

Sister Jacqueline
Magazine Industry Seminar
Harvard Business School
July 2, 1964

TO BE SEGREGATED IS TO BE DEPRIVED

Introduction: It's my pleasure this morning to introduce our speaker, Sister Jacqueline Grennan, who is going to speak on the subject of "To be Segregated is to be Deprived", but she tells me that it isn't about race. And I can't think of any better introduction than to read this paragraph which reported her presence at a panel discussion, The 49th Association of Canadian Advertisers. I couldn't be more eloquent than these words: "The only woman and the only Roman Catholic educator on President Kennedy's advisory panel on research and development, in education is a pert, blue eyed nun, addressed with affectionate informality by her fellow panelists as Sister J. She is Sister Jacqueline Grennan, S.L., 36, Vice President of Missouri Webster College and her place on the panel is no concession to her sex or religion. She belongs in the trail blazing company she keeps, an experimental elite, educators of educators, that includes M.I.T. physicist, Jerrold Zacharias, Harvard Psychologist, Jerome Bruner, and U. S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Kepple. To colleague Bruner she is in the great tradition of the abbesses of the 16th century; co-panelist Zacharias, a frugal man with superlatives, says she may well turn out to be the Joan of Arc of education.

I should do a little back history on this and tell you that only three and a half years ago that same Jerrold Zacharias was trying to save a very good mathematician from "those medieval nuns in the midwest". I'd like to chide him now and to ask him if from his philosophical and theological point of view, which is not quite the same as my own, if he has done any research on what was the end of Joan of Arc. I'm trying to stay out of the Los Angeles Diocese.

In a commencement address given by Dr. Zacharias at Tufts University just this spring, he was talking about the formation of committees to make great explorations. He made a plea in his address that in the formation of such committees along with any group of professionals should always be included what he calls some very bright amateurs. I'm not at all sure that I will deserve, at the end of this talk, the adjectival description, but I am sure that I will deserve the noun description. In your area I am indeed an amateur and I can think of no reason for their bringing me here except that I may bring to you what I should call a little bit of precious naivete. I have come to have a great respect for precious naivete in intercommunications. I think perhaps the most deadly thing that any one of us has to face is an in-group climate in which we keep talking to ourselves and convincing ourselves of that with which we have already been indoctrinated. It is for this reason that I wish to talk to you today about the open society, the values of the open society, the absolute critical value of the open society in our world and to talk in terms of "to be segregated is always to be deprived".

I believe that this is true, certainly in the field of race, just as true for the over privileged suburbs as it is for the inner cities. But it is also true of socio-economic class, true of the professions, true certainly in religion and philosophy, in national and in ethnic groups.

There is a very exciting book which has come out in the last year called The Christian Commitment. It is written by the theologian Karl Rahner, the great middle European theo-

logian who was very controversial at Vatican II, one of the theologians who was held off by the Roman Curia and embraced by that great John XXIII. In this book, The Christian Commitment, Karl Rahner says that we are living in what he calls a Christian diaspora. He goes back to the Old Testament image and talks about the Jewish Diaspora, the condition of the Jews who went out from Jerusalem into pagan lands where they were no longer a Jewish community, but were Jews of the diaspora. And he transfers this image into the western culture of our time.

At one time we were the Christian West. In this sense Christianity was nominally at least co-extensive with the nations themselves. And so we had Christian education, Christian culture, Christian aesthetics, Christian art, and Christian social institutions. This is no longer true, he says, because we, the Christians, are in the minority, but we are in the minority everywhere. And so we must be Christians of the diaspora, reduced or exalted to our individual worth. We are now Christians in education, Christians in art, Christians in social welfare. Because, as Rahner says, these are functions of the whole people, they must never be subcultures. It is this kind of thesis that absolutely fascinates me at this time.

It is much more important that any member of a subculture be a person involved in a greater culture than that he operate from the, I think, debilitating position of the subculture itself.

What I am trying to say is that ghettoism or provincialism is always debilitating. It is more debilitating to the group that is practicing the segregation or the provincialism or the parochialism than it is to the great culture. But it also deprives the great culture because here is an enriching and a hybrid kind of contribution from which the great culture is being deprived. And so I have practically lost my head at times by saying that it seems to me, from our point of view, that absolutely the worst thing that could happen to us is to achieve the old time ideal of every Catholic child in a Catholic school.

