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The hard facts of future needs provided a context of urgency and promise for the pleasant recollection of past achievements during the Founder's Day ceremonies and activities of March 25 on the Georgetown campus.

This particular Founder's Day was far more than another occasion to salute the past. It also served as a forum for the announcement of the first capital-giving campaign in the University's history, a $26-million effort to meet what have been called Georgetown's "minimum" needs.

To reemphasize the institution's long-standing close relationship with the nation and its leaders, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey was on hand to help the Very Reverend Gerard J. Campbell, S.J., President of Georgetown University, bring both past and present into focus.

"This 177th birthday of the founding of this great University is as much a part of American life as any of the great documents of our history," Vice President Humphrey told the over six hundred guests at the Founder's Day Luncheon in New South Cafeteria. "Thus Georgetown has a hold on the hearts of the American people because it is a part of the history of this Republic.

"What a great privilege it is to be called upon to foster this institution and to enhance its place in the life of this nation; and, while I have not been called upon to ask people to do anything, I would say that it would be a rare honor for any citizen of any means to have as his legacy in his own personal history the known fact of his participation in the development of this great institution of learning.

"I join with you in pride for your century and three-quarters of service to this nation and its capital. I join with you in the hope that the ambitious plans you have set forth for 'Wisdom and Discovery in a Dynamic World' will be realized. I believe that the character, the
enthusiasms, and the dedication of the people gathered here must surely give those responsible for the administration of this great University renewed confidence that they have not set their sights too high.

"I call upon you," the Vice President continued, "to keep this University a bright light in this great American society of ours. Let it help light the way as it has in the past, and be remembered as one who carried the torch of learning. Be remembered as one who contributed to a living memorial for yourself, for the continuity of civilization, for the continuity of learning itself. What greater thing could you do?"

Father Campbell, in formally opening the University's Progress Fund campaign, recalled that Georgetown's founder John Carroll had written to his friend Father Plowden that "the difficulties indeed perplex, but do not dishearten me." The President went on to recall some of the financial difficulties which Georgetown, through the vision of its leaders, had overcome in the past. "On this Founder's Day," he assured his audience, "we look toward the future with the same confidence our Founder manifested. The difficulties facing any university today are quite enough to perplex all of us. We refuse, however, to be disheartened."

Three years of study and analysis have made apparent certain priorities the University must meet within the next five years, Father Campbell explained, including some urgent needs in physical plant. "The buildings we plan to build," Father Campbell said, "will not be luxuries; neither will they be an end in themselves. They are important only to the extent that they contribute to the teaching, research, and public service which are the essential concerns of this University. We intend that they should be beautiful and distinctive, but not luxurious or needlessly expensive."

An expanded building program proved to be only the more immediately visible part of the profile of progress Father Campbell drew in outlining the manifold objectives of the campaign which his words set into motion. The investment in Georgetown's human potential was presented as equally vital and compelling.

"In pursuance of these objectives," the University president said, "the Board of Directors and the President's Council of Georgetown decided that today we shall formally launch a program which hopefully will secure a minimum of $26 million."

"These funds, supplemented by federal grants already obtained, will make it possible for Georgetown to make a great stride in its service of Washington, the nation, and the world."

Among the immediate needs listed by Father Campbell were the following:

A new University library. At present the main library occupies crowded and inescapably inefficient quarters in the Healy building, palpably not designed for such use. A $4.2 million structure has been designed,

Mr. Humphrey addresses the students from the porch of Old North.
with a capacity of a million volumes to serve as “a
great educational laboratory supplying the resources
and services necessary to the student, teacher, and
scholar.”

**Four buildings in the University Medical Center.**
A total projected cost of $5 million has been set for
construction of a medical center library, basic science
laboratories, a classroom-auditorium complex, and a
new dental clinic. (Father Campbell stressed these
structures would be barely adequate to meet enroll-
ment increases planned in the Medical and Dental
schools by 1968.)

**A new Law Center.** This will be built on a site al-
ready owned by the University, at a cost of $4 million.
The Georgetown University Law Center, fifth largest
in the United States, is inadequately housed with an-
tiquated facilities. The need for new facilities for future
growth in the quality and diversity of the Center's of-
ferrings has become imperative.

**Faculty salary increases.** “The most important
element in a university is the quality of the faculty.
Distinguished scholars and teachers can make great
universities, even in inadequate and outmoded build-
ings. However, just as we do not intend to inflict poor
physical conditions on the faculty and students, we
recognize that the greatest possible effort must be made
to raise the salaries of our faculty members. The next
five years will be crucial in the battle to overcome our

Walsh area president Thomas Kane makes Mr. Hum-
phrey an honorary undergraduate.

"On this 25th day of March, 1966, the Student
Council of Georgetown University and the un-
dergraduate student bodies, in recognition of
his devotion to and interest in the future of the
nation's youth and his inspiring leadership as
a national and international figure, do hereby
recognize the Honorable Hubert Horatio
Humphrey, the Vice President of the United
States, as an honorary member of George-
town University's undergraduate student
body."
present inadequacies and to achieve a salary level which will compete with the best in the nation. I will not be satisfied until this goal is achieved. No one is more aware of the implications of such an undertaking than I. The University must receive a vast transfusion of funds if this goal is to be reached. In our Progress Fund we have assigned $3 million for endowed chairs and an additional $3 million to support other faculty salaries and programs. Again, these are minimum requirements to meet our needs. Every avenue of income and support will have to be exploited if we are to be successful in our ambition to reward adequately the distinguished faculty which serves the University.

Accelerated student aid funds. A recent report of the Council for Financial Aid to Education estimates that a viable academic program for a student body of first-rate ability must be prepared to furnish financial aid to from 35 to 45 percent of the student body. In the past academic year Georgetown was able to award full and partial fellowships and scholarships to less than 25 percent. A total of $4 million is needed so that the University may give needed aid to deserving students, Father Campbell pointed out.

A President’s Progress and Venture fund. A newly created fund totaling $2.4 million will, it is hoped, be created by funds raised during the campaign. Such a fund would, for example, enable the University to undertake a number of studies of special projects and to continue its master plan to encompass the years 1975 and 1985. Father Campbell noted this fund will support projects in education, research, and scholarship which need “seed” money if they are to develop properly so that they may achieve more substantial support from outside sources. “We cannot afford to fail” in this, “the most ambitious undertaking in Georgetown’s history,” Father Campbell declared to the Founder’s Day Luncheon audience.

Earlier in the day, Mr. Humphreys had been made an honorary member of the student body and had accepted the designation with an accolade and an admonition. “I can think of no affiliation I would rather have,” the Vice President said, standing on the porch of historic Old North, at the scene of addresses by George Washington, Lafayette, Lincoln, and Grant, “than to be a member of Georgetown University’s undergraduate student body. And, if you have any demonstrations or protests that you are organizing, please let me in on them.”

“But I do think I should make the record clear,” Mr. Humphrey added with a smile, “that after having been so singularly honored by this citation that gives me all of the privileges, duties, responsibilities, and other trappings of office as a member of the undergraduate student body, that I am not under the control, or surveillance or the discipline of Father [Anthony] Zeits [Director of Student Personnel].”

