of these notations is Samuel Z. Klausner's article "Empirical Study of 'Ethical Neutrality' Among Behavioral Scientists" (Winter 1966) which was noted as originally being presented at the Eastern Sociological Society meeting in Boston on April 11, 1964. The notation also stated that the work was supported by Contract AF 49 (638)-992 of the Air Force Office of Scientific Research. In the case of Werner Stark's article "The Routinization of Charisma: A Consideration of Catholicism" (Winter 1965), the notation indicated that the paper was originally given as a lecture at the meeting of the Metropolitan New York Chapter of the American Catholic Sociological Society held in October 1964.

The first thirteen volumes of the *Review* were all very similar to each other. The articles were straight narrative and used few charts or graphs. Some very interesting changes are seen during the next sixteen year period.

The "News of Sociological Interest" section underwent one of the most substantial changes. During 1953, this section appeared to be an afterthought on the part of the
editors. In Issue 2 of Volume 29, this feature reached its lowest point when the entire feature was only one half page long and contained only two entries, one of which was about the half-tuition scholarships being made available by the Catholic University of America to their graduate or professional schools. The next issue of the same volume had the results of a survey conducted by Russell Barta and Charles O'Reilly entitled "Some Attitudes Toward Dating and Marriage of 201 Catholic College Students" (Fall 1963) but very little news. It took on the appearance of an article in its format. In Issue 2 of 1955, Sr. Miriam Lynch's, O.S.U. name appeared as co-ordinator of this section. By Issue 3 of that same year, she expanded the feature to eight pages and published the information under ten headings including the likes of "Sociologists Abroad", "Promotions, New Appointments, and Departmental News", and "Local Community Projects: Research and Service". Under her direction, this feature took on the appearance of what the original intent of the board had been. It showed a Catholic sociological community that was involved, active, and professional. The reader felt informed and it built a sense of attachment to one another. The feature often ran between six and eight pages in length. This format continued until Sr. Miriam resigned in 1960 from both the Editorial Board and as News Editor of the journal citing additional teaching responsibilities as the reason. In 1961, the feature changed
its title to "News and Announcements." No indication was given to the identity of the coordinator of this information. Rather than the informal grouping of information as established under Sr. Miriam, the news items were now listed by academic institution. In 1961, a "Notice to Contributors" was published which details and information necessary for authors to know prior to article submission. Included in this information was a section on the submission of news items which indicated what would be considered to be "appropriate news and announcements." Items such as "... changes in staff, new appointments, promotions, resignations, retirements and deaths" could be submitted. Also considered to be acceptable "... major changes in curricula, special programs, conferences, institutes, ... and activities of staff members including the reception of grants, research projects and special studies." This was followed by a listing of submission deadlines for the information to be sent to the editor. In 1964, with the change to Sociological Analysis, the entire feature was dropped from publication. Its elimination was one indication that the old guard was no longer in control. Originally it was felt that one of the most important side benefits of the society was its ability to build a sense of camaraderie among the members. In tandem with that sense of belonging,

came a sense of pride in the abilities and the professionalism of the American Catholic sociologist. The news of the members' activities also encouraged the readers to explore further studies or additional ventures that might not have considered possible. With the change in focus, the journal's pages were opened to anyone, not just Catholics or members of the society, who was interested in the topic of sociology of religion. The need to build a tight-knit and supportive society no longer existed and, therefore, the need to publish news items no longer existed.

Another change was the appearance of advertisements within the pages of the journal. The advertisements by the various book companies did not appear scattered throughout the journal on the actual article or book review pages, but were usually found after the Book Review section or the index. These advertisements took on various purposes. In Issue 3 of Volume 16, the Chicago Medical Book Company had a full page general advertisement regarding their company, its policies, and type of books it published without listing specific titles.¹⁷ Major book companies such as Harper Row and Random House were also joined by smaller advertisers such as St. Anthony Guild Press. Occasionally, the books that these companies advertised were written by members of the society such as Joseph Fichter's book Sociology.
published in 1957 by the University of Chicago Press. More often the advertisements dealt with books that would be of specific interest to the Catholic sociologist such as *The National Catholic Almanac - 1956* from St. Anthony’s Guild or *Society - An Introduction to Sociology* written by Ely Chinoy and published by Random House. In addition to books and publisher, different forms of advertisements appeared. In some of the issues full page subscription forms for the journal of membership information for the society were included. In Volume 17, Issue 2, the society printed a full page advertisement for the convention to be held in December 1956 in Milwaukee with reference made to the convention program published earlier in the issue. In 1963, the society advertised the sale of tapes of all sessions of the 1962 ACSS convention talks. Loyola University began advertising the Institute of Social and Industrial Relations in 1957. One of the most unusual notices appeared in Volume 21 Issue 4 at the end of the book review section. It read:

**Employment Bulletin**

500M-Teaching Education and Sociology; M.S.S. and M.A. Fordham; N.Y.U. candidate for Ph.D.; teaching experience; m. 1 child; will relocate. Please address answers to S.M. Liguori, B.V.M., Mundelein College, Chicago 40, Illinois, Chairman, Committee on Employment. Replies will be sent directly to the applicant.\(^{18}\)

This was the only time this type of advertisement for employment was ever printed.

As the authors matured professionally and refined their empirical skills, a new style of writing became apparent. Charts and graphs appeared with more frequency. The results of more surveys and studies were reported on along with the methodology used to obtain the results. For example, in Issue 1 of 1955, T. J. Harte, C.Ss.R. published the results initiated by the Catholic University of America whose universe was composed of 4105 respondents.\textsuperscript{19} In the same volume Issue 4, Br. D. Augustine, F.S.C. ended his article by listing the detailed plans for the group research project that supported the information in his article.\textsuperscript{20} Richard Larson wrote an article that explained the techniques involved in using a scalogram and applied it to a study of the difference in value-attitudes found in Catholic and Protestant clergymen.\textsuperscript{21} The articles became less historical in nature and tended more towards data analysis.

One of the most important differences in the two periods studied was not found in the appearance of advertisements, types of book reviews offered, or the format used in the articles but rather could be seen in the nature


of what was considered to be suitable dialogue for publication in the journal. It involved the appearance of unexplained statements and the innuendoes of disagreements within the board. During the first thirteen years, no dissension among or disagreements with the Editorial Board or the direction of the journal was ever apparent in print. That was not the case during the next sixteen years. The following two cases are offered as examples of the glimpse allowed to the general readership into the strong and occasionally conflicting personalities behind the scenes of the journal.

In the first issue published in 1956 within the "News of Sociological Interest" feature was printed the Philadelphia Convention Reports and Constitutional Changes adopted in December 1955. In this section, reference was made to the debate at the convention over instituting a more democratic manner in which to hold the election of new officers argued by Gordon Zahn. The debate centered around the election of officers being done at the conventions by only those who were in attendance as opposed to the use of a mail ballot sent to the membership at large. This debate lead to the adoption of amendments to Articles IV and VI of the Constitution which upheld the traditional manner of elections being conducted by the attendees at the
convention. 22 Also included in this section was a report of three resolutions passed at that same convention. The second resolution read:

2. The American Catholic Sociological Society also resolves that any article published in The American Catholic Sociological Review and later incorporated into a book either in its exact form or in a substantially equivalent form should include a courtesy acknowledgement of such prior publication in the Review.

Be it further resolved that The American Catholic Sociological Review shall have prior publication rights to all papers presented at the annual meetings of the Society, and the Review shall be provided with advance copies of all papers for consideration for such publication. 23

The submission was signed by The Resolutions Committee which was composed of Br. Eugene Janson, S.M., Paul Mundy, and Br. Gerald Schnepp, S.M. all three of whom were actively involved with the production of the journal. The committee felt that the society and journal was not receiving proper credit or respect from the contributing members. The journal had established an air of respectability and expected to be treated appropriately. The publication of the resolution was seen as a way in which to instruct contributors in the appropriate etiquette and common courtesy involved with publications. It was offered in print so that there would be no confusion as what was considered by the Editorial Board


to be appropriate.\textsuperscript{24}

One of the most straightforward statements of disagreement was published in the section entitled "From the Editor's Desk" written by Sylvester Sieber, S.V.D., Editor of the journal. His final paragraph of this piece read:

On March 2 of this year I assumed the editorship of the ACSR. In approximately nine months I have midwived the accouchement of six issues of the journal with a pride and joy that were only marred by the errata that crept in despite my best efforts. During this time about ten changes were introduced which I think were improvements. Perhaps it was my "will to power" flexing some of its unused muscles that suffused my ego with a synthetic sense of accomplishment, but the task of getting out the magazine was a challenge and a pleasure. I hereby wish to thank all those who cooperated with me. Although I had originally agreed to edit the last two issues of 1959 and the four of 1960, I had, against my better judgement, vaguely planned on making more changes in the future. Owing to my disagreement with a decision of the Executive Council of the ACSS at the annual convention in New York, a decision that was made after I indicated that it would necessitate my resignation, in lame duck fashion I finished these last two issues. With these last lines, therefore, if it is still necessary, I hereby resign as editor of the ACSR.\textsuperscript{25}

There is no discussion in the News section or in the minutes of the convention as to the nature of the disagreement. However, it was noted that his entire editorial board resigned and was replaced for the 1961 publications. Along with various format changes, the first issue of 1961 also contained a rather lengthy notice to contributors establishing the expected format to be followed regarding

\textsuperscript{24}Mundy interview 10 November 1993.

article submissions. An untimely closure was put to the situation on February 13, 1962 when Sieber died of a coronary attack while preparing for his classes at Loyola University. As part of the one page obituary written about him for the journal, Ralph Gallagher summarized Sieber's involvement with the journal and society by saying:

Father Sieber was a member of many societies and of the editorial board of *The American Catholic Sociological Review* for more than ten years. He took over the position of Editor for 1959 and 1960 publishing six issues in less than six months. Father Sieber manifested in his role as Editor that he had no time for compromise.²⁶

It was to be noted that Sr. Miriam Lynch's resignation, which was discussed earlier, was related to Sieber's resignation.

During the years between 1953 and 1968, more attempts were made at focusing specific issues of the journal around specific topics than had been done previously. The theme for the 1953 convention was "Social Problems for the Church". Issue 2 of 1954 reflected this theme by offering two introductory articles: one defining the nature of sociology of religion, and the other discussing the relationship of the American Catholic sociologist and the sociology of religion. The four additional articles in this issue discussed the sociology of religion in various areas of the world (France Belgium, Germany and Austria, Latin America,

and the Netherlands). These four articles also contain very extensive bibliographies. Issue 1 of 1956 included two articles on the Industry Council and one summarizing a survey of forty-five Catholic industrial workers and their understanding of Catholic social teaching. In 1962, a majority of the fourth issue was devoted to Teilhard de Chardin and his views of sociology as interpreted by six different authors. Issue one of 1963, four of the six articles published dealt with the topic of juvenile delinquency. While not having an entire issue devoted to the topic, there were ongoing articles and discussions about the topic of Catholic anti-intellectualism beginning with the publication of Andrew Greeley's article on the subject in Issue 4 of Volume 23 (1962).

THE SWITCH TO SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

While the concept of sociology of religion had been introduced as a topic to the readership in 1954, the actual change in focus of the entire journal took place only after much ongoing debate and discussion on the part of the Editorial Board. The Publications Committee report published in 1963 dealt with some minor changes such as a change in printers, but then went on to report on the meeting of the Editorial Board at the convention in 1962 during which the discussions primarily focused around the change in title for
The report further stated that, "Planning for future issues of the *Review* beyond 1963 has been suspended pending the results of the current discussion relative to potential changes in the name and/or focus of the journal." But, there was no delay in publication and the first issue on *Sociological Analysis* was published on time.

The first issue under the new title offered a two page introduction to *Sociological Analysis* followed by a notice to contributors. In every other aspect, Volume 25 followed very closely the format used for the previous twenty-four years of publications. It contained articles, book reviews, and a miscellaneous section that contained news of interest. The convention programs were published as well as committee reports and annual financial reports. The only real visual difference was in the size of the volume itself. Not only did it have fewer pages than the preceding volumes but it was physically an inch taller and wider than the other volumes.

The format changes began to take place with Volume 26, or the second year of publication of *Sociological Analysis*. The news section was eliminated, as well as, the publication of the convention agendas. Advertisements no longer appeared on the pages. Only vestiges of them appeared as full page order forms for the *Index to the American Catholic...*
Sociological Review - Volumes 1-24 which appeared in the first two issues of Volume 26. While the book reviews remained, they were very limited in space and quantity. No committee reports or news regarding the society appeared. While the articles published were more ecumenical in their interest, there were no specific issues devoted to a particular topic.

The introduction to Sociological Analysis stated that the change "... does not in this case indicate that a revolution has taken place; rather it represents as evolution that has been going on in the American Catholic Sociological Society." It also went on to state:

Through the years, the American Catholic Sociological Society has served as a meeting ground for sociologists who are Catholic. The meetings of the Society and the content of the journal reflected their varied sociological interests. It has become apparent to many, however, particularly in recent years, that the professional interest of Catholic sociologists are best served by participation and communication with their non-Catholic colleagues in their common fields of specialization. Attendance at the meetings of various sociological associations and communication of research results through the various general and specialized journals followed as a natural result.

While the change was not a revolution, for the journal continued to associate itself financially with the society, there was a definite growing attitude of independence on the part of the journal. The society maintained the title

---


29Ibid., 1.
American Catholic Sociological Society for the next few years. This was an image that the journal was attempting to leave behind. Rather than encourage membership for the sake of being Catholic, the editors wanted to encourage readership based on mutual interest. The new format supported no learned society's meetings or special interest group activities. The attempt of the journal was to sell itself based solely on content. While that content did offer many articles written from a decidedly Catholic point of view, the image to be developed was based on a multi-religious approach that was not to be associated with only one church.

While this approach may seem harsh, the reader must take into consideration other outside influences. Historically, it was important to note that by 1964 Vatican Council II had taken place and a new direction towards ecumenism was very prevalent in the Catholic Church. In the directives of the Council, it was mandated that:

All Christians should be of an ecumenical mind, but especially those entrusted with particular duties and responsibilities in the world and in society; hence the principles of ecumenism sanctioned by the Second Vatican Council should be appropriately introduced in all institutions of advanced learning.\textsuperscript{30}

Just as in the beginning of the society's history when the encyclicals called Catholics to a life of social action and

that call influenced the founding of the society, as well as, the journal, the Church was now calling its members to a different Weltanschauung. As members of that Church by both religious affiliation and professional status within its institutes of higher learning, the editorial board had almost no choice in the direction it was to take. It was to open its pages and welcome authors from every religious affiliation. It was felt that this could be done most effectively by downplaying the use of the word "Catholic" and open affiliation with the society.