A couple of years ago I said to my Cardinal for whom I have great respect, "Suppose that the United States were to accept the position of so many pressure groups and were to agree to support private religious schools either directly through the schools or through the parents. Then suppose we were told we would be given equal, but separate rights". If such an offer were made, I hope we would be bright enough to say, don't do that to us. You have already done that historically to the American Negro. And we know from his experience that unless you are a full and a participating member of the whole society you are not a full influence in that society. You are not a completely inter-active member of that society.

And so it seems to me that this, from what I would call apostolic reasons, not from legal reasons, would be the most deadly thing that could happen to the education of Catholics. I'm talking now, not about Catholic education, but about the education of Catholics which I consider much more important.

It is the education of persons which is important. It is the person who must make decisions, it is the person who must act with free will. It is the person who must choose smogg alternatives. We live in a highly sophisticated society, a society wherein the words of Newman, there are no blacks and whites, there are only areas of varying shades of gray; where we simply cannot wait for someone to push a button and tell us what to do in our philosophic or in our moral standards; where we must learn to handle alternatives and to do the very best we can with our limited intelligence.

This, all of it I think, has profound implications for the whole field of communications. And, it is here that I think I do share in your world, because I am convinced that the field of communications is as proper to formal education as it is to the world of periodicals, and as proper to the world of periodicals as it is to formal education. I think all of us are convinced today that formal education can be only an opening wedge, an opening wedge to the learning process which I hope each of us will be indulging in until we run to our graves. Then, if

there be an eternity, and I happen to believe there will be, I hope that learning process is going to go on forever and ever and ever because I can't think what else contemplation could mean.

If this is true, if we are going to indulge in the learning process for ever or at least if we are going to indulge in it until we run to our graves, then it behoves all of us who are involved in the field of communications, in interpersonal relationships of the mind, to consider what kind of learning theory we believe in.

I think that there are two polar learning theories and many ramifications between. One I shall choose to call indoctrination; the other I shall choose to call insight. And I would suggest that the radical groups that we've heard so much about in the last two weeks are always guilty of indoctrination. Be they the Communist left or the John Birch right, it is because they are guilty of indoctrination that they are dangerous. Because they subject people to monolithic thinking, to platitudes, to a conviction that one can make simplicistic kinds of judgements, they somehow rob us of that aching, full-of-wonder reality that life is tough, but wonderful; that one has to operate within limits and make the best judgements one can make with his finite mind at any given moment, that there is no such thing as being absolutely sure.

Many of us, from our ghettos, have been guilty of this kind of indoctrination, We have been guilty of it in our textbooks, we have been guilty of it in our religious groups, we have been guilty of it in our economic groups, and, we always do it out of what we see as a kind of security orientation. Let us give our children the security of a foundation. Let us not worry them.

And I would answer to this kind of judgement that the only security that a late 20th century American or a late 20th century world citizen can have is what I shall call the security to be insecure. This is the fundamental security we must give to our persons in our society. We do live in an open-ended society. It is open-ended geographically. It is open-ended

ideologically. It is open-ended scientifically. It is open-ended philosophically. The counter pressures are everywhere and I think they are vitalizing counter pressures.

The physicist who lives in his lab knows that he may not solve the thing that he is trying to solve, even in his lifetime. But, he doesn't stop trying to solve it. He is excited to the chase by the fact that he has a finite mind which is pushing back reality by what he calls successive approximation, pushing it back and back and back. Operating in that glorious unknown, he has to work, at least in the field of his endeavor, in his laboratory, with the security to be insecure. He knows that he may have to change his pace, that he must watch phenomena, that he has to have a terrible kind of intellectual humility if he is going to be honest, the intellectual humility to confront facts, to confront reality, to confront processes and to change his mind on what was his hunch. I would suggest that we need this personal posture just as desperately in our social situations, in our philosophical situations. I would like to say that we, in my particular sub group, have done a terrible dis-service to a man like Thomas Aquinas. Because, if Thomas Aquinas was great, and I think he was, his greatness lays in the fact that he was able to ask the most profound questions of his time. But, if Thomas Aquinas were living in 1964, and if he were great, his greatness would lie in exactly the same field, namely, in the ability to ask profound questions of the data of 1964. Thomas Aquinas didn't have the data of 1964. There have been generations of evolution, intellectual evolution, since that time. And we make the terrible mistake, I think, of canonizing a man, in secular as well as in religious thinking, of canonizing a man for what he found rather than for the process of his finding. We worship the static image instead of the dynamic process. And in doing this I think we commit an irony on our great creative thinkers because we freeze what they found. A creative thinker is always a man who is ahead of his time. If a man is a creative thinker in 1800 the thrust of his mind projects decades ahead. If the same man were living in 1900 he would be thrusting forward from 1900, because he would be the same