If the day was a personal triumph for Mr. Humphrey, it was no less one of institutional success for the University. The successful combination of reminiscence and rededication could only have had maximum impact on students, faculty, alumni, and friends of Georgetown. What remained was to convert philosophy to action, plans to deeds. And for this, the support of all members of the University community was essential.

As Father Campbell said, again quoting from John Carroll’s letter to Father Plowden, “Do not forget to give and procure assistance.” Giving and procuring that assistance was the next step in action for the Georgetown capital campaign.

FATHER CAMPBELL’S STATEMENT
ON THE CONTINUING IMPORTANCE
OF THE ALUMNI ANNUAL FUND

For some years the Alumni have been making vital contributions to the University through the Alumni Annual Fund. The proceeds of this fund give the University resources which are essential to her daily operations. The contributions of the Alumni to the Annual Fund provide an important supplement to the University’s income. In days of high budgets and threatening deficits, the Alumni Fund makes it possible for us to continue improving faculty salaries, student aid, and other important developments.

I am addressing this communication to you to make clear the importance of both the Progress Fund, for capital needs and the Alumni Annual Fund, for operating expenses. During the next three years, we will be approaching Alumni, friends, corporations, and foundations in order to secure the substantial sums necessary to make our $26 million Progress Fund a success. In the meantime, the daily operations of the University must continue. This means that our need for assistance in meeting these operating expenses will also continue. The Alumni Annual Fund is not a luxury with which we can dispense during our capital program.

I strongly urge all Alumni to continue to regard the Annual Fund as their special responsibility. During the next three years we will approach all of our Alumni for contributions to our Progress Fund. I trust that you will respond generously with thoughtful and sacrificial gifts which help to insure the continuing greatness of Georgetown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL CENTER</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes library, basic science laboratories, classroom-auditorium, and dental clinic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW CENTER</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY SALARIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed chairs</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other salaries and programs</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT AID</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT'S PROGRESS AND VENTURE FUND</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$26,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this, my first "State of the University" message, I present a review of some highlights of the academic year during which I became President of Georgetown. On July 31, 1964, Father Bunn announced that I had been chosen as his successor, to take office on the following December 3, in a University Convocation marking the close of the 175th Anniversary celebrations. At the same time he announced that he was to remain at Georgetown, and to assume the newly created post of University Chancellor.

Understandably, I cannot even begin to express the emotions I felt on that day when, in the presence of the President of the United States, members of the hierarchy, hundreds of delegates from sister universities, colleges and learned societies all over the world, and of all the family of Georgetown, I accepted the symbols of office from my distinguished predecessor, and with them all the responsibilities and the opportunities of leadership and direction of this great University. I can only repeat here briefly something of what I tried to express in my acceptance address: "As I assume the office of President of this University, I need not declare my own unworthiness of this honor. I can only pledge such ability as I have to a task which is much bigger than I am."
Father Bunn’s Presidency

Nor is it possible in a message like this to pay adequate tribute to the twelve years of Father Bunn’s presidency. Many well-deserved encomiums have already been offered to him, but I think that in the perspective of history it will become ever clearer how crucial these years have been, in the foresight and energy with which he recognized, and advanced, Georgetown’s potential for greatness, and gave to the University an impetus and a direction which will be influential for years to come. Tangible, physical evidence of progress is there in plenty, in the many new buildings erected during these years—the Schools of Nursing and of Foreign Service, the German Diagnostic and Research Center, the New South Dormitory and Dining Hall, the Reiss Science Center, and most recently two student residences, Harbin Hall and Eleanor Darnall Hall; besides preliminary studies and plans for future contemplated additions to the University complex. But perhaps even more significant are the changes and reorganizations he effected in the internal structure and administration of the University, not only for the more efficient and productive management of its resources, material and human, but for the quickening and revitalization, in all our Georgetown Schools and Departments, of a spirit of community, of interested and dedicated effort toward the overriding goals and purposes of the University.

It is no exaggeration, but simple truth, to say that what Georgetown is today, and what she will become, can in large measure be attributed to Father Bunn. To be sure, in an institution so complex and varied, no one man has done or could do the whole job; many individuals, devoted men and women, have contributed substantially to the progress of the University during these years, as throughout her long and honorable history; but to the extent that “any institution is but the lengthened shadow of a man,” Georgetown will ever be indebted to his years of inspiring leadership, clear and purposeful vision, enthusiastic and untiring labor.

I am personally grateful for the year and a half I was privileged to spend in closest relationship with him as his Executive Vice-President. From this daily association in the conduct of the manifold affairs of the University, I absorbed much of his own appreciation of Georgetown, her great past and her present and future mission in higher education; but along with admiration there grew also the realization of the formidable task his successor faced in living up to, and advancing, his ideals and ambitions for Georgetown. It is both gratifying and inspiring to know that, as Chancellor, Father Bunn will continue to devote his experience, his wisdom, and his energies to the fulfillment of those dreams we all cherish for our University.

Problems and Prospects

That fulfillment will not be achieved easily, nor without the dedicated labor and concentrated wisdom of all associated with Georgetown. Her distinguished past and her bright future prospects obligate each of us, in whatever function or capacity we serve, to nothing less than our best, if we are to cope with our problems successfully and exploit our opportunities profitably. I shall have many occasions in days ahead to discuss these with all of you; at present, I shall but touch briefly on some of them, as they present themselves in these early days of my presidency.

In common with all other educational institutions, we face the problem of population explosion. Elementary and secondary schools have already felt this pressure; now it is the turn of the colleges to face this rapidly increased demand for admission, together with the enormously increased costs of providing material and instructional facilities. The statistics alone are staggering, hypnotizing, even numbing. But the administrator who is also a humanist and an educator sees the real dimensions of the problem in terms of thousands of able young men and women clamoring to enter undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools—and in the insisted, growing demand for highly educated people to meet our competitive and increasingly sophisticated modern situation.

But the problem is far more complicated and involved than the bald statement would seem to imply; as with the fabled Hydra, the attempt to hold down one head gives rise to two others. The conscientious administrator, admissions officer, dean, or president, realizing that he has to say “no” much more often than “yes,” will then soon and often ask himself if he has the right to continue refusing the majority of applicants to the university. From this fact he may be led into opposing temptations. Hypnotized by the allure of numbers, he may come to equate educational excellence with the ratio of candidates rejected each year—an insidious form of latent academic snobism. Or he may, in misguided zeal, be inveigled into building endlessly and expanding the student body as rapidly as places can be found in classrooms. The consequences, in lowered standards of instruction and of achievement, are to patent too need enlargement.

Underlying the whole problem is a fallacious national assumption regarding higher education. As a nation we are in love with it; we tend to rely on higher education as the panacea for all our ills, social, economic, and moral. Certainly, this is very flattering to all of us holding responsible positions in the educational world. With our clear, if sometimes
idealistic, view of the possibilities of education, we feel we can offer mighty contributions to the solution of our national and international problems. And, in a very real sense, we can. Nevertheless, this is a heady wine, and overindulgence may easily lead to a messianic complex that could be disastrous.