There was also a practical aspect to this change. Further on in the Council documents, concrete recommendations were made as to the manner in which these prescribed changes could most effectively be made. It stated:

(e) The libraries of seminaries and other institutions of higher education should be kept well supplied with books and periodicals, both those which deal with ecumenism in general and those which give particular treatment to questions of local ecumenical concern or of importance for the special purpose of the institution.  

A major source of subscriptions to the journal came from the libraries and professors of Catholic institutions of higher education. If the journal was unable to satisfy this directive, the librarians of these schools would look to other sources. Since annual budgets always limit available funds, some subscriptions would by necessity be dropped in

31 Ibid., 527.
order to allow the new ones, which would be more suitable to the needs of the institution, to be acquired. The professors would need a ready supply of new literature to not only enhance their personal backgrounds but as sources of enrichment for their classes. Again, private and institutional funds would be limited for such purposes. By changing format, the Editorial Board tried to secure the journal’s place in these institutions and with these professors thereby securing the existence of the publication.

Content Analysis Based on Shanas' Categories

As was stated in the previous chapter, Ethel Shanas created a list of sixteen categories which she used to classify the articles published over a fifty year span in The American Journal of Sociology.\(^{32}\) That categorization became the basis for Fr. Gilbert Callahan's study of the first fifteen years of The American Catholic Sociological Review which in turn became the basis for this research. Each item entry has been assigned to a single category both according to content and its ability to support one of the goals of the society in order to give a clearer picture of the relevant trends found in the sixteen years between 1953

\(^{32}\)The reader might consider it helpful to refer to the previous chapter for this list.
and 1968.\textsuperscript{33}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{TOTALS OF ITEM-ENTRY CATEGORIES}
\begin{tabular}{lc}
1. Articles & 282 \\
2. Book Reviews & 63 \\
3. Periodical Reviews & 20 \\
4. News of Sociological Interest & 46 \\
5. Reporting on the Annual Conventions & 5 \\
6. Reporting on Round Tables, Symposia, Tributes & 0 \\
7. Rosters or Listing of ACSS membership, or \\
   Who's Who Among Catholic Sociologists & 1 \\
8. Index to Volume & 14 \\
9. Notes of Sociological Interest & 27 \\
10. Communications & 8 \\
\hline
Total of Item Entries & 466
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

The Table of Contents for the years between 1953 and 1968 offer 466 separate item entries. (see table 11) The division into the ten categories is based upon the division found in the previous chapter. There were a few significant changes between these two larger periods under study. During this second period there were sixty-six more items-entries that appear in the table of contents. This difference could partially be accounted for by the fact that there are sixty-three more articles and eleven more book reviews published during the second period. There was a decrease in the Periodical Reviews and the News of Sociological Interest items. While the first period had five entries for reports on Round Tables or Symposia, there were none during the next

\textsuperscript{33}The classifications used are neither objective nor rigidly exclusive. The classification of a single article must therefore be subjective.
sixteen years. One other item entry of note was that there was only one listing of ACSS membership rolls during this second period as opposed to the nine listed in the first portion of the study. An increase in notices to contributors and obituaries accounted for the increase in the Notes of Sociological Interest section. It was these 466 item-entries that were the basis for the classification for both content and goals.

It is again acknowledged that the entire publication is presented by a Catholic organization. In classifying each entry, the content rather than the religious overtones were the basis for categorization. (see table 12) This was done in order to not create an artificial religious category that, by the nature of the publication, most articles would fit into. The classification of content was done from a larger sociological perspective. It is also noted that many of the articles could possibly be assigned to more than one category. The decision for placement was based upon what appeared to be the most prominent aspect of the article.

The content analysis of years 1953 through 1968 will be discussed along with a brief comparison to the same category totals found in the first thirteen years.

The "Theory and History" category, containing 15 percent of all item-entries, was the most active for two basic reasons. First, the Review was established to be a forum for Catholic social thought. To this end, the
philosophical and theological positions of various authors were presented for consideration and discussion. An example of this can be found in two issues of the journal published between 1962 and 1965 which were devoted to specific topics. The Winter 1962 issue was devoted to the author Teilhard de Chardin and the interpretation of some of his work. The first issue of *Sociological Analysis* (Spring 1964) focused on the Thomist Ethic, the Protestant Ethic, and Max Weber's sociology of religious beliefs. Secondly, there was an ongoing attempt on the part of the authors to define sociology and the Catholic relationship or response to it. Thomas O'Dea's article "The Sociology of Religion" (Summer 1954) and Rudolph Morris' article "What is Sociology of Art?" (Winter 1958) were two examples of this. The category itself represented 13 percent of the total number of items published during the first thirteen year period. Only a slight increase to 15 percent, or sixty-eight items, was found during the next sixteen year period. The publication of thirteen items in this category from 1953 through 1955, which represented 15 percent of the total items published during this three year span, was consistent with the pattern found in the previous time periods. There was little change in this trend until 1962 through 1965 when twenty-four items, or 23 percent of the total items published during that period, appeared in this category. The increase could be accounted for by the publication of two issues
### TABLE 12
ACSR ARTICLE DISTRIBUTION BY CATEGORY AND YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Theory &amp; History</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Inst. &amp; Organiz.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social Pathology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Human Ecology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Population</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Races &amp; Nationalities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Methods of Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sociology Elsewhere</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other Social Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Social Reform</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sociological &quot;Shop-Talk&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Student Dissertations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Special Bibliographies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Social Survey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previously mentioned, Winter 1962 and Spring 1964, that had been devoted to a very thorough presentation of two specific topics.

The next category entitled "Social Institutions and Organizations" contained twenty-seven items or 6 percent of the total item entries. This was a drastic reduction in this category from the first thirteen years period during which
it represented 15 percent of the total items published. While articles such as "The Industry Council Plan as a Form of Social Organization" by Joseph Fitzpatrick, S.J. (Fall 1953) appeared in the early years, there was a definite switch in focus during the later years. "The Role of the Laity in the Catholic Church" by Fr. Joseph Schuyler, S.J. (Winter 1959) and "Organizational Theory and the Canonical Parish" by Barry Young and John Hughes (Summer 1965) became more representative of trend toward discussion of the social institution of the Church and its impact on society. Even with this new focus, there was a continual decline in articles published in this category from 1953 through 1965. During the last period under study, 1966 through 1969, an increase in items occurred as a result of the new ecumenical focus of the journal. Articles such as "Changes in Social Status of Lutheranism in Ninety Chicago Suburbs, 1950-1960" by Samuel Mueller (Fall 1966) now helped to fill out this category.

The third category was entitled "Social Pathology" and its focus was to present articles that suggested possible causes and cures for social ills. During the sixteen year period from 1953 on, only eight items appeared in this category but their very presence was significant based on the fact that during the first thirteen years, only two articles appeared in this category in toto. The articles that appeared from 1956 through 1968 promoted a trend
towards a more global awareness of social problems and their possible solutions than had been seen previously. "Democracy Versus Economic Security in the Underdeveloped Nations" by Edward Henry (Summer 1961) and "Social Action Priests in the Mexican American Community" by Patrick McNamara (Winter 1968) were indicative of the articles now being offered.

There were no articles in this category published during 1953 through 1955, and only one article was published during each of the next two time periods. From 1962 to 1965 two articles were published and by the last period, 1966 through 1968, four articles are credited to this category.

The next category, "Social Psychology", doubled in its size from the original thirteen years. Thirty-four articles were presented over the sixteen year span. The periods from 1959 through 1961 and 1966 through 1968 offered the greatest concentration of items (ten and thirteen respectively). Part of this increase was due to the change in writing style within the journal. "Social Attitudes of Catholic High School Students" by Joseph Fichter and P. W. Facey, S.J. (Summer 1953) was indicative of the trend towards more empirical research and data presentation. Articles like "The Effect of Occupational Setting Upon the Perception of Status" by Leo Depres, Salomon Rettig and Benjamin Pasamanick (Winter 1959) reflected the high level development and refinement that the social sciences had reached.
The fifth category, "Human Ecology", more than doubled in size from the original thirteen years. While the two articles found in 1953 through 1955 were reflective of the previous trend in publication, the years between 1956 and 1968 showed a much different pattern. In 1956 through 1958, eight articles were published in this category which represented 9 percent of the total items published during that period. Again, the growing ease with which the Catholic sociologists were able to apply empirical techniques to their studies encouraged article production in this category. Articles like "Some Aspects of Residential Segregation in Chicago" by Sr. Claire Marie, O.S.F. (Winter 1953) and "A Survey of Going Steady and Other Dating Practices" by Gerald Schnepp, S.M. (Fall 1960) fit comfortably in this category. The trend towards finding patterns in human behavior especially in small focused groups was growing. This growth was reflected in the pages of the journal.

The sixth category "Population" showed no time periods when its topic was especially prevalent. Thirteen articles in all were published in the category throughout the sixteen years between 1953 and 1968. While this is an area where originally the empirical technique was employed by the contributors to the review, interest in the topic caused a shift of focus to other categories. The articles that were presented were very broad and global in scope. "Postwar
Japan: A Case Study in Population Policy and Social Disorganization" by Thomas Burch (March 1958) and "Growth Trends in Latin American Populations" by Paul Gibbons (Summer 1961). Family planning, both as a Catholic Church issue and a natural solution to overpopulation, was a topic that was frequently addressed in articles such as "The Catholic and Family Planning" by Thomas Casey, S.J. (Summer 1960)

Thirty-one articles address the topic "Races and Nationalities". Only one article appeared in the first three years (1953 through 1955) and two in 1956 through 1958. The third time period contained ten articles on the topic. While many of these articles dealt with specific nationalities such as "Attitudes of Puerto Ricans Toward Color" by Joseph Fitzpatrick, S.J. (October 1959) and "Cultural Change Among Three Generations of Greeks" by Helen Capanidou Lauquier (October 1961) other took a broader view like Edward Suchman and Lois Alksne's "Communication Across Cultural Barriers" (December 1961). The race relationships addressed by this category during the original thirteen years dealt with the nationalities entering the country after World War II and the Black culture. This sixteen years deals more with the Hispanic culture. Subcultures and their idiosyncrasies are also discussed as in "Religion and Values Among Nova Scotian College Students" by Douglas Campbell (Summer 1966).

In the first sixteen years, methodology was admittedly
a weak point for the Catholic sociologist. While the journal never really exerted any concerted effort to rectify this situation, during the first thirteen years, ten articles did appear in the category "Methods of Research." The next sixteen years offered only eight articles in this area. The articles that did appear were along the lines of Terence Sullivan's, O.S.B. "The Application of Shevky-Bell Indices to Parish Analysis" (Summer 1961). Many of the younger authors exhibited expertise in the new techniques and used them in their publications, but the responsibility of training, especially the older members, in new or appropriate methodology was not a role that was accepted by the editorial board.

Eight articles appeared under the category of "Sociology Elsewhere". This section peaked in 1953 through 1955 with the publication of four articles all of which can be found in the June 1954 issue of the journal. They dealt with the sociology of religion in France and Belgium, Germany and Austria, Latin America, and the Netherlands. These four articles were used in an attempt to define what sociology of religion was by showing it in different cultural settings. The Society was still too actively involved in establishing its own identity and later dealing with redefining its own focus to spend much effort in examining the field in other countries.

Ten of the twelve articles in "Other Social Science"
appear within the years 1953 through 1961. A varied group of articles were represented in this category. "Socio-Economic Status and the Nursing Candidate" by Sr. Bridget Creighton, R.H. (March 1954) and "Some Anthropological Implications of the Racial Admission Policy of the U.S. Sisterhoods" by Raymond Bernard, S.J. (June 1958) indicate the broad approach to this category. An article such as "The Principle of Subsidiarity" by John Kenney, S.J. (March 1955) could easily be argued to fit into category one on theory. But based on the focus of the article, the elements of the theory that deal with economics and political influence cannot be overlooked. Therefore, the decision was made that it would best fit into this category.

During this sixteen year period of the study, no articles were published that had as their primary focus "Social Reform". The encyclical mandates of the first thirteen years were not as prevalent. While social reform was addressed in many of the articles, it was not their primary focus. As the Society moved toward the early 1960s, a new direction was being stressed in the Church and along those lines went the interest of the contributors to the journal. Another reason for the lack of articles was the growing separation between sociology and social work. The concept of applied sociology was not as prevalent as it had been in the field.

As in the first thirteen years, the category of
"Sociological 'Shop-Talk'" was the largest category. It was composed of seventy-five items which account for 16 percent of the total published items. The first period, 1953 through 1955 produced sixteen articles while 1956 through 1958 published seventeen. This trend continued during the next two periods. 1959 through 1961 produced twenty-one and 1962 through 1965 published eighteen. The last period, 1966 through 1968 only contained three articles. This was accounted for because of the effort on the part of the board to establish the new focus of the journal after the change in title. Very few articles, other than those which dealt exclusively with the sociology of religion were published. This category mainly included the "News of Sociological Interest" feature which was eliminated as of 1964. This partially accounts for the high numbers and the sudden decrease in the last four years. A few articles did appear in this category such as "Audio-Visual Aids on Marriage for Catholic Schools" by Sr. M. Leila, R.S.M. (March 1957) and "Fiction: A Tool for Sociology Teachers" by Thomas Trese, S.J. (June 1957). The other articles again, as in the first thirteen years, dealt with curricular features.

The "Student Dissertation" category was void of entries simply due to the fact that no student dissertation were published during the sixteen year period. While a few notations had been made regarding an article being part of or the basis for a student dissertation, none was published
in its entirety.

There was only one listing under "Special Bibliographies." This article, while not a compilation of books, was in effect a listing of topics. "The Catholic University of America Advanced Degrees in Sociology by Year of Graduation, 1904-1955" compiled by Bernard Mulvaney, C.S.V. (December 1955) and appeared to be best incorporated into this category.

The "Social Survey" category experienced the largest rate of growth of all the categories. In the first thirteen years, only one article was attributed to this area. In the years from 1953 through 1968 there was a steady increase in this category finally offering thirty-one articles in toto. The largest grouping was found in the final four year period from 1965 through 1968 offering thirteen items. "The Cross Cultural Diffusion of a Social Movement" by Desmond Connor (Summer 1963) and "The Rate of Perseverance to Ordination of Minor Seminary Graduates" by Denis Dougherty, O.S.B. (Spring 1968) were typical of the types of papers found in this category. Again, the extended training in methodology allowed for the expansion of this category.