kind of man in his time that he was a century earlier. This I think is true of our statesmen, true of our religious thinkers, true of our philosophic thinkers, certainly true of science and technology and business and industry.

Those of you who represent one of the burgeoning industries of our time know this. I won't mention names for fear of being accused of vested interest but I am sure that there is one publishing group, thought of by some people as a monster in the publishing world that perhaps more than any other has evolved on the principle of research and development. It's really gone off on wings, it keeps trying one thing after another, and in this sense it has been able to grow and grow and grow and grow - to accomplish tremendous things. I am sure there are other groups of you for whom this has been true too.

Our age is the age of research and development not only in science and technology, but in the whole human experience. I happen to know well a good number of executives at Monsanto Chemical Company and I am fascinated by this company. Monsanto Chemical Company in 1946 had gross sales of 35 million dollars. Seventeen years later in 1963 that same company had gross sales of one billion three hundred and fifty million dollars. From thirty-five million in 1946 to one billion three hundred and fifty million in 1963. The very warp and woof, the very organic soul of Monsanto Chemical Company is research and development.


One of the most thrilling experiences one can have in the St. Louis area is to go out to that research and development campus on Lindbergh Road, and go through that research and development complex. One day the director of the research labs was taking me through. We walked into a lovely concert hall and there was a fellow playing a harpiscord. When I asked if he were giving the concert that night, the lab director replied, "Oh no Sister, he runs one of our research teams, he's liable to play that harpiscord all day". Then he chuckled and said, "But he might have a great idea tonight". I told this to a group of suburban school



system teachers in University City in St. Louis and I said, "Can you imagine what the local school board would say".

All of this says to me we must make up our mind whether we want the security of the 4-1/2 % savings account, which admittedly we sometimes need, or whether we want to play the blue chip stocks.

Recently in a conversation with my Superior General, a great woman, I said, "If I had some money to invest a couple decades ago, and if I had been smart enough to see some things like IBM or Polaroid, I would have pulled everything I had out of everything else and slammed it in there and taken a chance. And then everybody would have said that I was lucky.

If you're successful as a gambler, you are courageous; if you are unsuccessful as a gambler, you are foolhardy. But one has to be able to take either option. One has to have the kind of security to be insecure if one wants to gamble for the great end. Some of us are saying we must look at our institutions this way.

Any institution which has been around a long time will not be able to remain vital if it holds on to its vested interests. This is why I was so interested in the question that one of the gentlemen asked Mr. McClelland yesterday about the Chinese culture. I am convinced that what educators call the Hawthorne effect is perhaps the most precious thing we have in the principle of self renewal. It is the very spill over, the very vital life of experimentation, that makes things good. As soon as we lose that quality of experimentation, the vitality and the life go right out of the process. What we must do somehow is to do what the great corporations have done. We must build in a Hawthorne effect, by building the whole spirit of experimentation and innovation into everyone of our industries. We may be accused of considering only a small percentage of people in such an approach. In McClelland's terms, what are we talking about? Are we talking about a little group up here  that is going to manipulate society because you make them highly inventive? I would say that we are not talking about

only those people. Maybe we can bring the active group down  but I am even more worried about these people , the more passive members of our society. I am worried about the masculine and feminine old maids who are terrified by our society, the people who are most susceptible to indoctrination because they want something safe and secure. They want an ostrich hole that can somehow or other protect them from the tensions of life. I would submit that the more passive members of our society are in great need of realizing that we live in an innovative society and of coming to terms with that innovative society. If they can watch people innovate in school, as well as in the rest of the learning world, they can hopefully more easily come to terms with this. One of the mathematicians whom I respect a good deal was presented with this problem: "Of course you can go to a group of third graders and get them doing quadratic equations and linear functions and matrix algebra and not just learning terms, but inventing mathematics. But can you get every child in that classroom to do it?" He answered first of all by saying, "Did you ever get every child in a classroom to add properly?" But, then he went on to something much more important. He admitted that they do not all invent at the same rate and perhaps there will be some who never really invent at all, but at least they will live in a mathematics classroom in which they recognize that the essential habit of mathematics is invention. They will not be duped into thinking that mathematics is some kind of a computational security where people falsely believe that this is one world where you can have right and wrong answers.