Allied to this is another fallacy—that higher education is the birthright of every American, whether or not he is capable of assimilating it. Assuredly, every citizen has the right to, and the national interest has the obligation to provide, opportunity to develop to the fullest his talents and capabilities. But equality of opportunity is not the same as equality of ability. Democratization of education is ambivalent in theory; in practice it can be a dangerous two-edged weapon. As I asserted in my Commencement address last June, I do not believe that a high school diploma and the ability to meet tuition costs are the certain passports to higher education. In some circles, I know, this is heresy. Nevertheless, while fully admitting the necessity of wider opportunities for able young men and women, I feel that there are many on practically every university and college campus who should not be there at all. Such, for instance, as those for whom attendance at a university is merely a status-symbol, or an open-sesame to social or economic advantage. Above all, the old "gentleman's C" is a luxury we can ill afford today.

Our need is for more educated people, but equally for better educated people, for quantitative expansion without loss of quality. We cannot deal with the problems of the Sixties and Seventies in terms of the Forties and Fifties. Changes, growth, new departures must combine to solve our present and foreseeable problems. But this is a national situation. Just as no institution is justified in ignoring it, so none should act on the assumption that it must carry the major share of the burden. It is for each university and college, conscientiously but realistically, to appraise its resources and to assume its proper share in fulfilling its obligation to the nation and to the world. Dilution of standards, vitiation of objectives, in an unthinking drive for ever larger numbers, will inevitably aggravate, rather than alleviate, the essential problem.

In view of this, some years ago a study was undertaken here at Georgetown, and a determination made of the optimum number of applicants to be accepted in each School, consonant with our ability to provide them what they ask and expect of us—the quality of education for which Georgetown has become renowned. And I should reiterate here a long-standing policy of the University—that, all other things being equal, preference will be given to the children and relatives of our Alumni.

The Student Body

To come now to some specifics, the year witnessed another modest increase in University enrollment to a total of 7,471, distributed as follows: College of Arts and Sciences, 1,564; Graduate School, 1,284; School of Medicine, 393; School of Law, 1,220; School of Dentistry, 369; School of Nursing, 327; School of Foreign Service, 967; School of Business Administration, 567; Institute of Languages and Linguistics, 770. The student body continues to be quite cosmopolitan, with all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone represented, and with 513 students from 82 foreign countries.

Some evidence of qualitative progress may be seen in the increased number of doctorates awarded in linguistics, and in the first Ph.D. in mathematics—both of which programs are of recent origin; less obviously, but no less significantly, in the improved ratio in the Graduate School of full-time to part-time students: In 1964-65, 775 to 509, respectively, compared to 627 full-time, and 541 part-time in the preceding year.

Many of these students needed some form of financial aid, and, to the extent of its limited resources, Georgetown continues to make every effort to provide such assistance. Thus, in 1964-65, a total of $614,518 was granted, in the form of scholarships, fellowships, and other student aid. Of this sum, $12,015 was income from our few endowed scholarships; $478,564 came from unfunded scholarships and fellowships, and $123,938 from gifts allocated to scholarships and student-aid purposes.

Besides these direct Georgetown scholarships, outside agencies, such as the Woodrow Wilson, the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer, the Danforth, and the National Science Foundations accounted for student aid and scholarships to 1,032 students, totalling $1,161,410.

During the same period loans amounting to $679,180 were made to 998 students, of which $428,000 came from Funds allocated during the year to Georgetown under federally sponsored student loan programs, and the balance from the various University loan funds established over the years.

An often unrecognized, but substantial, contribution of the University to student aid lies in the fact that in the National Defense Education Act program, the University provides one dollar for every nine from the federal government, and further incurs, without compensation, the considerable administrative costs involved in dispersing funds, keeping records, and making collections on these loans.

The Anniversary Year Concluded

As is customary, the academic year began with the Mass of the Holy Spirit in late September. Since the first quarter was still in the 175th Anniversary Year, the Fall Convocation was timed to coincide with the Medical Center contribution to the occasion, a symposium of lectures by distinguished Nobel Prize winners in medicine. Participants in the symposium were honored at the Convocation with the awarding of the Degree of Doctor of Laws to Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, and the Degree of Doctor of Humane Letters to Dr. Daniele Bovet; Sir Howard Florey, F.R.S., F.R.C.P.; Dr. Corneille Heymans, and Dr. Bernardo A. Houssay. This Convocation was
notable also in marking a change in a long-standing tradition at Georgetown—namely, the conferring of honorary degrees with accompanying citations read in Latin, and printed both in Latin and English on the Convocation program. In keeping with the current atmosphere of aggiornamento, and recognizing as a matter of practical fact that the ancient and honored classical tongue is not as widely studied and understood as in former days, the Board of Directors decided that henceforth citations should be delivered only in English. The change has been met with mixed feelings of regret for the passing of a fine old custom, and of relief, both on the part of those who had the job of composition, and of those who had to follow the proceedings by reading the English translation during the Latin presentation.

The earlier events of the Anniversary Year have already been recounted in previous President's Reports, so I shall mention here only two others occurring in the closing stages. The first of these was the Conference on Freedom and Man on November 30, and December 1 and 2, which brought to our campus a distinguished group of philosophers and theologians of worldwide reputation, such as Father Hans Kung, Father Karl Rahner, S.J., and Father John Courtney Murray, S.J. Large delegations to the Conference came from all parts of the United States and Canada, and so widespread was its appeal that the capacity of McDonough Memorial Gymnasium was overtaxed, and a public-address system had to be set up to bring the speeches and discussions to standees outside and to another group in Gaston Hall. The papers of this Conference have been edited by Father Murray, and published under the title, Freedom and Man, takes its place among the other publications of Anniversary Year conferences and institutes, eight in number, in the "Wisdom and Discovery" Series, published by P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York.

The 175th Anniversary Year came to a close, as already mentioned, on December 3, 1964, with a brilliant University Convocation, and with my inaugeration as the new University President. On this occasion President Lyndon B. Johnson, who many years ago had been a student for a short time in our School of Law, delivered an important foreign-policy address, and was honored with the Degree of Doctor of Laws. A similar degree, posthumously conferred on the late President John F. Kennedy, was accepted in his name by his sister, Mrs. R. Sargent Shriver. Mr. Johnson, it will be remembered, as Vice-President, had taken part in the beginning of the Anniversary, as guest of honor and recipient of a John Carroll Medal, at the Alumni John Carroll Dinner, held at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York in October, 1963. Following the tragic assassination in the following month, President Johnson very graciously accepted and fulfilled the commitment of President Kennedy to attend the concluding exercises of the celebration.

There is simply no way, other than this general acknowledgment, to say worthy thanks to the many alumni, faculty, students, and student organizations, who contributed to the brilliant success of the Anniversary Year. The Anniversary Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Joseph T. Geuting, Jr., a member of the University President's Council, devoted long and laborious hours to the broad preliminary plans and preparations, and to the coordination of subcommittees representing all the University Schools and Departments, under whose auspices appropriate events were designed and conducted with dignity and eclat. But to Father George H. Dunne, S.J., the Executive Director, and his Associate Director, Dr. Riley Hughes, of the Department of English, should go the lion's share of credit, as on them and their staff at Anniversary House fell the major task of carrying out the Anniversary plans. To the rest of us at the University, it almost seemed they had early decided that their job was to accomplish the impossible daily, over two years and more—and then set themselves to produce the happy results, with brilliant imagination and indefatigable energy.