The last category "Miscellaneous" was by nature the largest. All book reviews, indexes, obituaries, committee reports, and periodical reviews fit into this category. "Inconsistency in Career-Goals of a Group of Catholic Nursing Students" by Anita Yourglich (December 1953)
was the only article in this category.

While there were no substantial decreases in any category, some major increases are noteworthy. The first five categories along with the seventh category showed the largest increase in item count and percentage of items. They were: (1) Theory and History, (2) Social Institutions and Organizations, (3) Social Pathology, (4) Social Psychology, (5) Human Ecology, and (7) Races and Nationalities. The increase in "Theory and History" had a two-fold explanation. First, any increase in the number of articles published, which there was, would automatically increase all sections. But this was not a valid reason for an increase of sixteen items from the previous time period. The second and more valid reason was the specific focusing of individual issues around specific authors. This would generate articles offering analysis of position and theory explanations, which it did. This type of issue did not lend itself to survey or empirical testing but rather historical narrative. The other five categories increased because of the contributors desire to publish the findings of their research. More than any statement, these areas indicate to the reader the focus of the contributors. All areas indicate the interest on the part of the sociologist to study humankind in its social interactions. While focus shifts historically from one ethnic group to another, the basis of the study was the larger human experience: mankind's ability to interact with,
be influenced by, and deal with conditions that are the direct result of living in a society. With the improvement of empirical skills, the sociologist was better able to present the findings that had been uncovered through survey and research. The ability to build a better and more accurate survey tool was becoming commonplace. Most of the studies dealt with small groups. In this way, the sociologist was able to pinpoint issues or questions to be addressed and, in turn, be able to come up with manageable data that could easily be reported. While the first group of contributors had theoretical training, it was very apparent from the various category increases that the next group of Catholic sociologists was well versed in methodology and very comfortable using it.

Content Analysis Based on the ACSS Stated Goals

As stated in the previous chapter, the Review and Sociological Analysis were established under the auspices of the American Catholic Sociological Society. The Society had three original goals by which it made decisions and operated its business. As an official organ of that society, it was the responsibility of the editorial board to do their utmost to see that the goals and plans of the society were adhered to in all respects. While the three original goals have over the years been reworded and slightly altered, the basic intent was still the same. In order for better continuity in
this study, the goals as they were originally stated will be used as the basis for the rest of this analysis. Those goals were:

1. To stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics in the field of sociology
2. To create a sense of solidarity among Catholic Sociologists
3. To unearth and disseminate the sociological implications of the Catholic thought pattern

It was very evident in the last chapter that the journal did meet each and every goal. While the first and third goals were mainly addressed through the publication of articles, the second goal was fostered through the use of the pages of the journal by keeping the activities of the society and the membership well documented. The 466 item entries during the period from 1953 through 1968 will be classified according to the same goals to see if that direction is still apparent even through the change to *Sociological Analysis*. (see table 13)

The first goal was "To stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics in the field of Sociology". This goal was addressed by 253 entries over the sixteen year span. This figure indicates that 54 percent of all the published items supported this one goal. Of the 253 entries, published articles accounted for 233 (92 percent) of the items. Over the five time periods, there was a gradual increase in both items and articles found to support this goal. The content analysis supports the opinion that every aspect of sociology was allowed to be addressed and the fact
TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF THE ITEM-ENTRIES BY STATED GOAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics in the field of sociology</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60 (253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To create a sense of solidarity among Catholic Sociologists</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22 (133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To unearth and disseminate the sociological implications of the Catholic thought pattern</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unclassifiable according to the Constitutional purposes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100 (466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(76)(282)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number indicate the total item count per goal during each period. The number in parenthesis indicates the number of articles that are coded into this category for each period. For example, the first goal during years 1953-1955 has thirty-nine items. Of these, thirty-seven are articles.

that the articles were published in a Catholic journal, while having some influence, did not hinder their publication.

The second goal, "To create a sense of solidarity among Catholic sociologists" actually underwent a decrease in item
entries from the first thirteen years. Over the five smaller time spans, there was a gradual decrease in the items found in this goal. 1953 through 1955 had twenty-seven entries, two of which were articles. In both 1956 through 1958 and 1959 through 1961, the number of entries dropped to twenty-six. In each period there was only one article published to help meet this specific goal. Thirty-two items appeared from 1962 through 1964 and three of them were articles. The lowest number appeared in the last four year period (1965 through 1968) when only twenty-two items supported the second goal. Of this number, four were articles. This decrease in the last period can be attributed to the elimination of such items as membership lists, convention notes, and most importantly the "news" feature. Some of the statements found throughout the later years of the journal point to a lack of commitment on the part of the board to support this particular goal. It was not that they openly refused to do so, but it was evident by what they chose to include or exclude from publication that this goal was not a priority item for them. Their focus was to interest non-Catholic authors and readers in the journal based on content and not religious affiliation. While 29 percent of all items did address this goal, it could possibly be argued that the goal was, relatively speaking, well supported. It is only when the reader looks past the numbers to the intent of the board that a serious doubt begins to arise over the future
support of this goal beyond the time restrictions of this study. The Board might be more supportive of the goal if the word "Catholic" was removed for they were intent on creating a sense of solidarity and commitment among sociologists who were interested in the sociology of religion.

Fifty-nine articles supported the third goal which was "To unearth and disseminate the sociological implications of the Catholic thought pattern." Of the thirty-eight articles which supported this goal, sixteen could be found in the last four year time period. This corresponded to the redirection of the journal to a focused piece on religion. The articles that supported this goal were not found in any particular content category. During 1959 through 1961, there were nine items that support the goal all of which were articles. They all deal with the practical influence of the church on the memberships daily lives. This included the discussion of family planning, dating practices, and attitudes toward school desegregation. The support of this goal remained fairly constant over the sixteen year period.

The fourth category, "unclassifiable", was created as a category for those few items that did not fit into the three goals. It included such items as indexes and notices to contributor spelling out the specifics of paper submission. Again the lack of items in this area indicated that the choices made to fill the pages of the journal were in fact very much in agreement with the goals of the Society.
Conclusion

The original thirteen volumes reflected a learned society and its official publication in its infancy. The struggle to develop past the planning stages and make a name for itself in the larger sociological community was evident in the choice of articles and language used. The constant struggle for definition and clarification of purpose was also evident.

The next sixteen volumes reflect a very different type of struggle. Rather than appearing as a solidified purpose-driven unit which would hold its own in the larger sociological community, the struggle for internal control sparked infighting among the board which became apparent to the casual reader on the pages of the Review.

When looking at the content over the twenty-nine year period, it is obvious that any sociological subject was fair game for the Catholic sociologist. Even though the study was flavored by the Catholic point of view, diversity was none the less encouraged. As the science of sociology was defined and refined, so too were the abilities and capabilities of the Catholic sociologist. Theoretical and methodological approaches to a topic were both within their capabilities.

It was also obvious that the goals of the Society were supported. The journal did reflect the leadership in its good points and its bad points. It speaks well for the
strength of the society, that it was able to recognize the need for a change in focus even though that change would cause some pain and alienation among the membership. The Board took a chance and based on the success of the Review and the later success of Sociological Analysis it was evident that the decisions were appropriate.
CHAPTER 6
THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE REVIEW TO THE
AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

The history of the American Catholic Sociological Society can be viewed as an historical snapshot of one of the early developmental stages of the science of sociology. At the time of its formation in 1938, the ACSS was one of many small interest groups such as the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, the National Conference on Family Relations, the Social Science Research Council, and the National Conference of Social Work which were all seeking ways in which to adapt the relatively new science of sociology to their specific fields. All of these groups felt and maintained an affiliation with the larger sociological world but needed the support and camaraderie of more singularly focused colleagues with whom to share common interests, techniques, and findings. Rather than appearing randomly as a topic on a convention roster or as a sub-committee, these organizations found it more advantageous to their interests to function as independent groups. This was also true of the ACSS.

The American Catholic Sociological Society began as a group of trained professional educators who were also bound...
by a common religious affiliation. During the thirty years covered under this study, these two elements remained constant within the membership. The ACSS posted many impressive achievements during its history. During the time from 1938 through 1968, the ACSS addressed the question of Catholic sociology, became a national organization, created and published 116 issues of a relatively topical journal, developed small regional groups, survived in spite of rationing restrictions imposed by a war, and continued to exist even after a fundamental change in focus. While accomplishing these things, it must be noted that the society functioned with two very distinct purposes in additional to the three formal goals which it set forth.

First, the ACSS was a group of trained professionals interested in studying and advancing the field of sociology, both personally and within the Catholic educational system. It was necessary to ensure that sociology was not just taught in the Catholic institutions, but that what was taught was compatible with the teachings of the Catholic Church. This can be seen clearly in the publication of one of the advertisements found in the journal which read in part:

... It is the inalienable right as well as the indispensable duty of the Church to watch over the education of her children ... not merely in regard to the religious instruction ... but in regard to every
other branch of learning.¹

This advertisement seemed to echo one of the most dominant but unpublished directions found in the Society both in its conventions and journal. Sociology was a growing field that would be very interesting to many of the younger students. It also needed to be studied in order to fulfill the directives found in the encyclicals. The ACSS sought to find ways to insure that Catholic students, no matter what level attained or institutional experience, would be secure in the concepts of the Catholic faith during their studies of the science or application of sociology. The ACSS accomplished this by influencing both college and high school curricula. High School panels and round-table discussions were common occurrences during the conventions. The publication of a suggested lists of recommended sociological reference books for the Catholic library, the suggested use of the journal in classrooms as a tool for discussion, and the clarification of "Catholic" points of view, both in print and at conventions, for the teachers of these courses, all contributed to the better understanding of what was considered to be appropriate for the Catholic student in sociology.

For the most part, the original membership had training in philosophy and theology with little attention paid to

epistemology and methodology. It must be remembered that limited training in sociology was available at Catholic institutions of higher education at that time. As the teaching of sociology expanded in both the Catholic and secular systems, more Catholics received training in the methodology and basics of sociology. The presence of these new professionals was welcomed within the society along with the new tools and information that they brought with them. While the leadership of the ACSS did little to train the general membership in current methodologies, the journal and conventions were vehicles through which the authors could publish these new techniques. The intent of the ACSS was not to be a source of methodology but a source of values clarification and resources for the Catholic sociologists and their students.

The second function of the ACSS was more apparent. The Church stood in opposition to the more secular, positivist approach to sociology. As stated in a brochure issued in 1938:

Armed with the approval of the Catholic Hierarchy of the United States, The American Catholic Sociological Society launches its campaign "to restore all things to Christ." In the words of Monsignor Sheen, "We are the Revolution." Thoughts lie behind our deeds. The thought-life of America must be revolutionized. The code of Christ, the principles of the Gospel, and the words of the holy pontiffs will be the weapons of this revolution.²

²Rosenfelder, Master Thesis, 162.
"To restore all thing to Christ" was interpreted as a restoration of the Word of God spread among the various societies studied and the use of value judgements inherent in sociological analyses. No society could be studied, no recommendations made for change, no social reform could take place without acknowledgement of God and the role values must play in all of the aspects of community life. Paul Hanly Furfey was the strongest proponent of this topic with his articles calling for social action. Sociological studies were tools to be used to correct social ills. Sociology was to be applied, rather than simply a theoretical study to be conducted. The journal was seen as the most effective way to get this accomplished and the number of articles published relating to this issue bears out the ACSS's dedication to this function.

An apparent major problem that faced the Society throughout the thirty years under study seems to stem from a sense of hesitancy or uncertainty about the membership’s joint decisions and their ability and desire to make an impact outside of their limited group. Just under the seemingly cohesive and calm surface of the society, lay major insecurities stemming from various problems with the leadership found within the society. Much of the focus or direction of the society came solely from Ralph Gallagher's vision. It was his personal response to the mandates of the encyclicals and interpretation of the directives issued by
the Jesuits that ultimately lead to the creation of the ACSS and the publication of the *Review*. There was no question regarding the strong influence that he held over the Board and the society in general. This was evidenced by his position as executive secretary for twenty-three years and his simultaneous position as editor of the *Review* for its first fifteen years of existence. It often seemed that, even though others were elected to the various offices of the ACSS and journal, that the delegation of power that should have accompanied their offices was in word only. While Gallagher maintained firm control of the society, the fact remains that the ACSS was not his only concern. He kept very active in his work with penal institutions, police work, public speaking engagements, and his teaching responsibilities. It was not that Gallagher was uninterested in the society once it had been established or preoccupied by his other duties and interests, rather his style of leadership influenced greatly the manner in which the ACSS operated. This is evidenced in the way in which even the formal goals were addressed.

The third of the three formal goals of the society which were voted on at the organizational meeting held in 1938 was "To unearth and disseminate the sociological implications of the Catholic thought pattern." In the light of this goal, it is argued that the fundamental issue of the existence of Catholic sociology and the subsequent validity
of the Catholic sociological point of view were key and necessary foundational statements to be made by a Catholic sociological society in support of its very existence. For approximately twenty years, the opposing sides of the argument regarding the reality and/or existence of Catholic sociology were randomly presented to the general membership by prominent authors within the pages of the Review. Likewise, firm statements regarding the individual beliefs of the various presidents of the society about these very issues were also made public both at the conventions and in the publication of the Presidential Addresses. Conversely, it is evident that the question of a position statement on these issues was never put to a vote nor was any definitive statement ever issued that showed that the society as a group said yea or nay to the existence of Catholic sociology. Neither side, even when in possession of the presidency of the organization, assumed the responsibility for such a statement or called for a formal decision to be voted on by the general membership. It appeared that the two major factions on this issue were content to disagree in print and to leave it at that level. Even Gallagher, a proponent of Catholic sociology, appeared content to leave it there.

The second formal goal of the ACSS called for the creation of a sense of solidarity among the Catholic sociologists. While the general membership often spoke of
this solidarity as a feeling of "coming home" experienced when attending the ACSS conventions, this was not the only interpretation they gave to this goal. The other aspect of it was seen in their ability to present a united front on issues that the society felt needed to be addressed. The minutes of the various business meetings showed a collection of resolutions and statements that were the direct result of discussions and a voting process. Contrary to the ACSS goals, the points of agreement or resolutions were often on minor or non-confrontational issues. For example, at the second convention held on December 29, 1939 the following resolution was passed unanimously:

Resolved: That the American Catholic Sociological Society pledge its allegiance to the Holy Father, to the American Hierarchy, and particularly to its Honorary President, His Excellency, the Most Reverend Edwin V. O’Hara, D.D., Bishop of Kansas City.  

While allegiance to the Pope and the American Catholic hierarchy was not a minor issue, the circumstances of the time made the statement almost redundant. This was a newly organized American, Catholic society meeting in 1939 headed by a Jesuit and housed at a Jesuit University. Half of the society’s membership claimed affiliative ties with the American Catholic clergy. To not make such a statement or to pass any other form of this resolution would be virtually unthinkable given this set of circumstances.