The McClelland evidence that economic growth shows a close functional relationship with first grade readers is certainly interesting. If this is true, and I suspect it is, then we must be awfully careful about what we do in the early years of learning. If we believe that we can indoctrinate kids with the American dream or with a religious point of view, if we believe we can indoctrinate them and then expect them to live in a highly tense world in which their very security is dependent upon their spirit of inquiry - the spirit with which

they can inquire in tension - then, I think we take the final safeguard away from them. Because they are utterly frustrated by the experience of the open society which is always evolutionary.

Another terribly exciting book published now for a number of years, written many years ago, but suppressed for a long time by my own church, is The Phenomenon of Man, in which Theilhard de Chardin suggests that we are now in the stage of self conscious evolution. Theilhard, a paleontologist, is a respected evolutionary theorist. He suggests that when we reach the level of thinking man, the stage of evolution has now become self reflective and therefore self directing, that man can now, to a large extent, qualify the direction of evolution. He suggests that just as the scientist believes that we have had many misfires for every breakthrough in materialistic evolution, that we are now witnessing many misfires in what he thinks is the great breakthrough to social man.

It is the notion that we are now trying to arrive at some idea of social man in the continuing process of evolution which intrigues me. Now I'm sure if there were representatives of the John Birch society or their counterparts in our midst, I would immediately be called a deep shade of pink. This is not what I mean at all. I would be picking up again what McClelland said yesterday about our being involved with the two great needs of developing an achieving, ambitious, forward-thrust society and at the same time of developing a society which is conscious of its fellow man. This is a paradox, a seeming contradiction, then it may be the greatest challenge that lies before us. And most of us in this room have anything from a third to a half a life to go on trying to achieve the paradox, to achieve the resolution. We must somehow try to develop a new kind of man, a new kind of woman, who realizes it is virtuous to be ambitious, that each of us has only one life to spend. I like to say to young women: If I went into a dress shop and I had \$50 and I had a choice of wearing something other than this, I'm sure that I would find five or six things I'd like to buy. Then

I would be forced to decide on which one I would spend my money. I like to look at my life this way. I've got one life to spend. The decision of where to spend it is the most important decision I shall ever make. If I believed in reincarnation, and I'd almost like to believe in it at this point, I'd like to try architecture on one go-around, I'd like to try physics on one go-around. You know, it's just fascinating to think of the number of things you can invest your life in, but you make a commitment and you work within those limits, and you try to squeeze out of that commitment, not by the talent in the napkin but by foolhardy or courageous investment, you try to squeeze out of it everything you can for your contribution to this great, great corporation which is the world community. If we can ever begin to communicate this to students, then I think we begin to get a new kind of ambition, a new kind of achieving society which sees its achievement as building the corporation which is the world community.

Dr. Carrol Hochwalt who is just retiring as the Vice President for Research and Development at Monsanto, a thrilling kind of man, was recounting to me a few weeks ago, the history of his own life. It's a lovely little gem. When he graduated from Dayton University, he and Dr. Thomas, who is the chairman of the board at Monsanto, organized a little chemical company in Dayton, Ohio on a shoe string. They didn't have a dime. They got somewhere with the company. They blew it up one day. They were in their early twenties. A religious brother who was the head of the chemistry department and their former teacher called them up and offered them the use of their college labs until they could build again. They built it up again. A few years later when Edgar Queenie came over and offered to "buy a stable full of chemists", they had to make this great decision. Would they go to Monsanto? Would they invest here? Now remember this was not the Monsanto of this age. Would they continue to invest in their own company or would they merge with Monsanto? They made a calculated decision. Then decades later you review the whole fibre of Dr.