For me, the year and a half was a magnificent introduction to the best in Georgetown, in one of her finest hours. On assuming the presidency, it was and is most comforting and inspiring to know that there are such devoted colleagues and fellow workers throughout the University in the important work we are engaged in; and it is my hope and expectation that the spirit of the Anniversary Year will remain long with us as we face the future together.

**Phi Beta Kappa**

The next University activity to be noted, in chronological order, would normally be the annual Founder's Day Convocation in March. In 1965, however, this function was suspended, in view of another event of major importance to Georgetown and the achievement of a long-standing wish of the faculty and administration of the University. The United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa voted the establishment of a Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa at Georgetown, confirming our own conviction that our University had long since achieved the academic quality and excellence which merit this high distinction. This happy culmination of many years of effort to achieve this honor is due in greatest part to the persevering zeal of Dr. Franklin B. Williams, Chairman of the Department of English, and himself a holder of a Phi Beta Kappa key from Syracuse University, who headed the committee on campus, under the then Dean, Father Joseph Sellinger, S.J., working towards this goal. Most appropriately, Dr. Williams was elected the first President of the Georgetown Chapter.

The formal installation of the Chapter took place on April 29, 1965, in a Convocation, at which Dr. Whitney J. Oates, of Princeton University, President of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, presented the charter of the Georgetown Chapter, conferred keys on newly elected members, and delivered the Convocation Address. In all, 46 students were enrolled in Phi Beta Kappa: Graduate School, 1; College of Arts and Sciences, Class of 1965, 22; Class of 1966, 4; and School of Foreign Service, Class of 1965, 19. Honorary memberships were conferred on the following: Very Reverend Edward B. Bunn, S.J., Chancellor of Georgetown University; Very Reverend Joseph A. Sellinger, S.J., President of Loyola College, Baltimore, and former Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; Dr. Goetz A. Briefs, Professor
Emeritus of Economics; Dr. Wilfred D. Desan, Professor of Philosophy; Reverend Francis J. Heyden, S.J., Professor of Astronomy and Director of the Georgetown Observatory; and Dr. Heinrich Rommen, Distinguished Professor of Government. Two alumni were inducted: Dr. William K. Wimsatt, Jr., B.A. ’28, M.A. ’29, Professor of English at Yale University; and Dr. Paul E. Sigmund, B.A. ’50, Associate Professor of Politics at Princeton University.

Commencement

Commencement Exercises were held on Monday, June 7, at which more than 1,370 degrees were conferred. Honorary degrees of Doctor of Laws were awarded to His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston (in absentia, because of His Eminence’s regrettable illness at the time); on Mr. George Meany, Hon. Matt Szymczak, and Hon. Edward A. Tamm. The Degree of Doctor of Humane Letters was conferred on Dr. Leonard Michael. To the great satisfaction and applause of the whole University, the John Carroll Medal of Merit was awarded jointly to Father George H. Dunne, S.J., and Dr. Riley Hughes, in appreciation of their work for the Anniversary Year, noted previously. As an introduction to the families and relatives of the graduates, in this first Commencement at which I presided, I reserved to myself the privilege of delivering the Commencement Address.

The Law Center

Plans have been developed for the erection of a new Law Center, culminating several years of study of our present and future foreseeable needs. One earlier question—namely, the possibility of relocating the Law Center on campus—has finally been settled in the decision to continue the Law Center in a downtown location, for many reasons, not the least of which is the present impossibility of obtaining additional property in the University vicinity. But even the present location has long been judged inadequate, both for present uses and for possible future expansion, and attempts to acquire additional property in the area have hitherto proved fruitless. In the spring of 1965, however, the University was alerted by an alumnus to the availability of an entire city block of land, not far from the present location. Lengthy negotiations have led to the purchase of this site, located between F and G Streets, and 1st and 2nd Streets, in the Northwest section of the city. Besides obviating the difficulties of conducting classes while rebuilding on the present 5th and E Streets location, the new location is sizable enough to provide for future needs; it is within the same “Judiciary Square” vicinity as our present Law Center; and the realization on our land holdings will go a long way to sustaining the costs of this new purchase. Intensive studies are being made by the University Planning Committee, in cooperation with the Law Center Development Committee, on projected enrollments, faculty and staff, library, office and classroom requirements, and all the many items which must be determined before the program can be translated into actual drawings and models. Tentative plans have been drawn for an administration building, classroom and office building, library and auditorium building, and a chapel. It is our earnest hope that the new Law Center may be in being and in complete operation before the celebration of the Centenary of the School of Law in 1970.

The Medical Center

During the past several years a comprehensive master plan for Medical Center development has been under way. A consortium of architects, comprising Mariani Associates and Ellerbe and Sons, was assigned the task of developing a coordinated plan based on surveys and projections of our present facilities, and future needs and requirements, embracing all the fields of our Medical Center in teaching, research, and in-patient and out-patient health services. On the basis of this survey and the master plan developed, application has been made for federal assistance, under the recently passed Congressional Act for this purpose, for construction of a Medical Center Library, an auditorium, classroom and clinical and research laboratory complex, a new basic science facility, and expanded and improved dental clinics. For the building of these new facilities, grants totaling $6,074,900 were allocated to the University, which in its turn is obligated to provide matching funds in the amount of $5,331,350. This is a heavy obligation, but the prospects for the future of our Medical Center and its enhanced position of leadership in these vastly important fields of health, education, and service inspire us with the confidence that, under the providence of God, and with the support of Georgetown alumni and friends, we shall succeed in this undertaking.

University Library

The urgent need for an adequate Library has been a recurring theme of Father Bunn’s presidential messages for many years, emphasized by the Report of the Middle States Association Evaluation Committee in 1961. Since the latter time, and most intensively over the past two years, the Library Development Committee, under Father James B. Horgan, S.J., Director of Libraries, and Mr. Joseph Jeffs, Librarian, and including members of the faculty, administration, and student body of all our Schools, has labored diligently to construct a library plan meeting our present and future needs, incorporating the most modern techniques and methods in library function, and coordinating the host of recognized needs, suggestions, and criticisms received from many sides. Expert and impartial advice was sought in the engagement as consultant of Mr. Keyes Metcalf, formerly librarian of Harvard University and a leading consultant on libraries. Architects of national and international reputation were interviewed to select the most qualified for the purpose, the choice finally resting on John Carl Warnecke and Associates, an architectural firm of distinction, which, with its proven ability in harmonious design has an added advantage in familiarity and understanding of the District of Columbia and the Georgetown areas. Application for assistance to our library program, under the Federal Government Higher Education Facilities Act, has resulted in a grant for this purpose of $1,838,302, to which the University must add a matching sum of $4,152,198 to meet the closely
estimated cost of over six million dollars for this essential University building. Construction will begin in the latter part of 1966, and is expected to take about two years for completion.