---

It was not only in the beginning years of the society that such resolutions were addressed. The Convention of December 1949 reported four resolutions that had been passed. First, it was resolved to thank six different individuals and/or groups involved with the hosting of the convention in New York City. This list included: Francis Cardinal Spellman, the Archbishop of New York City; Fordham University and its faculty and students; and Fr. Joseph Fitzpatrick who served as chairperson for the local arrangements. Second, expressions of "heartfelt gratitude" for the "assiduous performance of their duties" during the past year were extended to the Honorary President Bishop Edwin O'Hara, President Msgr. Robert Navin, and Executive Secretary Fr. Ralph Gallagher. Third, the year celebrated the Golden Jubilee of Pope Pius XII's ordination and the tenth anniversary of his elevation to the Papacy. The society resolved to: renew their statement of affection for the Pope; prayerful and militant participation in his call for a special year of prayer and penance for world peace; recognize the Vatican as a bulwark of peace and unity; and work with the Pope to exterminate "militant atheism and communism." Fourth, it was resolved to send copies of the last resolution, bearing the signature of the ACSS president and executive-secretary to the Pope through the American
Apostolic Delegate.⁴

There was no reason for the society to limit its resolutions to this non-confrontational type of resolution and not to take a stand on relevant issues of the day. The year before, while addressing the Institute of Social Order in Chicago and speaking on behalf of the American Bishops, Samuel Cardinal Stritch stated:

We must be honest in admitting that Christian social thought does not greatly influence political and social action in our country or in the world. . . . The principles of Catholic thought remain unvocalized and ineffective.⁵

He went on to call for their support of his efforts to correct this situation and asked them to employ a "great deal of social thought" and to publish "profound social literature." But, when the opportunity presented itself, little was done.

When the second and third goals of the society were coupled, an unquestionably strong and unified position could have been attained and have had the impact called for by Cardinal Stritch. But, often what happened had the opposite effect. The society had the opportunity to follow through on its last resolution to support the Pope's efforts by using the Review to take a militant stand against communism and atheism. But, it did not. During the two years after the


⁵Social Order, Vol 1 (5-47 through 12-48), 194.
resolution was passed, Volume 11 (1950) offered a series of articles on the sociology of religion while Volume 12 (1951) contained such varied topics as industrial sociology and an introduction to sociometrics. No article took a stand against the issue of communism or atheism. Another example was found in the convention news published in 1948 which listed a resolution that had been passed. The resolution read in part that the society expressed "... approval and sympathy with the action of Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter of St. Louis on ... the elimination of educational 'Jim Crowism' in his diocese". In apparent contradiction to this statement, the Review also reported the following minutes of the business meeting of that same convention:

... Proposals on public issues were set before the assembled body ... A lively discussion followed in which Paul Hanly Furfey, Edward Marciniak, and Joseph Fichter, S.J. participated as leaders, and in which they expressed opinions on whether the ACSS should take a stand on any controversial issues of local, state or national nature. Judging from the silent responses of the majority present and from the final vote on the proposition, the society seemed to feel that it should not express its position on issues of controversial character.

Both of these statements were discussed at the same

---

6 This issue includes articles on the pastoral role in France, social breakdown within the Montana Blackfeet, and a sociologist’s view of the parish.

7 The American Catholic Sociological Review, Vol. 9, No. 1. 47.

8 The American Catholic Sociological Review, Vol 9 no. 1, 49.
convention and published within the same journal issue. Historically, this was a time during which "Jim Crowism" was a controversial issue both nationally and locally. The society took a stand to back and support Ritter's actions yet voted not to take any controversial stands. The ACSS could not have it both ways, yet it seemed that was the mode of operation with which they were most comfortable.

An example of the leadership's unwillingness to upset the status quo was cited in Rosenfelder's work. In November 1939, the American Journal of Sociology published a review of the book Social Problems written by Fr. Raymond Murray, C.S.C. and Frank Flynn, both members of the ACSS. The review, written by Dr. Reuter of the University of Iowa, referred to the book as an effort to perpetuate archaic beliefs and medieval patterns of thought. Fr. John Coogan took exception to the content and length of the review, two and one half lines, and wrote to the editor of the American Journal of Sociology citing Dr. Reuter's "... unfair attitude toward the Catholic Church." After Coogan received no response from the editor, he then wrote to Dr. Burgess, President of the American Sociological Society, to complain and state that the ACSS membership would be told of the situation. Burgess replied that when he assigned the book for review he had given no thought to the issue of Catholic treatment of social problems, and merely gave the book to someone interested in social problems and also told the
reviewer of the available space limits for the review which was two and one half lines. At the Business Meeting of the second annual convention, Coogan explained the situation to the Board and asked them to issue a protest "... to the American Journal of Sociology on their method of handling Catholic books" in order to secure a more favorable treatment of this book and of similar texts in the future. Coogan went on to say that he had already written a protest but would like to be able to add to it that the Society was in full support of his statements. Paul H. Furfey then suggested that, in order to be more effective, the protest should be directed towards the general policy of giving Catholic books to reviewers who are not Catholic or who were "definitely unfriendly." He suggested that Catholic books should be reviewed by persons who would give them an impartial review. His statements implied that only Catholics were capable of impartially reviewing a Catholic text. His suggestions was that not only this review but the general policy for reviews should be protested. Furfey's proposal was passed unanimously by those in attendance at the Business Meeting. No documentation followed that indicated any form of follow up on this proposal and, in fact, no group protest was registered with the American Sociological Society. Rosenfelder did add that in an interview with Gallagher he learned that "... in spite of this unanimous
approval, it was thought better not to protest *qua* ACSS. "\(^9\)"

No further reference was made as to who suppressed the proposal and when. The reader is only left to assume that it was either the Executive Board or Gallagher. But, with no further information passed along to the general membership, the reading of the Business Meeting minutes or any conversation regarding the issue with someone who was present at the meeting would leave the group with the understanding that a protest, as it had been formulated, was registered with the American Sociological Society. It could also be assumed that the larger sociological society would either be forced to act on the protest or stand by their policy on book reviews, which would then be viewed as a snub to the ACSS. Neither situation was actually the case. The entire discussion and vote appeared to be a exercise in futility and serve no purpose other that to reaffirm the decision made a year earlier to establish an independent society in part based on the second class treatment the Catholic sociologists perceived they had received from the American Sociological Society.

The need for independence was constantly checked by the continual attempts at affiliation with the American Sociological Society. This debate fluctuated between independence and affiliation for over thirty years, beginning with the organizational meeting, throughout the

---

change in focus in the journal and the society, and beyond. Each time the vote to affiliate was passed, there was a delay or hesitation in action on the part of the board which resulted in no actual affiliation taking place. Even after the debate and decision in 1964 to affiliate was rejected by the American Sociological Association due to its newly amended constitution, attempts were still made by the ACSS to stay closely involved at a more subtle level. The brochure of the ACSS published in 1971 stated:

Joint meetings are held regularly with the American Sociological Association (ASA), and occasionally with other related associations, including the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, the Religion Research Association, and the International Conference for the Sociology of Religion. The annual meeting is held at the same location as the ASA on the two meeting days immediately preceding its convention and included one or two joint sessions with it.\(^\text{10}\)

The general membership and/or the various boards often seemed to take a position on a statement or course of action and then back off almost as if they were afraid of disturbing the status quo or of the power any unified stand might generate. Most group decisions were simple matters to be discussed and left in-house contrary to the society's stated formal goals of disseminating their research and information to the wider field. While it could be argued that the journal was established for this purpose, the

---

\(^{10}\)American Catholic Sociological Society Membership Brochure, American Catholic Sociologiccal Society Collection, Marquette University Archives, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
Review never had a large enough circulation rate to accomplish this at the level that the ACSS's goals implied. It is therefore necessary to look past the facts and statistics to what was actually occurring.

The difficulty in coming to a consensus and then following through might be construed as a lack of strong leadership or the result of a laissez-faire type of organizational structure. But, it is also necessary to look at the ACSS from an organizational viewpoint. It was structured and organized with stated goals and the means set in place to accomplish those goals. Why, then, the difficulty in consensus especially on the issue of Catholic sociology or topics of particularly Catholic interest?

To come to some to form of answer, it is important to look at the reference-group theory as proposed by Herbert Hyman. According to his theory, there are basically two types of reference groups to which humans belong. One can be viewed as a community or social cluster into which you are born or have been raised. The other are those groups which humans join and towards which they orient their actions. It is this second type of group to which membership in the ACSS would belong. In this group structure, the opinions, convictions, and actions of the group would provide a model for constant comparison of the individual member's own

---

convictions, opinions, and course of action. When one voluntarily assumes membership within such a society, it is expected that the member would also assume the particular slant on social reality as taken by that group. By making a conscious decision to align with a group, one assumes the values as proposed by that group.

Humans build a social construction of reality based on their memberships in these various groups. Berger refers to reality as being socially created. Since each of our reference-groups offers a particular construct of its version of reality, the more groups a person either has chosen to align him or herself with or currently belonged to, the broader and more clarified the personal view of reality becomes. This is an important concept to consider based on the fact that while the members chose to join the ACSS, it was probably not their only affiliation nor their primary affiliation in regards to their Catholic, sociological, or professional careers. Each member then could be seen as having primary and secondary allegiances which would each carry a different view of reality and a different weight based on the individuals commitment to aligning themselves to the constructs of the group. As an example, being a member of the clergy did not insure that a person had a stronger, more appropriate, or more defined sense of Catholicism then that of a lay person. This sense

\[12\] Ibid., 118.
or deep understanding was determined more by the importance that the individual placed on membership and conformity with the particular reference-group vision than on simple association with the group. To some of the members, their membership in other learned societies might carry a greater importance than association with the ACSS. When this was the situation, the expectations of the dominant professional society, even though in minor conflict with the ACSS, would take precedence in the vision of the member.

Another factor for consideration was that of the language used by the group. It is through the use of specific language and shared meanings that any group expresses its opinions and convictions to and among its members. When common language is used to define concepts, often the reality of the meanings of the words is distorted by the user's and receiver's frame of reference. The use of common language, especially in describing art and religion, is very difficult to standardize. The language used by the ACSS carried with it sociological, educational and religious overtones; any combination of which could lead to misconception or misunderstanding on the part of the receiver.

Since humans work on different levels of consciousness simultaneously, the levels of cognition or meanings attached

to our words and actions change with our associations. If we view everyday life as being ordered and prioritized with the inherent meanings in those activities as constant, then the choice of vocabulary and its shared meanings, when used in terms of daily activities, are straightforward and non-debatable. While professional involvement in sociology and its language might have been a daily activity for many of the ACSS members, active participation in the ACSS itself and its specific vocabulary was not part of the daily experience of a majority of the members.¹⁴ This situation would tend to make the vocabulary used in the journal and group discussions susceptible to misunderstanding at even the most basic level because of the infrequency of its use and contextual frame of reference among the members. If we look at the social construction of reality from this vantage point, it is possible to see that part of the difficulty with reaching the truth of Catholic sociology, or any but the most basic form of consensus, was very difficult. The membership was constructed of educated professionals who were well aware of the fact that even though the same language was used in their various sociological or Catholic affiliations, the meanings of the words differed greatly based on the particular reference-group. When they read about or discussed the same issues during the American Sociological Society's meetings and the ACSS meetings, the

¹⁴Ibid., 21-23.
language may have been the same but the meanings attached to the words were not. Since much of the membership's writing was not limited to publication only in the Review, the need to be cautious to protect professional integrity was ever present.

One word that never came into question was that of "sociology." Every member of the ACSS considered themselves to be interested in and engaged in the field. There was no question that in a Durkheimian sense their research involved the search for latent and manifest functions within the societies they studied. They used the appropriate methodology and terminology during those studies and subsequent publications. The point of clarity revolves around the ideology associated with the word "Catholic" both in reference to the society and to the field of sociology.

A society exists due to the fact that a majority of the time the members' definition of the most important situations coincide. The ACSS was no different in this aspect. The motives of the membership for being a part of the ACSS might have been different, but the ways in which they defined the ACSS or its given purpose had to be sufficiently similar for this type of joint function to occur. It is possible then to see that even though some members joined due to dissatisfaction with another group, some used it as a tool for professional advancement, and

---

15Peter Berger, The Social Construction of Reality. 94.
some just used it as a platform for personal ideologies there were common bounds that join them together. Those common bound between them were their interest in the field of Sociology, their roles as educators, and their affiliation with the Catholic Church.

The wider the discrepancies found among the members, either as a basis for joining or an assumption as to the vision of the group, the more likely the possibility of disorganization or some form of social conflict became. What appeared as disorganization from the very beginning was actually conflict stemming from the various attitudes the members brought to this infant society. Many members viewed the ACSS from a standpoint of how they could personally benefit from the society rather than what they could offer the society in terms of their talents and knowledge. Since membership in the ACSS was often not a primary affiliation, and not as necessary from the vantage point of a career or fundamental belief, the discrepancies were closer to the surface and more readily felt. Twenty-four years after its start, these discrepancies caused the society to pull back, regroup, and actually redefine its fundamental direction. Once this had been accomplished, those who no longer felt a role in the society left, and the new version attracted other new members who had similar interests.

The identity of the individual as a member of this organization with a specific role to fill became a key
factor in the membership. The members knew their role in the larger sociological community. But, when they voluntarily placed themselves within this smaller and more restrictive society, the concept of their "Catholic" identity became an issue both personally and professionally. The more reading or training one received that offered exposure to Comte's view of a value-free sociology and the Church's view of this subject, the more the member felt put upon to make a choice between the two. Any person in this position, that is one feeling somehow alienated or different, would naturally seek out others in the same situation for affirmation and camaraderie. Part of the group's identity came not only from their personal views on being a Catholic sociologist, but also from the position assigned to them by the large and secular sociological society. If the person's professional self-worth as a sociologists was defined solely by the use of the word Catholic in reference to ability by the secular group, then it is understandable that the construction of a group like the ACSS was necessary to change this self-image. It has been shown that the members of the ACSS, especially in the formative years, were seeking such an identity and that this was very important to them on various levels. There is little evidence that membership in the ACSS did much to change or alter any of its members in very drastic ways. What membership did offer was a strong sense of self.

If we look at this concept of identity from an
ideological point of view, we must question if maintaining this separation from the larger, secular group carried with it some form of vested interest on the part of the ACSS. Did the leaders distort social reality in some fashion so that it would serve some form of function or legitimate some practice within this new society?