Hochwalt's life. He understands everything I believe in in education because he lives in the climate of research and development. He doesn't understand anything else. And so he would say that the most dangerous thing we can do is not to gamble, the most dangerous thing we can do is to remain stagnant. We can, I think, direct evolution. To do this we have to be responsibly involved. A friend of mine recently reminded me that it is more important to start a revolution than to write a satire. And perhaps we have had very many too many people writing satires, empty satires. The satires which I think belong to the nineteenth century romantic poets, ivory-tower satires that offered no resolutions, no first hunches, no first approximations, but condemned all of society around them. The poet took on the role of the priest without the commitment of the priest. This I think would be terribly dangerous in our society. On the other hand, the responsible involvement of one who is willing to go in and make some of the hunches and to live with the hunches and to say he made mistakes if his hunches are wrong and to remake some others could reshape and remake the American society.

We have today the most ecumenical kind of spirit, not only theologically, but personally. A new kind of ecumenical spirit which is, I think, deserting the old debate technique which ruined us all and is centered rather around honest inquiry. In this spirit when I come together with someone from a completely different sub set, (and many of the people that I know and love most are from what should be non intersecting sets), we can understand each other and come to know each other precisely because we are concerned about solving the same aching questions. In as much as we seek together the same aching questions, we understand each other and I think we begin to make some kind of dent on those questions.

If the agnostic humanist is concerned about the problem of the inner cities and if I, a person who in his eyes was supposed to represent a world in which commitment and freedom

of inquiry were mutually exclusive, pursue the same question with the same frame of mind, each one of us has to give up our stereotypes of the other. And in giving up our stereotypes of the other, a new kind of energy is produced which we can give to each other and to mankind. This is why I believe so very much in the principle of non segregation. This does not mean monolith. This does not mean lowest common denominatorism. It is rather the vitality gained by mixing a rich diversity of views. I would suggest that not only is it more acceptable for some Catholic student to go to Harvard or Princeton or Dartmouth or Yale or Brandeis as well as to Notre Dame or Boston College. It is acceptable for them as persons, but perhaps critical for Harvard and Dartmouth and Yale and Brandeis. With this conviction, I am begging that religious congregations do something about these habits, so that we can again assume our citizenship and that we may on the free and open market again volunteer to make our investment in the mainstream of American society. You see, I would maintain that Harvard and Dartmouth and Yale and Brandeis and Mount Holyoke, my friends, cannot do without some of us. It's just too easy for them without some of us.

A great atheistic physicist friend of mine said, "My God, Sister J. I want to be around places like M.I.T. and Harvard when your generation of theists moves in". But I am hauntingly aware that this is not an easy kind of involvement. I am hauntingly aware that when one does believe in the open society, when one does believe in involvement, when one does believe in inquiry, one is always taking the chance of losing as much as one gains. I am hauntingly aware that if we make this kind of investment, if we keep making it, some of us are going to get lost and some of what we believe in is going to be lost. And because I am becoming more and more convinced of the finiteness of my own mind and of my own spirit, we may not even know for sure whether what we lost was absolutely right or absolutely wrong, or something inbetween.

But I would suggest for my own sub set, that unless we are willing to do this that we have just given up the values which we think we own. As long as an intellectual and a

seeking society can see us as those people with blinders (physical blinders for some poor nuns who drive) but intellectual and spiritual blinders as well, they can dismiss us, dismiss us easily. But if we really believe in truth, and if we believe we have finite minds, then it seems to me that those of who believe in what I call the grace life, the super-natural life, if we believe in it and if we're not phony, then we ought to be the most courageous or most foolhardy people in the history of mankind. We ought to see the grace life as a new power drive. We ought to see this as a quality which can allow us to go in where others may fear to go. It's amusing but terrifying to come to a place like Boston as a nun. It is frustrating to walk through the Treadway Hotel and to have the lovely little guy with the Irish brogue who's pushing the go-cart say to you, "Are you alone? Sister." And you say, "Yes, I'm alone." He counters with, "Is it all right for you to be alone?" and you want to say to him, "You know lad I'm past nineteen."