University and Community

Among the other problems facing University life in these days is that of student involvement in movements and activities on the social scene. Certainly, a university must be alive to the world in which it lives, not to conform to that world, but to shape it. It is a matter of delicate judgment to balance the enthusiasm of youth, and its occasional tendency to overactivity, with its proper first concern on campus—education, including, to be sure, the development of social conscience and consciousness. Many activities at Georgetown over the years have been directed to this end—the annual Thanksgiving and Christmas Fund Drives, in aid of the poor and the aged; Red Cross Donor campaigns; the United Givers’ Fund, and the like, and various projects undertaken by individual students and faculty members, or by campus organizations.

Noteworthy in this field during this past academic year has been the work of the Georgetown University Community Action Program (GUCAP), under direction of Father John C. Haughey, S.J., of the Department of Theology, and Director of Sodalities on the Campus. From small beginnings, as an outgrowth of Sodality social action programs, GUCAP increased and flourished during this past year; more than 500 students were engaged at one time or another in a wide range of social activities, from tutoring sessions for slow learners, recreational and rehabilitation programs, to counselling potential “dropouts” and potential delinquents. This entirely volunteer program was conducted by the students, after classes, on weekends and holidays, in cooperation with welfare and social service agencies in the District of Columbia. Typical of the tributes paid to the earnestness and self-sacrifice of the GUCAP workers is the remark of the head of one of the D.C. tutoring agencies: “Two years ago, I would have laughed if someone had suggested asking the Georgetown students for help. Now we hold them up as a model for others to follow.”

College Orientation Program

Another pioneering effort in an allied field is the Georgetown University College Orientation Program. Under direction of Dr. Roger Slakey, of the Department of English, and with assistance from the National Science Foundation, the Program seeks to encourage and aid high school students from low income families who demonstrate both ability for and interest in college education, but with very little prospect of attaining it, because of poor achievement records, motivation problems, or financial disability. With the endorsement of the District School Superintendent, Carl F. Hansen, and the cooperation of District school officials, teachers and counsellors, a group of 49 selected students were brought to the campus in the summer of 1964, for tutoring classes in English, mathematics, the physical sciences, remedial, and improved-efficiency reading, and for guidance sessions in proper organization and methods of study, as well as motivation stimulus. Field trips and cultural activities were arranged, including museum tours, concerts, and theatre performances, to stimulate and heighten artistic appreciation. As a follow-up to the summer sessions, monthly seminars were held throughout the school year; and wherever possible, the interested cooperation of parents and families in the program was solicited. Faculty members for the sessions and seminars were drawn from Georgetown, from Trinity College, and from high schools in the District.

The success of the College Orientation Program, both in its early results and in its future promise, has been most gratifying. Of the original group enrolled in the program, students who otherwise would in all probability have failed to qualify for admission, or to meet college standards, twenty-six have been accepted in various colleges and universities and currently seem to be doing well. Of these, six are enrolled at Georgetown, with the aid of some $8,000 in scholarships and loans. Further student aid has been made available for students enrolled in thirteen other colleges.

Under Georgetown leadership, efforts are now underway to extend the College Orientation Program by structuring similar programs in all the area institutions of higher education to discover, and to rescue for our national needs much potential power, which up to now has been lost.

The National Scene

Georgetown continues to be a training and screening center for the Peace Corps, under the direction of Father George H. Dunne, S.J. The versatility and adaptability of the Peace Corps to world needs is illustrated in the sixth and seventh programs, in the summer of 1964, from which 35 volunteers went to Colombia, and 30 to Chile to assist in university education in those countries; and in the eighth program in 1965, which trained and sent 44 workers to Brazil to assist in elementary and secondary school needs, and in community development. Part of the 1965 program consisted of poultry raising and truck farming; and on a fairly sizable piece of ground kindly loaned by the Sisters of the Visitation Convent, the trainees, under agricultural experts from the Beltsville Experimental Laboratory, not only acquired the knowledge and skill to pass on to their future clients, but reaped also a fine harvest of eggs, fliers, and broilers, and quantities of fresh summer vegetables.

In addition, members of the faculty and administration of the University continued to be in demand throughout the country and abroad as guest lecturers at university and college seminars, at meetings of professional societies and organizations, as counsellors to federal and state agencies, to business and industry, and as commentators and coordinators for radio and television programs, both national and local.

The faculty contributed 150 articles to scholarly journals during the academic year and published 20 books.

Internationally, 15 Georgetown students attended the University of Fribourg in Switzerland, for their junior year abroad, under Father Louis Hahn, S.J., of the Department of Theology; and in Summer Institutes and courses in Madrid, in Dijon, Salzburg,
Mexico City, and elsewhere for other students. In prospect are future institutes in places as widely distant as Sophia University in Tokyo and the University of Moscow.

The Graduate Consortium

The first full year of functioning of the Graduate Consortium of the District area, designed for more productive use of the five participating universities—American, Catholic, Howard, George Washington, and Georgetown—has shown results surpassing our most sanguine expectations. Under this system, arrived at after more than two years of discussion among the area university professors and graduate school deans, selected and approved students may attend courses at another university for credit accepted by their “home” university. During the first semester, 1964-65, 94 students attended 71 different courses for a total of 326 semester hours at other than the home university, involving 32 separate departments and schools. This number increased in the second semester to a total of 115 students in 62 courses and 47 departments, for a total of 358 semester hours of Consortium student-exchanges.

The initial success of the Consortium has encouraged exploration of still further areas of cooperation among the participating university schools and departments, and in the expansion of inter-library loans and withdrawals. The experiment has attracted considerable notice and attention throughout the country as a forward-looking effort to meet the increased demands by avoiding unnecessary duplication and promoting maximum use of faculties and physical resources.

Under the agreements reached in 1964, the Consortium is directed from a downtown office location, apart from any of the university campuses, under an executive director, Dr. Elmer D. West, and a staff answerable to the Consortium Committee of all the universities. Here registrations are arranged, records coordinated and filed, and results authenticated to the offices of the several deans. Financial transactions are entrusted to the University Treasurer at Georgetown. Besides the subsidies from each university, the Consortium again received substantial assistance from the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation. Further support is being sought from other educational foundations. To insure stability and permanence to the program, compatible with the independence and integrity of the several universities participating, the legal incorporation of the Consortium is at present under consideration.

Georgetown and Community Support

This past year witnessed a new landmark in Georgetown history. Under the direction of Mr. James W. Egan, Jr., Vice-President for University Development and Public Relations in our reorganized Office of Development, and Robert A. Girmscheid, Jr., ’58, for the first time a University appeal was made to the Washington community for annual support. Mr. Llewelyn A. Jennings, Chairman of the Board of the Riggs National Bank, and a member of the President’s Council, accepted the post of general chairman of the Community Appeal, and recruited a distinguished group of 207 Washington citizens, business and professional men and civic leaders, to solicit funds for University support.