There is an historical context that cannot be overlooked when we look at the social construction of reality. The sociology of knowledge was concerned with the relationship that existed between human thought and the social context within which it arose. Therefore, we must address this global and national context.

Historically, we must first look towards the overall structure of the Catholic Church during the 1930s. This was a Church militant. A Church interested in social welfare and justice, but from what we would consider today to be a very traditional point of view. The primary goals were to bring the word of God to the world, and in doing so, bring the world back to God. The salvation of souls held primary importance, often even over the physical needs of the group being served. The Church leaders were the male clergy trained within the structured and closed Catholic system. These leaders pledged fidelity and affiliation with the Pope. When he mandated or called for action, it was to be given unquestioningly. If he felt a cause was to be

\[16\] Berger and Luckman, 4.
championed or fought against, it became the duty of clergy to follow his lead. The laity understood their position in this structure and their responses were dictated by the clergy.

Education was a key factor at the national level. Catholicism was a minority religion in America. The foundation of Catholic education was necessary to fulfill the directives of the church as well as building identity. When we take the work of the society and apply it to American Catholic education, Mannheim's notion of education also comes into play. He suggested that what was needed "would be an education that would make a pupil adjusted to actual social reality, and even more than that: one that would enable him to transform that reality and to raise it to a higher level."\(^{17}\) This is exactly what the Catholic Church called its membership to do by calling for social action and one of the main functions of the ACSS. The higher level the Church called for included not only the spiritual well being of the person, but to make sure that that person had an awareness of the needs of the society. The positivist approach taken in the broader sociological field was not acceptable to the Catholic Church nor to Mannheim. The best way to deal with it was to repackage it under their own heading. It was mandated by the American Bishops that social

action be a priority. How to accomplish this under the guise of scientific terminology was the issue for the American Catholic hierarchy while it did not appear to be an issue in the European arena.

At the same time, there was the development of this new science called sociology that was capable of looking at societies and making prescriptions for change. It could be employed to look at the very same social welfare issues that the Church was involved with. The problem with the science was that in looking at these issues, its main goal was not the salvation of souls but often the physical welfare of the people. This science was growing in popularity in the secular field and enticing Catholic youth into its study. Comte's "Value-free" terminology was opposed to the very basic vocabulary used by the Catholic leaders.

Many of the Church hierarchy understood that this new science, in order to be controlled and channeled, had to be introduced into the larger Catholic educational system but with caution. Rather than be regarded as overreacting and unbending, the leaders understood that, while not compromising, they would have to find a way in which to adapt this study to the tenets of the Catholic Church. The church needed science, especially sociology, as an ally in its struggle against what it viewed as undogmatic metaphysics. If the encyclicals and Papal mandates were to

18 Ibid., 68.
have any effect on the world, they needed the support of these new scientists. The terminology, methodology, and techniques of sociology would be of substantial benefit in interesting Catholics to follow the path as set by the Papacy. While it may not have been the within the vision of Gallagher to form a society to single-handedly convert sociology into a tool to be used for the spread of Catholic tenets, he was definitely caught up in the language of his superiors to help in this process. One only has to go back and look at the encyclicals, Jesuit mandates, ISO bulletins, and words of Bishop Sheen and Cardinal Stritch to see the similar message, the call to action, that was present from each of these sources which carried a great deal of influence especially in Gallagher's life. It then was in the vested interest of the Catholic Church that such societies would be established for the promotion and continuation of the Catholic Church itself.

So what then of the issue of Catholic sociology? There were three active and competing factions within the ACSS: those supporting Catholic sociology, those against it, and those whose focus was the promotion of Catholic social action. The two sections in deepest conflict over verbiage were those for and against the issue of a Catholic sociology. The general topic that regularly received the most space in print was that of social action. This begs the question that the debate over Catholic sociology was a
contrived minor devise quietly put into play to keep the Catholic sociologists ever aware of their unique Catholic stance in the field. The discussion over the existence of Catholic sociology could most effectively be conducted in the presence of like-minded individuals. It, therefore, kept this group insulated and virtually uncontaminated by the secular group. When the members thought of their position in the ACSS, what would come to mind first was the Catholic stance on the science as opposed to the science itself.

The issue of the existence of Catholic sociology or any religious form of sociology appeared to be a non-issue in the larger field of sociology as a whole. Using Shanas's codes to compare the development of various article topics found in the Review's content against that of the American Sociological Review, it was noted that there were very few articles on religion in the secular journal. The issue of a religious, especially Catholic, form of the science does not appear in the pages of the ASR, which could be considered to be the definitive source of reference for American sociologists regarding their interests. Even those actively involved within the debate within the ACSS do not appear to take it beyond the pages of the Review. When writing for other journals, we see that Mueller's articles were economic and historical in nature. Gallagher focused on criminology and penal reviews, Ross was interested in traveling to and studying the European community, and Mihanovich even dabbled
in futurology. The main discussants of the topic in the ACSS did not broach the topic outside of the ACSS.

Mannheim speaks of a dynamic synthesis coming about only after the interplay of various competing factions takes place. This synthesis of ideas is the closest that anyone can get to absolute truth. What was the truth, did Catholic sociology exist? Again we must go back to the historical context. The issue of Catholic sociology can been seen throughout the first twenty years of the journal. Its presence was most evident when reading the annual Presidential Addresses as presented at the convention rather than trying to piece together how many articles were published annually one side of the argument or the other. Based on publication space, the reception of these articles and the subsequent publication did not follow any set timeline. While each Presidential Address was not solely based on this topic, it usually contained some reference to the stance that the current president took on the issue. The twenty years offer no synthesis or compromise on ideas regarding this topic. Whether this is due to the language and its difficult inherent meanings as discussed earlier, or it is due simply to the fact that there is no synthesis to be reached is difficult to say. Its concept either exists or it does not. The change in direction, and the gradual weaning away from this topic, leads the author to believe

\[19\] Ibid., 25.
that the discussions on Catholic sociology served as a rallying point around which to gather these sociologists, but that it was not the real agenda. What substantiates this opinion is the quiet, almost subtle way, in which this topic gradually fades from discussion. As subsequent generations came into the ACSS, they did not and could not view the debate in the same light since their history and background were not the same. The debate over Catholic sociology was continued, but usually by those who had been first or second generation members. The more time that passed, the more the membership looked, even the older generations, at the issue in a new light. The newer and younger members had a different vision as to the direction of Catholic thought patterns. Their interest focused along the lines of the sociology of religion often in comparative study. This interest was directly linked to the new outlook that came about as the hierarchy of the Church began to redirect its focus in the late 1950s just prior to Vatican II. Gone was the hierarchical direction to establish a Catholic outlook or identity, and replacing it was a call to ecumenicism.

This switch in focus was alluded to in a 1971 brochure published by the reformed Association for the Sociology of Religion, formally the ACSS. It read in part:

Organized in 1936 [sic] as the American Catholic Sociological Society, its primary function for two decades was facilitating the fellowship of Catholic sociologists. In the late 1950's a growing interest in the sociology of religion accompanied examination of the accelerating changes in church structures and the desire
to understand and explain them sociologically.

A focus on sociology of the parish quickly developed into larger organizational analysis and investigation of the contribution of religious values to social change. Interest expanded to include comparative analyses of belief systems of the East and West, theories of religion and society, the current content and context of religious meanings, the nature of belief, the processes of spirituality, the possibilities of structural change in religious institutions, and the relation of all these to economic and political development and the dynamics of social change. Those growing interests in the sociological study of religion expressed itself in the annual meetings and the journal was formally recognized in 1971 with a change in name.²⁰

The switch in the society’s focus was compatible with the switch in the Church hierarchy’s focus. With this switch came the easy abandonment of the debate on Catholic sociology.

Mannheim viewed factual knowledge as being determined by social factors and such knowledge he refused to believe could be separated from values. He felt that socially determined knowledge was valid and legitimate.²¹ While some knowledge was not necessarily verifiable from a positivist view, it may be true and temporal. If one could find out what bias was inherent in the individual’s perspective, one could then discover the ‘truth’. In Mannheim’s terminology, truth consisted essentially in some pragmatic character of one’s response to reality. He speaks of being "in truth" rather

²⁰Marquette University Archives

²¹Mannheim, 28.
than speaking the truth.\textsuperscript{22} Truth is expressed in the essence of historical reality. By understanding the way in which the ACSS functioned and responded to the conditions of the time, the truth of their actions can be determined. That truth did not include a decision on Catholic sociology.

It would appear that the emphasis should not have been so strongly attached to the issue of Catholic sociology. This was a means to achieve group identity but not the core issue. Rather, the entire discussion of the implementation of Catholic social action housed the synthesis of ideas and true knowledge for this group. The Church's call to reach the needy, assess and correct their situation, and return them to Christ were the mandates that initiated the founding of the ACSS. It had been proven in the sociological world that this could be accomplished by using the scientific process of study, analysis, needs assessment and recommendation, and final prescriptive actions taken to correct the inadequacies. But for the Catholic, this science could not be separated from values. The ACSS accomplished this goal and continued to work as an effective tool throughout its existence.

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 31.
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**REPRESENTATIVES AT THE FIRST MEETING OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILLINOIS</th>
<th>De Paul University</th>
<th>Msgr. Howard Egan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Loyola University</td>
<td>Fr. Ralph Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mundelein College</td>
<td>Sr. M. Liguori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Xavier College</td>
<td>Sr. M. Celeste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joliet</td>
<td>Col. of St. Francis</td>
<td>Dr. Frank P. Weberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest</td>
<td>Barat College</td>
<td>Ms. Margaret Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Park</td>
<td>Passionist Monastery</td>
<td>Fr. Joseph O’Leary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Forest</td>
<td>Rosary College</td>
<td>Sr. M. Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| INDIANA       | Notre Dame Univ.   | Fr. Raymond Murray         |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IOWA</th>
<th>Clarke College</th>
<th>Sr. M. Pascal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dubuque</td>
<td>Columbia College</td>
<td>Fr. M. M. Hoffman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MICHIGAN</th>
<th>St. Joseph College</th>
<th>Fr. Vincent Hughes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Mary Grove College</td>
<td>Sr. Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. of Detroit</td>
<td>Fr. John E. Coogan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINNESOTA</th>
<th>Col. of St. Scholastica</th>
<th>Sr. Isabel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duluth</td>
<td>St. Benedict Col.</td>
<td>Sr. Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph</td>
<td>Col. of St. Thomas</td>
<td>Mr. Stephen Mamchur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>Col. of St. Theresa</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Wiley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISSOURI</th>
<th>St. Louis Univ.</th>
<th>Fr. George C. Hilke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>Fontbonne College</td>
<td>Mr. A. H. Clemens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NEBRASKA      | Creighton Univ.        | Mr. Laurence Brown          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OHIO</th>
<th>Xavier University</th>
<th>Fr. Thomas Kane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>John Carroll Univ.</td>
<td>Fr. Louis Weitzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Ursuline College</td>
<td>Sr. Marie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>Univ. of Dayton</td>
<td>Fr. Francis Freidel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Euclid</td>
<td>Notre Dame College</td>
<td>Mr. F. W. Gross</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WISCONSIN</th>
<th>Marquette Univ.</th>
<th>Dr. Paul Mundie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Mount Mary</td>
<td>Ms. Marguerite Reuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notre Dame Motherhouse</td>
<td>Sr. Canisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West DePere</td>
<td>Sr. Seraphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Norbert College</td>
<td>Fr. Francis Clabots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ORIGINAL CONSTITUTION

Presented by Sr. Liguori on March 26, 1938

ARTICLE I - NAME

The name of this society shall be the American Catholic Sociological Society.

ARTICLE II - PURPOSE

The purpose of this society shall be to stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics working in the field of Sociology, to create a sense of solidarity, to stimulate study and research in the field of Sociology and to unearth and to disseminate particularly the sociological implications of the Catholic thought patterns.

ARTICLE III - MEMBERSHIP

Membership shall be open to all who are interested in the field of theoretical, practical and pure Sociology. Membership shall be granted upon approval and classification of application by the Executive Council. There shall be the following classes of membership:

1. Constituent - open to any person professionally engaged in sociological work.

2. Student - open to college and university students whose principal interest is in Sociology or related fields.

3. Associate - open to all others interested in Sociology who are not included in the above groups.

4. Institutional - open to colleges, universities and societies willing to support financially the work of this Society.

5. Life - open to individuals willing to support financially the work of this Society.

Voting power and eligibility for office shall be limited to Constituent members.

ARTICLE IV - OFFICERS

The officers of this Society shall be a president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer. Each officer holds office for one year and may be re-elected. All officers shall be elected by ballot at the first regular meeting of each calendar year.
ARTICLE V - MEETINGS

The Society shall meet at least once a year. The time and place of meetings shall be determined by the Executive Council.

ARTICLE VI - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Executive Council shall have supreme control of all the affairs of the Society. It shall consist of the four elected officers who shall serve in their respective capacities on the Executive Council, and one additional member to be elected by the Society by a majority of the suffrages at the annual meeting of the Society. The function of the Executive Council shall be:

1. To arrange meetings and programs.
2. To control the relationships of the Society with other learned societies.
3. To determine and control any publications of the Society.

ARTICLE VII - AMENDMENTS

This constitution and its by-laws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the constituent members attending any regular meeting, provided that a draft of the proposed amendment be sent to each constituent member at least thirty days before the regular meeting.

ARTICLE VIII - COMMITTEES

All committees shall be named by the Presiding Officer at the meeting at which they are appointed and shall function until such time as their duties have been fulfilled or the Committee has been discharged by the acceptance or rejection of its report at the regular meeting of the Society.

ARTICLE IX - VACANCIES

Vacancies which may occur in the offices or in the Executive Council may be filled by the President (or by the Vice-President in the absence of the President) with the advice and consent of the remaining members of the Executive Council. Such appointments to vacancies will hold until the next regular election of the Society.

ARTICLE X - DUES

The dues for the respective classes of membership, payable at the beginning of each calendar year shall be:

1. Constituent - $1.00 annually
2. Student - 1.00 annually
3. Associate - 2.00 annually
4. Institutional - 5.00 annually
5. Life - 25.00 annually

Dues shall be payable annually. The Fiscal year begins January 1st. Dues are payable on or before April 1st of each year.

ARTICLE XI - INCORPORATION

The Society shall be incorporated in the State of Illinois as a learned Society.
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1941 QUESTIONNAIRE

1941, Questionnaire sent out by Sr. Anne, O.S.B. regarding membership thought on definition of "full" membership category. All requirement questions and alternatives required a "Yes" or "No" reply.

REQUIREMENTS FOR MEMBERSHIP

Please check the requirement you would favor for one to be ranked as having full membership in the Society.