But then you know that you and all that you stand for have asked for this kind of image. You've allowed the world community to think of nuns as the cloistered, protected, kind of perpetual intellectual adolescent, who have to be sheltered. And yet I spent my life for a principle. I spent my life for a life, a life which I read with my finite mind in the gospel, of a Christ who could make the Woman of the Pharisees and the Woman of Well and the Woman taken in adultery completely at home when they weren't at home with anybody else. And I think we have to live with that. We have to decide whether or not we shall become the most empathetic, the most compassionate, the most understanding, the most profound people, or the most sheltered. This I would apply to institution after institution in human living. You, I think, have a tremendous kind of responsibility. You represent magazines which for various kinds of sub culture groups are at least filtered through as indoctrination. If I could apply for a job I think I'd apply for a job with one of the woman's magazines. Not because you're the most acceptably prestige-ful, but because you are working

on what I think is one of the toughest markets in the United States, the American suburbanite woman.

The degree of shallowness of mind of so many American suburbanite women terrifies me. Because I believe in a series of approximations, because I believe in bite size learning, if I were running an American woman's magazine, I would really use all my imagination to push that frontier by inches. I would bother her a little, then I'd bother her a little more, and then I'd bother her a little more. I'd work to get that area of gray wider and wider and wider. I'd take the chance of over shooting a few times to make sure that I wasn't under shooting. Now I would do this for two reasons. First because I would believe that I had a life to invest in humanity and that was even more important than making money. And then I guess I'd be sheer pragmatic enough also to believe that if I run this to the hilt I won't have to worry about my stockholders, because I'll have one of the most dynamic, one of the most controversial, one of the most alive periodicals around. This is the principle we've operated on with a little unknown collage in the midwest.

It is perfectly understandable to me when I walk into this kind of a group that some of you very tenderly say to me, "Where is Webster?" I must expect this because I come from an institution which is thought of by many as one of those nun's colleges in the United States. They even call us parochial. But to a few people now around this country, a few powerful people, almost too much is expected of us because these people are convinced that we are already beyond the critical change point, and that we will emerge, within five or six years, as one of the forces of American society.

Little by little we inched an institution in the last five or six years. Little by little, with a principle. At this point, on the faculty of my college, there are about forty percent Sisters of Loretto who have been educated at a variety of religious and secular institutions. There are about sixty percent lay teachers and over half of them are not Catholic, by design.

They are Jew, every label of Protestant, some secular humanists for whom we have great respect.

In mid May of this year we had one of the most extraordinary days I have ever participated in. We had a panel which worked with our entire faculty and about twenty of our students who had been invited. On the panel were Dr. Brunner of Harvard who I think would classify himself a secular humanist, Dr. Elting Morrison, an M.I.T. historian who describes his great grandfather as "the quasi pope of the Unitarian Church in New England in 1838," Father Carroll Stuhmuller a religious order priest who is one of the liberal scripture scholars in our church. I was the moderator. All day we addressed ourselves to the question, "How do you prepare a student in a college like ours for full participation in the late twentieth century?" Not how do you protect his faith, but how to prepare a student in a college like ours for full participation in the late twentieth century. How do you get him ready to work next to a Hindu, a secular humanist, a Quaker, a John Bircher? How do you get him ready to work next to them, attempting to solve by successive approximations the problems of race, of population, of economic growth, of all of these things which have profound social implication.

We would suggest that you get him ready only if you invest in him a terrible pressure kind of inquiry and not one of indoctrination. This I think is your challenge. And in that turn it is good that we have some magazines that represent different kinds of political and philosophic perhaps points of view. But you cannot stoop to indoctrinate from your point of view. No one of us, from a vested interest point of view, can afford to be closed, can afford to indoctrinate. I'm a committed Christian, but my commitment to Christianity today is much more dependent on my attempting not to proselytize, not to indoctrinate, because I happen to believe in Christianity as too important to sell it so cheaply. I think each one of us must begin again to get this kind of habit of mind, this kind of habit of spirit. It is not easy

to live this way.

You are the exponents, I think, of continuing education. You control the market. If the ladies in suburbia read anything, they read Time, McCall's, and The Ladies Home Journal, Look and Life, and Better Homes and Gardens. These too often, constitute their only kind of continuing education. If you leave them in a narrow ghetto, if you leave them with a lot of pat answers that are stupid, then you are supporting their little narrow world. If you have the courage to keep inching the tension along and to create a highly sophisticated learning mode, then I think what some of us are trying to do in curricular development in the schools is carried on. There may be a new kind of potential alliance here. These are thoughts, highly personal, I suppose, because only personal convictions are worth anything, that I would like to share with you today. If I have a reincarnated life I shall come apply to one of you for a job, and would hope I get it.

Thank you very much.