An attractive brochure brought home to many of our fellow citizens not only the contributions of the University to the Washington scene over her century and three quarters of being and activity here, but outlined also the many needs of Georgetown to fulfill her community obligations. Socially, culturally, and economically, Georgetown has been a tremendous asset to the District. On the other hand, many Washingtonians may have been surprised to learn for the first time that, as an independent Jesuit university, Georgetown receives no financial support from the Church or the Society of Jesus, but must rely on her own resources, from tuition and gifts, for her work. The financial returns from this first Community Support campaign surpassed our highest expectations, in the total sum of $209,253.33. But besides this gratifying response, the University and the Community profited from increased mutual understanding, respect, and cordial cooperation for the benefit of all our District citizens. I take this occasion to express, for the whole University, the warm gratitude of Georgetown to all who contributed, in money, and in time and labor, toward the success of this first annual Community Support campaign.

Alumni Activities

No doubt, the 175th Anniversary Year and its concomitant celebrations have had much to do with the increased involvement of our alumni in University affairs, and their ever-growing support of Georgetown programs and plans. I believe, however, that the cause lies deeper than that, namely in their own appreciation, along with ours, of the opportunities and potentialities for greatness which lie open to their Alma Mater. Here again, I think, much credit must be attributed to Father Bunn, who has been tireless during his presidency in attending alumni meetings, dinners, and luncheons and other alumni gatherings all over the country. Internally, the Alumni Association has been strengthened and reorganized; alumni meetings on campus have been attended by faculty members and administration officers, outlining candidly and clearly both the progress of Georgetown, the problems confronting her, and the obvious dependence of the University on alumni support.

Significant of this increased rapport in recent years have been the election of the president of the Alumni Association to a seat on the President’s Council, and the elevation of the Executive Secretary to the position of University Vice-President of University-Alumni Relations. The first incumbent in this high post is Mr. Bernard A. Carter, ’49, who took office as Executive Secretary, succeeding the late Dr. James S. Ruby, on June 1, 1964.

But reorganization and strengthening would be ineffective without the individual efforts and loyalties of many, in all sections of the country, who have been stirred by the vision of a greater Georgetown, and have responded admirably. Impossible as it is to name them all, I would like here at least to assure them that all Georgetown is grateful, and takes new
courage from their devoted loyalty and enthusiastic support.

Perhaps the most patent evidence of this renewed spirit is the tremendous advance made in the Alumni Annual Giving Campaigns. From its beginning in 1954, when 2,250 Alumni donors, 11% of living Georgetown graduates, gave $107,936.35, Annual Giving has steadily increased year by year, to a record high in 1964-65, under the chairmanship of Mr. Thomas A. Dean, and with the cooperation of Father Anthony J. Zeits, S.J., University Representative to the Alumni, and for a time Acting Executive Secretary of the Alumni Association, to a record high of 36%, or 7,404 donors, and a total Annual Giving Fund of $389,190.88. Additional Alumni gifts of $220,971.40 brought Anniversary Year contributions to $610,162.28.

Significant also is an expanded program of alumni cooperation with the Admissions Office in recruiting and interviewing candidates for Georgetown in all parts of the country. The importance of this alumni service to the University is indicated in the appointment of an Alumni Representative in the Office of Admissions, Mr. Daniel Altobello, '63, to coordinate and direct the efforts of field representatives.

In addition to other spiritual activities of the Alumni Association, annual retreats, days of reflection and the like, a new annual program was inaugurated on March 28, in a series of Communion Breakfasts across the country, commemorating Founder's Day. Here on the campus, I celebrated Mass in McDonough Gymnasium, before a congregation of several hundred, including faculty, students and alumni. Following the Mass, breakfast was served in the New South Cafeteria; a telephone hook-up was arranged with many Georgetown groups in other sections of the country, for addresses to the assembled Georgetown alumni by me and by Mr. Eugene Stewart, B.S.S. '48, LL.B. '51, the President of the Alumni Association. In addition, to signalize the common bond of all the alumni groups with their Alma Mater, a member of the Jesuit faculty was present at each of these widely separated meetings, from coast to coast, and many gave an additional talk to their particular groups.

The Anniversary Year John Carroll Awards Dinner was held at the Shoreham Hotel here in Washington. The principal speaker, following brief talks by Father Bunn and President Stewart, was the then Associate Justice Arthur Goldberg. Recipients of the annually awarded John Carroll Medal were Edwin W. Beitzell, FS '28; William S. Catherwood, III, C '42, and immediate past President of Alumni Association; Al. Philip Kane, C '28, L '34; Dr. Thomas F. Kelhier, C '32, M '34; and Edward Bennett Williams, L '44. A special gold John Carroll Medal was struck and presented to Father Bunn, retiring University president, along with a scroll and citation, confering honorary life membership in the Georgetown Alumni Association.

Changes and Promotions

The academic year 1964-65 witnessed the following changes in administrative personnel:

Reverend Thomas R. Fitzgerald, S.J., Dean of the College, succeeded Father Joseph A. Sellinger, S.J., named President of Loyola College, Baltimore. At the end of the year, Dr. Frank Keegan, Associate Dean of the College, resigned to take a position with the Ford Foundation. Father Royden B. Davis, S.J., was appointed Associate Dean of the College and Dean of Freshmen. Dr. Frank Evans was promoted from Assistant to the Dean to Assistant Dean of the College and Director of Special Programs. Mr. William Wright, assistant to Father John Devine, S.J., in the Student Personnel Office was appointed Director of Student Activities and Acting Director of the Georgetown University Community Action Program (GUCAP), during a leave of absence for further study granted to Father John C. Haughey, S.J. Father Joseph S. Sebes, S.J., former Regent of the Foreign Service School, was appointed Acting Dean of the School of Business Administration, following the resignation of Dr. Raymond F. Pelissier.

Mr. John V. Quinn, Acting Registrar, was promoted to University Registrar. Mr. Roy W. Christianson was named Associate University Registrar.

Dr. Walter C. Hess, Associate Dean of the Schools of Medicine and Dentistry, became University Administrator of Grants and Contracts; succeeding him as Associate Dean is Dr. Clifton K. Himmelsbach.

In the School of Foreign Service, Dr. Charles P. O'Donnell has been appointed Associate Dean.

Dr. David J. McCarthy, Jr., was named Assistant Dean in the School of Law.

Faculty promotions during 1964-65 included:

Professors: Dr. Abdul K. Aziz (Mathematics); Dr. Baldev R. Bhussry (Anatomy); Dr. Jules Davids (History); Miss Margery E. Drake (Nursing); Dr. Edward D. Freis (Medicine); Mr. Richard A. Gordon (Law); Dr. Eugene R. Inwood (Psychiatry); Dr. Sol Katz (Medicine); Dr. Lawrence S. Lilienfield (Physiology and Biophysics); Dr. Malcolm W. Oliphant (Mathematics); Dr. Robert H. Parrott (Pediatrics); Dr. Richard A. Steinbach (Psychiatry); Dr. William W. Zorbach (Chemistry).

Associate Professors: Dr. William F. Arndt, Jr. (Commercial Medicine and Public Health); Dr. George W. Carey (Government); Dr. Edward J. Finn (Physics); Dr. Sigfried Garbuny (Economics); Rev. William L. Kelly, S.J. (Psychology); Dr. Josephine King (Anatomy); Dr. Herbert Maisel (Mathematics); Rev. Joseph M. Moffitt, S.J. (Theology); Dr. Othmar W. Winkler (Business Administration).