1. A Doctor's degree in Sociology or in any of the Social Sciences (widely interpreted), but if the Latter, the person must be teaching at least one course in Sociology on the College level.

2. As above except the person with the Doctor's degree in the Social Sciences to be required to have some credits in Sociology equal to a minor in the Doctor's degree regardless of teaching or not.

3. A Master's degree in Sociology or in any of the Social Sciences (in the latter, the person to be required to have at least a minor in Sociology in the Master's degree) plus at least nine credits further graduate study in Sociology or any of the Social Sciences.

4. A Master's degree in Sociology or in any of the Social Sciences, if the latter, the person to be required to have at least a minor in Sociology in the Master's degree.

5. A Bachelor's degree in Sociology or in any of the Social Sciences, if the latter, the person to be required to have at least a minor in Sociology in the Bachelor's degree.

6. A teacher of Sociology with few or no credits in Sociology.

7. A person who pays their (sic) dues to the Society and is interested in it.

Alternatives for the above.

1. Persons might be invited to full membership by the Executive Council if they have made some substantial contribution either by scholarly writings in the field, in the implementation of social theory, in labor relations, etc., and if such persons are known to have an interest in the Society and will follow through by being an active member. This should not be confused with an honorary membership which the Society might care to set up.
2. Associate members might be such as pay their dues because of an interest in the Society's work. These would share all the rights of the Full Membership group except the right to vote and hold office in the major offices of the Society, but could serve on Committees.
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1948 MODEL CONSTITUTION FOR LOCAL CHAPTERS
ARTICLE 1 - NAME

The name of the organization shall be ............... Chapter of the American Catholic Sociological Society.

ARTICLE II - PURPOSE

The purpose of this chapter shall be to stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics working in the field of Sociology, to create a sense of solidarity, to stimulate study and research in the field of sociology, and to unearth and to disseminate particularly the sociological implications of the Catholic though-pattern.

ARTICLE III - MEMBERSHIP

Membership shall be open to all who are members of the American Catholic Sociological Society.

ARTICLE IV - OFFICERS

The officers of ............... Chapter shall be a president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer. Each officer holds office for one year and may be re-elected. All officers shall be elected by ballot at the first regular meeting of each calendar year.

ARTICLE V - MEETINGS

1. This chapter shall meet at least once a year.
2. Monthly or bi-monthly local meetings, if feasible, shall be held.
3. Regional meetings may be sponsored by the local chapters with the approval of the Executive Council of the American Catholic Sociological Society.
4. Programs for all meetings shall be planned in consultation with the executive-secretary who may refer doubtful points to the Executive Council for final decision.

ARTICLE VII - AMENDMENTS

This constitution and its by-laws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the constituent members attending any regular meeting, provided that a draft of the proposed amendment be sent to each constituent member at least thirty days before the regular meeting. All amendments require approval of the Executive Council of the ACSS.
ARTICLE VIII - COMMITTEES

All committees shall be named by the presiding officers at the meeting at which they are elected and shall function until such time as their duties have been fulfilled or the committee has been discharged by the acceptance or rejection of its report at the regular meeting of the Chapter.

ARTICLE VIII - VACANCIES

Vacancies which may occur may be filled by the President (or by the vice-president in the absence of the president).

ARTICLE IX - CHARTER

This chapter is chartered by the American Catholic Sociological Society and exists only as a constituent element thereof.
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## APPENDIX 5

### REGIONAL DIRECTORS OF MEMBERSHIP IN ACSS (1958)

| Sr. Mary Agnes of Rome | \n|------------------------|
| Sr. M. Aquinice         | Rosier College, New Hampshire \n| William Bates          | St. Mary’s Academy, Wisconsin \n| Sr. M. Cesarie          | Fordham University, New York \n| Margaret Brindley      | St. John Fisher Col., New York \n| Sr. M. Camille          | Anna Maria College, Massachusetts \n| Fr. Cipeck              | Ursuline College, Ontario, Canada \n| Joseph T. Doran         | Fordham University, New York \n| Dr. John Connors        | St. John Fisher Col., New York \n| Dr. Evelyn Eaton        | Alverno College, Wisconsin \n| Sr. M. Chrysostom       | St. Ambrose College, Iowa \n| Sr. Peter Claver        | Immaculate Hts. Col., California \n| Dr. Mary Jo Huth        | Our Lady of LaSalette, Kentucky \n| Br. Herbert Leies       | St. Mary College, Kansas \n| Mrs. C.W. Hamilton      | West Baden College, Indiana \n| Br. Paul Kaptoski       | Marygrove College, Michigan \n| Sr. M. Jeanine          | St. Teresa College, Minnesota \n| Fr. Alexander Humphreys  | Emmanuel College, Massachusetts \n| Sr. Florence Marie      | St. Theresa College, Minnesota \n
### INSTITUTION

- Rivier College
- Rosary College
- St. Louis Univ.
- Notre Dame College
- College of Notre Dame
- Emmanuel College
- Our Lady of Cincinnati
- St. Mary’s Academy
- Fordham University
- St. Mary’s College
- Creighton University
- St. Theresa College
- Cardinal Stritch Col.
- Anna Maria College
- Ursuline College
- Fordham University
- St. John Fisher Col.
- Alverno College
- St. Ambrose College
- Immaculate Hts. Col.
- Our Lady of LaSalette
- St. Mary College
- West Baden College
- Marygrove College
- St. Teresa College
- Emmanuel College

### STATE

- New Hampshire
- Illinois
- Missouri
- Ohio
- Maryland
- Wisconsin
- Pennsylvania
- California
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SURVEY - MAY 24, 1948

1. What do you think of the suggestion that we have our annual convention alternately at the time and place of the:
   Catholic Economic Association: Pro-67; Con-30; No Vote-55.
   American Sociological Society: Pro-98; Con-17; No Vote-41.

2. Do you think we should arrange for our conventions independently, i.e., without regard for the meetings of other societies?
   With regard-129; Without regard-19; No vote-4.

3. What time of the year would you prefer for our convention?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 No Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In September  22 23 37 3 4 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Xmas &amp; New Year  82 18 10 5 3 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of January   42 40 16 3 0 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In June        4 10 12 46 0 80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If the next convention would be at the time of your choice, is there a chance that you would attend that convention?
   Depends on the place of meeting-103; Depends on program-21;
   I will be able to attend-40; I don't think I will be able to attend-5; No vote-5. (Some checked more than one item.)

5. Our previous conventions have always been either in the middle west or in the middle east. Do you think we should occasionally have meetings in other regions?
   Yes-98; No-40; No vote-14.

6. Where should we hold our next and future conventions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 Other No Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, New Orleans  8 21 24 13 3 2 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, Seattle 14 10 14 6 17 2 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver 10 23 11 13 8 1 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston 43 15 14 9 9 0 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Cities 36 21 14 8 7 2 64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. If the next convention would be at the place of your first choice, is there a chance that you would attend that convention?
   Depends on the time of the meeting-74; I will be able
to attend-53; Depends on the program-8; I don’t think I will be able to attend-6; No vote-15. (Some checked more than one item.)

8. What do you think about the suggestion that the executive secretary be regarded as managing editor ex officio of the American Catholic Sociological Review? Pro-115; Con-14; No vote-23.

9. Do you think the executive council should elect every year two new members to the editorial board of the Review and so arrange matters that the term for two of the oldest members expires simultaneously? Pro-99; Con-23; No vote-30.

10. Or do you think that the appointment of the new members to the Editorial Board should be: By the president of the ACSS-7; By the executive council-75; By the chairman of the editorial board-18; By members at the convention-10; No vote-42.

11. What do you think about the suggestion that the chairman of the editorial board act as editor ex officio (not managing editor) of the Review? Pro-98; Con-15; No vote-39.

12. Should the book review and periodical review editors be ex officio and for two additional years be members of the editorial board? Pro-108; Con-11; No vote-33.

13. Who shall appoint the book review and periodical review editors? The president-7; The editorial board-63; The executive council-38; The members at annual convention-8; The managing editor (executive-secretary)-9; The editor (chairman of the editorial board)-13. (Some checked more than one item.)

14. It is common procedure in other professional societies that editors be changed from time to time so as to give other members a chance, etc. If the chairman of the editorial board is to be ex officio editor (not managing editor) of the Review, would you think that a new chairman should be elected: Every two years-38; Every three years-49; Every four years-24; No vote-41.

15. How often do you think the office of book review and periodical review editors should change? Every two years-45; Every three years-51; Every four years-16; No vote-40.
16. Do you think the office of executive-secretary should be considered permanent unless he resigns or the annual convention wishes to elect another member? Permanent-70; Annual election-51; No vote-31.

17. It seems that some of the functions now exercised by the officers of the Society are (though not unconstitutional) non-constitutional because no provisions are made for them in the constitution. Would you think that the executive council should appoint a committee which examines the present constitution and, if deemed necessary, proposes changes and/or amendments?
   For-130; Against-17; No vote-15.

18. The president of the ACSS wishes to appoint a number of committees which shall be charged with (a) stimulating research in their specific fields, (b) preparing a session in their field for the annual convention. The president will appoint a chairman and the chairman will appoint his own committee of five members. The chairman shall be listed in the left column of the Society’s stationery.
   Are you for such committees-137; Are you against them-1; No vote-14.

Clement S. Mihanovich
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OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PRESIDENT</th>
<th>VICE-PRESIDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Fr. Ralph Gallagher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Fr. Raymond Murray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Paul Mundie</td>
<td>Sr. M. Ann Joachim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Fr. Francis Friedel</td>
<td>Eva Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Walter Willigan</td>
<td>Helen Toole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Eva Ross</td>
<td>Fr. Francis Friedel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey</td>
<td>Franz Mueller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Br. Gerald Schneppe</td>
<td>Fr. Bernard Mulvaney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Alphonse Clemens</td>
<td>Fr. Vincent McQuade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Fr. Leo Robinson</td>
<td>1st- Clement Mihanovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd- Sr. Leo Marie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Franz Mueller</td>
<td>1st- Clement Mihanovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd- Sr. M. Edward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Msgr. Robert Navin</td>
<td>1st- Sr. M. Inez Hilger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd- C. J. Nuesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Clement Mihanovich</td>
<td>1st- Sr. M. Gabriel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd- Edward Huth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Fr. Thomas Harte</td>
<td>1st- John Kane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd- Sr. Roderic Chisholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>John Kane</td>
<td>1st- Fr. Joseph Fitzpatrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd- Sr. M. Gabriel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st- C. J. Nuesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd- Sr. Lorette Marie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>C. J. Nuesse</td>
<td>1st- Fr. Sylvester Sieber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd- Sr. M. Jeanine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Sr. M. Jeanine</td>
<td>1st- John Donovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd-Fr. Joseph Fichter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Br. D. Augustine</td>
<td>1st- Allen Spitzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd- Emerson Hynes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Allen Spitzer</td>
<td>1st- Fr. Bernard Mulvaney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd- Fr. Cosmas Gerard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>John Donovan</td>
<td>Bela Kovrig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Sr. M. Edward</td>
<td>Ernest Kilzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Fr. John Thomas</td>
<td>Joseph Scheuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Jack Curtis</td>
<td>Sr. Inez Hilger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Sr. Francis Jerome</td>
<td>Mary Jo Huth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>John Hughes</td>
<td>John Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Fr. Paul Facey</td>
<td>Paul Reiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Paul Mundy</td>
<td>William Kenkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Fr. Andrew Greeley</td>
<td>Sr. Marie Augusta Neal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Donald Barrett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Gordon Zahn</td>
<td>Ralph Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Robert J. McNamara</td>
<td>Madeleine Giguere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEMBERS
Fr. Ralph Gallagher served as Executive Secretary from 1940 through 1961.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TREASURER</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Joseph Walsh</td>
<td>Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Raymond Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helena O’Neill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Joseph Walsh</td>
<td>Sr. Anna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Raymond Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Sr. M. Liguori</td>
<td>Frank Flynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Francis Friedel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Sr. M. Liguori</td>
<td>Frank Flynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. Paulette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Toole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walter Willigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Sr. M. Liguori</td>
<td>A. H. Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Francis Friedel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. M. Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernard Mulvaney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marguerite Reuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eva Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Br. Gerald Schnepp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Sr. M. Liguori</td>
<td>Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Msgr. Luigi Ligutti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Franz Mueller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N. S. Timasheff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Elizabeth Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Edward Marciniak</td>
<td>Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F.W. Grose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. M. Liguori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Leo Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Br. Gerald Schnepp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. Agnes Claire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. H. Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Marciniak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Msgr. Robert Navin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Toole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. David Twomey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1948 | Edward Huth  
Fr. Ernest Kilzer  
Sr. M. Liguori  
George McKenna  
C.J. Nuesse  
Fr. Leo Robinson  
Eva Ross |
| 1949 | Sr. M. Gabriel  
Br. Herbert Leies  
George McKenna  
Clement Mihanovich  
Franz Mueller  
Bernard Mulvaney  
Fr. Joseph Munier |
| 1950 | Br. Jude Aloysius  
James Burns  
Fr. Joseph Fitzpatrick  
George McKenna  
Franz Mueller  
Msgr. Robert Navin  
Eva J. Ross |
| 1951 | Msgr. Arthur Bukowski  
Fr. Joseph Fichter  
E. K. Francis  
Sr. M. Gabriel  
Clement Jedrejzewski  
Clement Mihanovich  
Sr. Miriam Theresa |
| 1952 | Br. D. Augustine  
Clement Mihanovich  
Sr. M. Edward  
Fr. Thomas Harte  
Sr. Miriam Theresa  
Sr. Mary Roderic  
Br. Gerald Schneppe |
| 1953 | Br. Eugene Janson  
John Kane  
Fr. Ernest Kilzer  
Sr. Miriam Theresa  
Rudolph Morris  
Eva Ross  
Fr. John Thomas |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE SECRETARY</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Donald Barrett</td>
<td>John Donovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Paul Facey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Joseph Fitzpatrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bertha Mugrauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother M. Roseanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Br. Eugene Janson</td>
<td>Fr. Ernest Kilzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Mundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. J. Nuesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. Thomas Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon Zahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Sr. M. Aquinice</td>
<td>Margaret Bedard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Cosmas Girard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Br. Herbert Leies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James McKeown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas O'Dea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. John Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Sr. M. Aquinice</td>
<td>Br. D. Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Bedard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Albert Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. Francis Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas O'Dea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. John Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Br. D. Augustine</td>
<td>Donald Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donald Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Albert Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Jo Huth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. Francis Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Joseph Schuyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. M. Aquinice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Donald Barrett</td>
<td>Jack Curbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Jo Huth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. M. Miriam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. M. Aquinice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Joseph Schuyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon Zahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>EXECUTIVE SECRETARY</td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1960 | Sr. Acquinice       | Fr. Lucius Cervantes  
John Hughes  
Sr. M. Inez Hilger  
Sr. M. Miriam  
Paul Reiss  
Gordon Zahn  
Sr. M. Acquinice |
| 1961 | 1962 Sr. M. Acquinice | Fr. Paul Facey  
Fr. J. Fitzpatrick  
Fr. Herbert Leies  
Clement Mihanovich  
John Hughes  
Gordon Zahn  
Fr. Lucius Cervantes |
| 1963 | Sr. M. Acquinice | Sr. Francis Jerome  
Thomas Imse  
Br. Harold Bertram  
Paul Mundy  
Sr. Marie Augusta  
Edna O’Hern  
Raymond Potvin  
Julian Samora |
| 1964 | Sr. M. Acquinice | Br. Harold Bertram  
Sr. Marie Augusta  
Edna O’Hern  
Julian Samora  
William Liu  
Margarite Donnelly  
Francis Cizon  
John Hughes |
| 1965 | Sr. M. Acquinice | Margaret Bedard  
William D’Antonio  
Rudolf Helling  
Werner Stark |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE SECRETARY</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Sr. Claire Marie Sawyer</td>
<td>Thomas Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rudolf Helling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Connors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William D’Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Werner Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Toomey, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Bedard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Sr. Claire Marie Sawyer</td>
<td>Margaret Bedard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William D’Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rudolf Helling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Werner Stark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 9

DR. PAUL MUNDIE'S LETTER OF APPOINTMENT
APPENDIX 9
DR. PAUL MUNDIE’S LETTER OF APPOINTMENT

First Editorial Board of the Review
February 28, 1940

You will recall that the American Catholic Sociological Society at its Christmas meeting voted to establish a quarterly review. This review was and is intended to publish the results of the scholarship of the many Catholic Sociologists in the United States.

I am writing at this time to ask if you would be kind enough to serve on the Editorial Board of the American Catholic Sociological Review. Until the Editorial Board finds time to review the situation and propose a definite plan of procedure to the Executive Council of the society, the journal will be under the direction of Rev. Ralph A. Gallagher, S. J., Executive Secretary, with the advice and counsel of the Editorial Board.

For the first two issues, there will be little responsibility on the part of the Editorial Board, since the society instructed the Executive Committee to publish the papers of the annual convention. For the other two issues, it will be necessary for the Editorial Board to take steps to secure papers of high scholarship.

May I urge you to serve on this board, if it is at all convenient. It is my sincere hope that it will be possible to ultimately establish a journal for and by professional sociologists. It is my further hope that the quality of the papers and book reviews therein shall be on a very high level. It is only by doing this that we will justify the publication of the review.

Sincerely yours,

Paul J. Mundie
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SURVEY CONCERNING THE CHANGE IN NAME OF THE REVIEW

At the December 8-9, 1962 meeting of the Executive Council at Rosary College, it was agreed that the following statement, which was accepted by those present, should be sent to the membership accompanied by a questionnaire.

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIETY

It was proposed at the business meeting of the American Catholic Sociological Society in Washington last summer that the name of the American Catholic Sociological Review be changed. In re-evaluating the purpose of the Society the Executive Council agrees that there is continuing need for the society:

1) to serve as a source of stimulation for its members;
2) to serve as a channel for production of work characteristic of shared interests of members;
3) to provide a channel of communication to persons outside the society who share the same interests.

Since the Executive Council feels that the proposal to change the name of the Review has considerable merit, it is soliciting the membership for further opinion. To meet the changing focus of interest of the Society’s members there seems to be a current need for such a change. It may well be that the future trend the Society will take will be toward some degree of specialization. The possible direction can vary and the proposed change of name will allow for this. In the event of any change of name however, the Review will continue to be owned and controlled by the American Catholic Sociological Society and this fact will be clearly indicated on the cover of the journal.

This statement was approved by all those present:
John E. Hughes, president
Rev. Paul Facey, S.J., president-elect
John Martin, vice-president
Sr. Frances Jerome, C.D.P., immediate past president
Sr. M. Aquinice, O.P., executive secretary
Sr. Marie Augusta, S.N.D.
Edna O’Hern
Bro. Harold Bertram, F.S.S.C.
Thomas P. Imse
Paul Mundy
Julian Samora
Paul Reiss
Donald Barrett

(Kindly fill in the following questionnaire and return it as soon as possible to Sister M. Aquinice, O.P. Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois).

Introduction:

There are five different points of view from which we can direct the future of the American Catholic Sociological Review. We can (1) keep the old title and the old focus (with reference to content); (2) keep the old title and introduce a new focus; (3) introduce a new title but keep the old focus; (4) introduce a new general title like "Review of Sociology", or (b) a new specialized title like "Sociology of American Catholicism." The following paragraphs give statements representing those alternatives. The arguments for each position were formulated by different Council members who volunteered to plead the cause of the position expressed. You are being asked to consider all five statements and then to indicate the ones that come nearest to expressing your own position. If you sincerely feel that none of the alternatives expresses your stand, kindly formulate a position in the section marked for the purpose.

* * * * *

ALTERNATIVE WAYS OF PROGRAMMING THE REVIEW

(Please mark a one (1) beside your first choice and a two (2) beside your second choice.)

1. Old title - old focus

One alternative is to retain the present title of the American Catholic Sociological Review and its present character as a general sociological journal publishing articles which reflect the interests of the Society membership as professional sociologists. It might be remembered that the American Catholic Sociological Society is an association composed of Catholic sociologists whose interests cover the whole range of areas within the discipline, therefore the present title and character of the Review accurately reflect the nature of the Society for which it is the official journal.

This is the position I prefer as choice number _____.

2. Old title - new focus
The old title should be retained (1) because of practical implications of change. The change should be resisted until the desirability of change is clearly demonstrated; (2) because it overtly and positively indicates the Catholic affiliation of the membership of the sponsoring society; (3) because of the value connotations to the founders and the pioneers and history of the Society.

A new focus, however, should be introduced because (1) it would more accurately reflect the feeling of the majority of the members that the emphasis in the Society and Review should be more specialized - emphasizing sociology of religion and sociological analysis of American Catholicism; (2) we as Catholics have access to sociological analysis of the Church and things Catholic; (3) the new focus would encourage this specialized research among the membership; and (4) would comprise a reason for existence of the Review. At present it is questionable that there is justification for the maintenance of another general sociological review.

This is the position I prefer as choice number ____.

3. New general title - old focus

A more general title will (1) satisfy the criticism of those who feel that the present title presents an inaccurate conception of the society. The change will reflect that fact that the membership is increasingly composed of professional sociologists; (2) permit the journal to have either a general content or a specialized content according to the changing character of the Society of the future. Basically, it provides flexibility and will not necessitate further change of name; (3) retain the interests of all members of the society at this time, including those with such specialized interests as medical sociology, demography and criminology; (4) furthermore, it is recognized that specialization could not be developed for sometime to come, and a specialized title would be inappropriate until that time arrives. (5) A general title will remove the threat to the membership that specialization at this moment may present and finally (6) it will attract new readers and new members.

This is the position I prefer s choice number ____.

4a. New general title - new focus

The reasons for the new title include the following: (1)
There is at present a confusion inherent in the title: it suggests that there is a Catholic sociology. (2) The present title deters possible contributors, readers and subscribers who assume the journal is for Catholics only. (3) It is time to remove another wall of the Catholic ghetto. (4) There is an inherent contradiction in the present title: much that appears in the journal is not really relevant to the term Catholic.

The reasons why this new title should be a general title are these: (1) There is a period of necessary transition involved (content change in convention programs and published articles will be gradual). A general title allows for some flexibility in developing focus. (A specific subtitle can be added later if needed.) (3) The experience of European Catholic sociologists is a helpful precedent. (Confer the publishing of Social Compass.) (4) Several new journals with a specific title in the area of religion have recently appeared (e.g., Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, and immediate direct competition with these should be avoided.

The following are reasons for a new focus: (1) The American Catholic Sociological Society is tending toward a new direction not fully defined at present. (2) The Society's members, as members, have special interests in the area of sociology of religion. (3) The other interests of the members are already provided for in other professional groups, (American Sociological Association, Society for the Study of Social Problems, Rural Sociological Society, etc.)

This is the position I prefer as choice number ____.

4b. New specific title - new focus

There is a new direction emerging in the Society. Members are emphasizing areas of study for which they feel special competence as Catholics. These include, but are not limited to, studies in the aspects of the structure of the Church; religious attitudes as related to political, economic, educational, familial behavior; Catholic doctrine and social reform; the liturgy and social attitudes. The movement into an increasingly viable subdivision of sociology justifies the existence of a separate learned society in the eyes of its own members and of interested non-members both of whom have been ambivalent about the need for a separate Catholic sociological society. The name of the journal should reflect this new direction because (1) the old name has been associated with a general orientation
rather than a specific one; (2) the old name has been associated with a "Catholic sociology" i.e., Catholic social philosophy, etc.; (3) the new name will bring the change in the direction of the Society’s efforts to the attention of non-members.

This is the position I prefer as choice number ____.

5. Other position

If you do not find any of the previously stated positions one that comes near to your own, kindly express your opinion here.

6. Any further comments you would like to make.

These are the results of the survey of the Executive Council and of the Editorial Board of the Review with respect to the change in title.

SURVEY OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS
(The numbers and letters refer to the items in the questionnaire you have just read.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>First Choice</th>
<th>Second Choice</th>
<th>Preferred name for Review if change is made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Hughes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sociology of Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. Facey</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Martin</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Frances Jerome</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Aquinice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Marie Augusta</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Religion and Society: A Sociological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bro. Harold Bertram</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Imse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. Larson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Mundy</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. O’Hern</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.H. Potvin</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Samora</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Sociological Analysis with emphasis on values and religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Reiss</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****
SURVEY OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD yielded the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Suggested Title Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Burch</td>
<td>Religion and Society: A Sociological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Cizon</td>
<td>Sociological Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William D’Antonio</td>
<td>Religion and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Donovan</td>
<td>American Catholicism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kenkel</td>
<td>Sociological Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bela Korvig</td>
<td>Review of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Potvin</td>
<td>Journal of Social Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Reiss</td>
<td>Review of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thomas</td>
<td>Sociological Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Frances Jerome</td>
<td>Review of Sociology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GORDON ZAHN LETTER
Loyola University
820 N. Michigan Ave.
Chicago 11, Illinois

August 15, 1960

With considerable regret I am writing this letter to bring to your attention a situation which, I feel represents a failure of editorial integrity and a surrender of the academic freedom of THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW. Since those directly responsible for the present editorial policy have not acknowledged -- much less granted! -- my written requests for a change in this policy, I have no alternative but to bring the issue to the members of the Editorial Board and the Executive Council of the American Catholic Sociological Society. It is my hope that these official bodies may resolve the issue satisfactorily so that it need not become a matter of public discussion or open controversy at our forthcoming convention.

The issue concerns my paper, "The Catholic Press and the National Cause in Nazi Germany", presented at the Political Sociology section of the 1959 Meeting at Mundelein. The paper received some immediate notice in the Chicago daily press, favorable comment in America, and, some weeks later, sharply unfavorable comment in Chicago's diocesan paper. This latter comment was widely circulated through the NCWC news service with the result that its sadly distorted and incomplete version of what I had said received national Catholic coverage. Since then, at least two attacks have been published in German periodicals; and these attacks, too, bear but the slightest relationship to the paper they set out to "refute". While all this goes on, the text of the paper itself has been intentionally suppressed by those holding editorial responsibility for the ACSR.

The sequence of events is important, so I shall try to recapitulate them briefly. As is customary, the paper was submitted to the ACSR following its presentation. Shortly after the range of interest and reaction (both favorable and unfavorable) manifested itself, Dr. Paul Mundy, as Editor of the ACSR, formally accepted the article for publication. His official intention to publish was further evidenced by the fact that the article was actually set in galleys (which were later destroyed in the Techny fire) and he accepted an order for reprints.

At this point, however, the Executive Secretary of the ACSS intervened with a personal request that Dr. Mundy delay publication for an issue or two in view of the fact that Loyola University was being subjected to pressures and protests reportedly originating with the German hierarchy which was described as being "up in arms" about my findings that German Catholic leaders had supported the Hitler war effort. Dr. Mundy reluctantly agreed to a postponement, but
only after he received Fr. Gallagher's personal assurance that the delay would be temporary and that the article would certainly be published by the ACSR.

But the article has not been published; and Dr. Mundy's successor has made it quite clear that it is his understanding that the article will not be published. Two issues of substantial importance become immediately evident. First, I contend that, despite the subsequent change of editors, the REVIEW and the ACSS are under a moral obligation to fulfill Dr. Mundy's official commitment as Editor and Father Gallagher's assurances as Executive Secretary. It is at this point that the question of editorial integrity is involved.

The question of the academic freedom of the REVIEW may be of even greater importance. We must decide whether any outsiders -- whether in Germany or in this country -- can be permitted to determine (a) what is printed in the official journal of the ACSS or (b) when it is to be printed. I have conducted something of an informal sampling of opinion on this through personal correspondence; and I have thus far encountered virtual unanimity on the position that, as the official organ of the ACSS, the REVIEW must insist upon its right of academic freedom. In this connection, Fr. Thomas, President of the ACSS; Fr. Scheuer, Program Chairman of the 1959 meeting; and Dr. Nuesse, Chairman of the section at which the paper was delivered, have all expressed support for my position that the article should be published. Fr. Thomas and Dr. Nuesse both suggested the possibility that a concurrent rejoinder might be published -- something to which I would have no objection whatever. But the important point is this: the pressures and protests supposedly emanating from abroad have apparently carried far greater weight in the editorial decision than have the opinions of such eminent and responsible members of the ACSS.

A far more extensive presentation of my position could be made, but I feel it should be reserved for a more suitable occasion. I still hope that the issue may be resolved before the forthcoming meeting in New York by some firm and explicit promise to publish the paper without further delay. However, in the event that those responsible for the present policy can not be persuaded to give such assurances, the issue will most likely be presented for discussion at that time. Since your official position might involve you in the outcome of such discussions, I feel you are entitled to the above summary of the facts and my position in this matter. Needless to say, I should welcome whatever support or assistance you might wish to give me in my efforts to induce the present editor to respect Dr. Mundy's commitment and to proceed with the publication of the article in question.