Assistant Professors: Dr. Paul Birznieks (German); Dr. Donald F. Bogdan (Psychology); Dr. Byungkyu Chun (Pathology); Dr. Bruce F. Davie (Economics); Dr. Armand Dumas (Orthodontics); Dr. Bruce F. Duncombe (Economics); Dr. Keith Ford (English); Dr. Robert P. Kling (Surgery); Dr. Donald M. Knowlan (Medicine); Dr. Peter A. Kot (Physiology and Biophysics and Medicine); Dr. Ann S. Peterson (Medicine); Dr. Eugene J. Smith (Biochemistry); Dr. George J. Visknius (Economics); Dr. Norman A. Walsensky (Anatomy).

Tenure (following previous promotion): Dr. Louis C. W. Baker, Professor of Chemistry; Dr. Robert Di Pietro, Associate Professor of Linguistics; Dr. Victor C. Ferkiss, Associate Professor of History.
1) HEALY BUILDING
2) MAGUIRE HALL (DORMITORY)
3) RYAN HALL (DORMITORY)
4) MULLEDY BUILDING (JESUIT RESIDENCE)
5) GERVASE HALL (JESUIT RESIDENCE)
6) NEW SOUTH (DORMITORY) AND CAFETERIA
7) OLD NORTH (DORMITORY)
8) NEW NORTH (DORMITORY)
9) DAHLGREN CHAPEL
10) RYAN ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
11) COLEY HALL (DORMITORY)
12) WHITE-GRAVENOR BUILDING
13) O'GARA INFIRMARY
14) GREENHOUSE
15) ANNEX II
16) POULTON HALL
17) W. COLEMAN NEVILS BUILDING
18) LOYOLA HALL (DORMITORY)
19) XAVIER HALL (DORMITORY)
20) RYDER HALL (JESUIT RESIDENCE)
21) EDMUND A. WALSH BUILDING
22) OBSERVATORY
23) ANIMAL RESEARCH FACILITIES
24) MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCHOOLS
25) GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL
26) MCDONOUGH GYMNASIUM
27) MAIN CAMPUS GATEHOUSES
28) SCHOOL OF NURSING
29) GORMAN DIAGNOSTIC AND RESEARCH BUILDING
30) KOBER-COGAN HALL (DORMITORY)
31) REISS SCIENCE BUILDING
32) DARNALL HALL (DORMITORY) AND CAFETERIA
33) HARBIN HALL (DORMITORY)
34) AMERICAN LANGUAGE INSTITUTE
35) ALUMNI HOUSE
36) PLACEMENT
37) CAMPUS CORNER
Financial Data

The fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, reflected in financial language the University's continued progress and growth. The operating budget for the year was almost $31,000,000, or $600,000 per week; total University assets approached $78,500,000.

Operations
During the year, total current income increased 12% to $30,719,538, while total expenditures rose 15% to $30,926,429. The University's deficit of $206,891 would have been considerably higher, had not earnings on endowed and invested funds increased to $451,866, and gifts received for current support increased to $707,871.

The deficit of $206,891 was absorbed by an appropriation against the University's funds functioning as endowment.

Current Expenditures
Our most significant item of expense continued to be salaries and wages, which, when coupled with staff benefits, amounted to $19,399,515, or 62.7% of our total expenditures.

Expenditures for sponsored research increased almost 12% to $7,091,105. The United States Government supported 76% of this research, while restricted gifts and grants from private sources accounted for the balance.

Assets and Funds
The net worth, or fund balances, of the University increased 4.3% to $63,147,012 during the year. This financial growth of approximately $2,620,000 together with an increase of almost $4,000,000 in our bonded indebtedness, made possible the increase in University assets to a record high of almost $78,500,000.

The University's investments, with securities valued substantially at cost, amount to $11,891,186 and are accounted for as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Commercial Paper</td>
<td>$2,428,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>$1,683,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Stock</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Stock</td>
<td>$3,492,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgages and Notes</td>
<td>$1,076,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>$2,709,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$470,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$11,891,186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The investment in University Plant assets increased $2,824,404 to $60,187,358 with the completion during the fiscal year of our two new dormitories, Harbin Hall and Darnall Hall. The construction of five new dormitories during the past ten years was possible only with Government financing. Our bonded dormitory indebtedness now stands at $8,783,000, with an average annual debt service of $481,500.

The University's Student Loan Funds increased 30%, or $481,715 to $2,074,923 with the receipt of federal student loan funds, plus a matching contribution from University resources. As of June 30th, 93% of our loanable funds or $1,931,525 was out on loans to over 2,400 students, both past and present.

Summary Statements
The following three statements have been condensed from the University's detailed certified annual report prepared by Wayne Kendrick & Company, Certified Public Accountants, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965.
### I. Balance Sheet
June 30, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$857,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>2,361,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans to Students</td>
<td>1,931,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td>372,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>11,891,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Held in Trust by Others</td>
<td>329,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus, Plant and Equipment</td>
<td>60,187,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous Assets</td>
<td>555,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$78,487,621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$3,240,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Payable</td>
<td>677,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds Payable</td>
<td>8,783,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits and Advances Received</td>
<td>2,639,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$15,340,609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Balances</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Funds—Restricted</td>
<td>$281,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Loan Funds</td>
<td>2,074,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus, Plant and Equipment Funds</td>
<td>48,316,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Funds</td>
<td>7,117,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Functioning as Endowment</td>
<td>4,786,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous Funds</td>
<td>570,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Balances</strong></td>
<td>$63,147,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Liabilities and Fund Balances**...$78,487,621

### II. Current Income and Expenditures
for Year Ended June 30, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Income</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>$9,237,899</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment and Other Fund</td>
<td>451,866</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements—U.S. Govern-</td>
<td>5,965,471</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Support Gifts</td>
<td>1,891,778</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts for Current Use</td>
<td>707,871</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>4,043,174</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital and Clinics</td>
<td>7,938,749</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>492,730</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Income</strong></td>
<td>$30,719,538</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Expenditures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Wages</td>
<td>$18,531,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Benefits</td>
<td>868,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies, Maintenance and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>9,320,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Purchases</td>
<td>1,229,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>615,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>233,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>127,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total Current Expenditures</td>
<td>$30,926,429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**University Deficit**...$206,891

### III. Endowment Funds
June 30, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Annual Income</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>$613,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and Medals</td>
<td>41,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation Support</td>
<td>3,518,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>56,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Support</td>
<td>728,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Support</td>
<td>345,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose Funds</td>
<td>1,613,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Endowment</td>
<td>201,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Endowment</strong></td>
<td>$7,117,596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Claude Bernard, the father of modern physiology, characterized the environment in which an organism exists—air for us, water for the fishes—as the *milieu extérieur*. But he postulated that the organism exists not so much in its external environment as in its *milieu intérieur*—the fluid environment that bathes individual cells, delivering nutrients, and removing waste products.

A medical school is a sensitive, moving, growing and reproducing organism. It exists primarily in its *milieu intérieur*, its faculty and students, its classrooms and laboratories. But just as an animal organism, it exists in an external environment: its mother university (ten American medical schools have no mothers!), its community, its nation, and the world. It exists also within the framework of the medical profession. It is beneficially or adversely affected by every significant alteration in its internal and external environments.