Sincerely yours,
Gordon C. Zahn, Associate Professor of Sociology
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PUBLICATION TOTALS BY ISSUE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Book Reviews</th>
<th>Short Notices</th>
<th>Periodicals</th>
<th>Ph.D. Disser.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940 #1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 #1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942 #1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943 #1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944 #1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945 #1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946 #1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947 #1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948 #1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sociological Analysis Begins**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 5 articles reviewed in one analysis
# APPENDIX 13
## STATISTICS ON BOARD PUBLICATIONS
### EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERSHIP - 1940 THROUGH 1952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Board Years</th>
<th>Total art.</th>
<th>Articles pub.</th>
<th>Published</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fr. Ralph Gallagher</td>
<td>1940-52</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Anne</td>
<td>1940-43</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Donohue</td>
<td>1940-42</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Elizabeth Francis</td>
<td>1940-42</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fitzgibbons</td>
<td>1940-42</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Flynn</td>
<td>1940-41</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey</td>
<td>1940-48</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz Mueller</td>
<td>1940-48</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. Leo Robinson</td>
<td>1940-43</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Ross</td>
<td>1940-50</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Toole</td>
<td>1940-41</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wiley</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Mundie</td>
<td>1941-42</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite Ruess</td>
<td>1941-45</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. M. Henry</td>
<td>1942-46</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br. Gerald Schnepp</td>
<td>1942-48</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1951-52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. H. Clemens</td>
<td>1943-48</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Kress</td>
<td>1943-45</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Leo Marie</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. S. Timasheff</td>
<td>1943-48</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Friedel</td>
<td>1944-48</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Liguori</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Mulvaney</td>
<td>1944-46</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Marciniak</td>
<td>1944-48</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. Ray Murray</td>
<td>1945-48</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Elizabeth Walsh</td>
<td>1945-48</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement Mihanovich</td>
<td>1946-48</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Coogan</td>
<td>1947-48</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Ryan</td>
<td>1947-48</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.J. Nuesse</td>
<td>1946-50</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Zahn</td>
<td>*1951-52</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

| Members | (138)100 | 22 | 66 | 12 |

The last officially published and complete list of Board members appears in Volume 9 Issue 1 (March 1948). The names of Nuesse and Zahn appear as Periodical Editor and Schnepp as Book Review Editor in later issues.

* Indicates that service on the Board continued past the scope of this chart.

Parentheses indicate total years of service on the Board
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### PUBLICATION TOTALS BY YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Book Reviews</th>
<th>Short Notices</th>
<th>Book Reviews</th>
<th>Periodicals</th>
<th>Total Period</th>
<th>Ph.D. Dissertations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(219)</td>
<td>(826)</td>
<td>(267)</td>
<td>(1093)</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(219)</td>
<td>(826)</td>
<td>(267)</td>
<td>(1093)</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(219)</td>
<td>(826)</td>
<td>(267)</td>
<td>(1093)</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(219)</td>
<td>(826)</td>
<td>(267)</td>
<td>(1093)</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(282)</td>
<td>(1281)</td>
<td>(303)</td>
<td>(1584)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(282)</td>
<td>(1281)</td>
<td>(303)</td>
<td>(1584)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Book Reviews</td>
<td>Short Notices</td>
<td>Total Book Reviews</td>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>Ph.D. Dissertations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(282)</td>
<td>(1281)</td>
<td>(303)</td>
<td>(1584)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(282)</td>
<td>(1281)</td>
<td>(303)</td>
<td>(1584)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(282)</td>
<td>(1281)</td>
<td>(303)</td>
<td>(1584)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>501</td>
<td>2107</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2677</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Code A - indicates Shanas Category (1-16)
Code B - indicates ACSS goal (1-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A-B</th>
<th>Vol 1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-1</td>
<td>&quot;The American Catholic Sociological Review&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>&quot;Sociology and the Catholic&quot; - Eva J. Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>&quot;Christian Social Thought in the First and Second Centuries&quot; - Paul Hanly Furfey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-3</td>
<td>&quot;Undergraduate Preparation of the Social Worker&quot; - Francis J. Friedel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>&quot;A Manifesto on Rural Life&quot; - James A. Byrnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-2</td>
<td>&quot;Socio-Economic Welfare and Trade Union Policy&quot; - Edmund Horne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>&quot;Presidential Address - 1939&quot; - Raymond W. Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-2</td>
<td>The Second Annual Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-2</td>
<td>Round Table on High School Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-2</td>
<td>News of Sociological Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-2</td>
<td>Book Reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol 1.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol 1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16-3 "Has America a Personality?" - Thomas J. Sullivan
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews

1940 Vol 1.4

1-3 "Why A Supernatural Sociology?" - Paul Hanly Furfey
1-3 "The Social Thoughts of Virgil Michel, O.S.B." - Emerson Hynes
1-1 "The Introductory Course in Sociology" - Eva J. Ross
2-2 "Man and Society" - James P. Connell
12-2 "1940 Research Census" - Marguerite Reuss
2-2 "Juvenile Delinquency and the Catholic Home" - Sr. Celestine
12-2 The Third Annual Convention
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews
12-4 Index of Volume I

1941 Vol 2.1

1-1 "Tragic Dualism, Chaotic Syncretism, Quantitative Colossalism, and Diminishing Creativeness of the Contemporary Senate Culture" - Pitirim A. Sorokin
12-2 "Courses on Race Relations in Catholic Colleges" - Mary Elizabeth Walsh
1-3 "The Cyclical Theory of Christopher Dawson" - George F. Fitzgibbon
2-2 "The Family in Transition" - Paul J. Mundie
1-2 "The Social Thought of Frederic Ozanam" - Sr. Eveline
4-2 "The Extent of Democratization in Catholic Educational Institutions" - William Mang
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews

1941 Vol 2.2

2-2 "On the Anniversary of the Encyclicals" - John A. Ryan
10-2 "Christian Social Concepts and the Sociologist" - Eva J. Ross
12-2 "Race Relations in the Curriculum of the Catholic College" - John LaFarge
2-3 "A Family Wage Formula" - Clement S. Mihanovich
2-1 "A Rural Approach to Urban Disorganization" - Most Rev. Vincent J. Ryan
16-2 "The Place of Sociology in Social Work Training" - Weltha M. Kelley
12-2 "The Introductory Course in Sociology"
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Roster of The American Catholic Sociological Society
16-2 Book Reviews

1941 Vol 2.3

2-2 "What Constitutes a Sociology of Religion?" - Franz H. Mueller
2-2 "The Central-Verein, a Non-Institutional Social Control" - Sr. M. Liguori
10-1 "A Catholic Approach to Anthropology" - Albert Muntsch
11-2 "Methods of Procedure in Securing Distributive Justice" - Eligius Weir
10-2 "Undergraduate Preparation for Social Work" - Sr. Elizabeth Frances
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews

1941 Vol 2.4

10-3 "Social Implications of the Cooperative Movement" - E. R. Bowen
16-3 "Personalistic Social Action in the Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno" - Paul Hanly Furfey
5-2 "Rural Culture in Europe and America" - Johann Mokre
12-2 "1941 Research Census of Members of the American Catholic Sociological Society" - Marguerite Reuss
10-2 "Fundamental Problems in the Sociology of Law" - N. S. Timasheff
12-2 The Fourth Annual Convention
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews
16-4 Index to Volume II

1942 Vol 3.1

12-1 "Are We Accepting the Challenge?" - Francis J. Friedel
1-3 "Sociology and Fundamental Values" - Howard E. Jensen
7-2 "The Catholic Approach to Interracialism in France" - Louis T. Achille
2-2 "The Rural Family Culture Pattern" - Sr. Anne
2-2 "The Family Under the National Defense Program" - Edwin C. Mulligan
2-2 "The Sociology of Human Relations in Industry" - Rudolph J. Schwenger
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews
1942 Vol 3.2

2-1 "Cultural Order in Liberal, Fascist, and Communist Society" - N. S. Timasheff
1-1 "The Lesson of Plato's Republic" - Paul Hanly Furfey
5-1 "Some Implications of Population Trends to the Christian Church" - O. E. Baker
11-1 "The Modern State and Public Welfare" - Wilfrid Parsons
5-1 "The Social Structure and Status System of Modern Communities: A New Approach" - Sylvester A. Sieber
4-2 "The Significance of the Adolescent Girl in Reconstructing Family Life" - Sr. Mildred
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews

1942 Vol 3.3

12-1 "Catholic Sociological Research" - Francis J. Friedel
12-2 "Comment" - Sr. M. Liguori, Franz Mueller, Eva J. Ross and Walter L. Willigan
2-2 "Study of the Catholic Family Through Three Generations" - Sr. M. Christina
2-2 "Nationality and Leakage" - Gerald J. Schnepp
1-1 "The Concept of Social Process in American Society" - Sr. M. Liguori
1-3 "Public Welfare Practice and Man's Social Heritage" - Agnes Van Driel
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Roster of the American Catholic Sociological Society
16-2 Book Reviews

1942 Vol 3.4

1-3 "An Appraisal of Sumner's Folkways" - Robert Harnett
1-2 "A Sociology of the Supernatural" - Luigi Sturzo
4-1 "Operational Concepts in Social Psychology" - Vincent Herr
8-3 "The Place of Empirical Sociology" - Bernard G. Mulvaney
2-3 "The Problem of War Causation" - Leo J. Martin
12-2 The Fifth Annual Convention
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews
16-4 Index to Volume III
1943 Vol 4.1

2-3 "The Sociologist's Contribution to Postwar Reconstruction" - Eva J. Ross
4-3 "On Propaganda" - N. S. Timasheff
10-1 "The Formal Object of the Social Sciences" - Francis J. Friedel
8-1 "An Appraisal of Research Methods in the Study of Southern Communities" - Edward A. Marciniak
6-3 "Recent Trends in American Child-bearing" - Bernard Mulvaney
12-2 "1942 Research Census" - Marguerite Reuss
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews

1943 Vol 4.2

2-2 "Labor and Reconstruction after the War" - John Ryan
2-1 "Economic Status and Leakage" - Gerald J. Schnepp
2-2 "The Family and Postwar Reconstruction" - Edgar Schmiedeler
11-3 "A Postwar Reconstruction Program for the A.C.S.S." - Robert C. Harnett
2-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews

1943 Vol 4.3

1-1 "Survival and Syndicalism in French Canada" - Percy A. Robert
2-1 "Catholic Sociological Theory - A Review and Prospectus" - Melvin J. Williams
1-2 "The Principle of Subsidiarity in the Christian Tradition" - Franz H. Mueller
2-3 "The Catholic Sociologist Faces a New Social Order" - Alphonse H. Clemens
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews

1943 Vol 4.4

2-2 "The Development of the Modern Dualism between State and Society" - Franz H. Mueller
2-3 "Integrating Forces for an International Community" - Leo J. Martin
16-2 "Catholic Social Service and Professional Training" - A. H. Scheller
12-2 "1943 Research Census of the Members of the ACSS"
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
Roster of the American Catholic Sociological Society
Book Reviews
Index to Volume IV

1944  Vol 5.1

4-1 "The Sociological Implications of Substandard English" - Paul Hanly Furfey
2-1 "The Sociologist and Postwar Reconstruction" - Eva J. Ross
5-1 "The Rural People in the Postwar World" - O. E. Baker
2-2 "The Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction" - John A. Ryan
6-1 "Prewar and Postwar Fertility" - Bernard G. Mulvaney
7-1 "Present Trends in Negro-White Relations" - Richard J. Roche
2-1 "National Sovereignty and World Society" - Paul G. Steinbicker
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews

1944  Vol 5.2

7-1 "Inter-Ethic Relations in the USSR" - N. S. Timasheff
5-1 "Rural People in the Postwar World - II" - O. E. Baker
3-3 "The Social Worker and Postwar Reconstruction" - Lucian Lauerman
1-3 "Group Work in Tomorrow's Community Planning" - J. W. McGowan
5-3 "The Changing Community in the Postwar World" - Margaret M. Toole
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews

1944  Vol 5.3

3-1 "Steam Power: A Study in the Sociology of Invention" - Paul Hanly Furfey
2-1 "Communist, National Socialist and Liberal Society, 1917-1939" - N.S. Timasheff, Friedrich Baerwald and Leo Martin
5-1 "The Development of the Catholic Church in New Haven, Connecticut" - Stanley H. Chapman
12-1 "New Knowledge About Prehistoric Man" - Raymond Murray
6-1 "Is the Catholic Birth Rate Declining?" - Sr.Leo Marie
12-2 Notes of Sociological Interest
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
6-2 Book Reviews
1944 Vol 5.4

16-2 "The Sociologist as Teacher" - C. J. Nuesse
2-1 "Men's and Women's Languages" - Paul Hanly Furfey
7-1 "The Comparative Study of Inter-Ethnic Relations" - N. S. Timasheff
1-1 "Society as a Process" - Friedrich Baerwald
12-2 Notes of Sociological Interest
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews
16-4 Index to Volume V

1945 Vol 6.1

1-1 "The Sociologist and Scientific Objectivity" - Paul Hanly Furfey
11-1 "Cooperatives and the Problem of Poverty" - Martin E. Schirber
5-3 "Returned Veterans in the Parish" - Edwin V. O'Hara
6-1 "Trends of the Catholic Population in the United States" - Sr. Leo Marie
1-1 "The Rise of Modern Society" - Franz Mueller
8-2 Notes of Sociological Interest
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews

1945 Vol 6.2

6-1 "Population Policies under National Socialism" - Leo J. Martin
2-1 "Family Life Among the Pueblo" - Sr. M. Henry
11-3 "Towards Postwar Social Cooperation" - Eva J. Ross
2-1 "A Course in Marriage and the Family for Seminarians" - Francis J. Friedel
14-2 Notes of Sociological Interest
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews

1945 Vol 6.3

16-2 In Memoriam Msgr. John A. Ryan, 1869-1945
4-1 "West Indian Beliefs and Superstitions" - Basil Matthews
10-1 "Recent Developments in Biological Sociology" - Charles I. McCarragher
10-3 "Religion and the Criminologist" - John E. Coogan
1-1 "The Inductive Study of Catholic Social Action" - Mary
Elizabeth Walsh
8-1 "On Methods in the Social Sciences" - N. S. Timasheff
2-1 Notes of Sociological Interest: A Round-table on Public Health Insurance
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
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2-1 "Catholic Refugee Families in St. Louis, 1948-1954" - John C. Reed
15-1 "The Behavior of Fathers as Reported by Normals, Neurotics and Schizophrenics" - James E. McKeown and Conrad Chyatte
12-2 News of Sociological Interest
16-2 Book Reviews
16-3 Periodical Reviews
12-2 List of Members
16-4 Index to Volume XV

1955 Vol 16.1

2-1 "Sociology in Catholic Education: Prospect for Capital Development" - C. J. Nuesse
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