A medical school relates to its internal environment through teaching and research. It relates to its *milieu extérieur* through these, and in addition service. This essay is about service performed by a medical school, specifically Georgetown University School of Medicine. It is about the relationship of our school to its local, national, professional, and global environment.

Dull (but vital) statistics will tell about the medical students, interns, residents, postdoctoral fellows, and graduate students that are the human products of our school. They number a total output of over 200 M.D.’s and Ph. D.’s each year. Dry financial statements reflect the research output of the medical faculty and students. We spend over $5,000,000 every year on research and produce over 800 research reports a year. These are the activities that nurture the school, providing for its growth and reproduction. While, as in the case of any educational institution, these represent service to community, nation, and profession, technically, they are not service. They are the elements absorbed and produced internally—nutrients and products—that comprise the internal environment of the school.

Below are described some of the activities and programs that relate the school to its external environment. It is sufficient however, to show convincingly that a medical school is a scientific, sociologic, economic, and political force of local, national, and international significance.

**Service to the Community**

Georgetown University Hospital is not a community hospital in the usual sense of that term. It is a university teaching hospital with special educational and research objectives. In order to best fulfill these objectives, it is obliged to provide the very best patient care, and in its beds, laboratories, operating rooms and clinics it has touched intimately the lives of hundreds of thousands of residents of the Washington area. Many hearts continue to beat, many kidneys continue to purify the blood, and many minds continue to function creatively because of the special talents offered by scientists and teachers of Georgetown.

Hundreds of physicians of our faculty serve their patients in hospitals affiliated with our medical school—District of Columbia General Hospital, Veterans Administration Hospital, Children’s Hospital, Arlington Hospital, and others. These hospitals provide superior medical care because of the education and research atmosphere created in them through the inquiring presence of our faculty, interns, residents, and medical students.

Over twenty-five percent of all physicians in the Washington metropolitan area are graduates of Georgetown University School of Medicine. Many other physicians received part of their postdoctoral training at Georgetown.

The enormous contribution that our school makes to the health care of the community is typical of that made by each medical school of the United States to its own community. Service to the community is the most obvious kind of service performed by a medical school. A medical school cannot perform its ordinary functions in education and research without a broad and strong base of community service.

**Georgetown and the City Hospital**

The District of Columbia General Hospital (more popularly known as D.C. General) is a 1,250-bed general hospital which serves as the municipal hospital for the District of Columbia. It is operated by the D.C.
Department of Public Health, which receives its financial support directly from the Congress. Medical care at D.C. General ranks with the very best of the municipal hospitals in the United States. This is the direct result of the participation of the Howard University, George Washington University, and Georgetown University schools of medicine in the operation of the hospital. The three universities supply manpower, money, and inspiration. Twenty-two members of the full-time faculty of Georgetown University School of Medicine supervise sixty-five Georgetown interns and residents and twenty postdoctoral fellows at D.C. General. The hospital swarms with our students. Many members of the full-time and volunteer faculty serve as visiting physicians, assuring that the least fortunate of our citizens receive the same or better medical care than that received by our most fortunate citizens.

Of the full-time faculty stationed at D.C. General, ten receive no income whatever from the District of Columbia. They are paid entirely by Georgetown University. Georgetown has made a large commitment to service in our city hospital. To be sure, D.C. General provides a magnificent training ground for our medical students and graduate trainees in the numerous specialties of medicine. But we are there because we want to be there. Since Georgetown is in the business of rendering health care, it has assumed the obligation of rendering health care to all citizens of Washington, regardless of economic status, in its own hospital and in the municipal hospital. (Statistic: In 1965, 5,800 babies were born at D.C. General. Of these, 2,000 were delivered by Georgetown people, teachers and students.)

Georgetown's Mental Retardation Program

More than a decade ago, Dr. Frederic Burke established at Georgetown the first mental retardation clinic in the Washington metropolitan area. This activity gradually gained financial support from the Civitan Club, Children's Bureau, U.S. Public Health Service, and the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation. President Kennedy's interest in this group of diseases has led to increased public awareness of the enormity of the problem of mental retardation.

Mental retardation is the third leading chronic illness in the United States. Three out of every hundred children born in this country are mentally retarded. Many such individuals are educable and can serve useful functions in our society. In order to achieve the goal of habilitation of these children, many talents are required. These include physicians of several kinds—pediatricians, neurologists, psychiatrists, and physiatriests; behavioral scientists—sociologists, psychologists and special educators, as well as social workers and special nurses. Georgetown's Child Development and Diagnostic Center has been a focal point for these activities. Under the leadership of Dr. Philip Calcagno, it has brought together a consortium of professionals and scientists from these many areas of study from other institutions in the Washington area to focus attention on the special problems of the individual patients referred to the Clinic. Thus Georgetown serves the community by offering its talents and its facilities for the study and solution of one of the most serious medical and sociologic problems affecting the community.

Service to the Profession

Medical education is a continuum. It begins long before a student enters medical school, and it ends only with the death of the physician. Medical education after formal residency training, "continuing" medical education, is perhaps best characterized by the title of a report issued by the Association of American Medical Colleges entitled, Lifetime Learning for Physicians. Ten years after graduation from medical school, unless he has adopted a regular program of continuing study, a physician is hopelessly obsolete. The knowledge available to him is less than that of a fresh graduate from medical school that year. The reason, of course, is that the total body of medical scientific knowledge is increasing at a nearly logarithmic rate. The physician must study or fall behind.

The most important service to the profession provided by a medical school is continuing medical education. Close contact between a medical school and the community of practicing physicians insures that those physicians can converse, confer, and consult with faculty members who are, through their research, personally advancing the body of medical knowledge. The following examples reveal how Georgetown makes its contribution to the continuing education of practicing physicians.

Hospital Affiliations

Aside from those hospital affiliations in the Washington area which promote the undergraduate and graduate training programs of Georgetown, our school has entered into a series of hospital affiliations which have as their primary purpose the continuing medical education of the physicians of those hospitals. In 1952, Dr. Harold Jeghers, then Professor of Medicine, established affiliations with St. Mary's Hospital in Rochester, New York, and Mercy Hospital in Buffalo, New York. Later, similar affiliations were established with Mercy Hospital of Kenmore, New York, and St. Vincent Hospital in Worcester, Massachusetts. These programs consist of periodic visits by Georgetown faculty for the purpose of conducting lectures, conferences, and ward rounds with the house staff and attending physicians. Through the years, these affiliations have served to upgrade the quality of patient care in those hospitals. The ultimate goal has been the development of a superior level of patient care in these hospitals so that local universities would establish affiliations for the purpose of serving their own programs. This has been accomplished at St. Mary's Hospital in Rochester, New York, where the University of Rochester has now established major affiliations on several services for its own programs of undergraduate and graduate training.

This unique program has been a prototype. It has demonstrated the capacity of a medical school to take community hospitals under its wing and, through the efforts of its faculty, vastly improve the quality of care in those hospitals.
Using the experience of these distant affiliations, we are now embarking on a program of affiliations in the Washington metropolitan area of the same kind—programs for attending physicians and house staff, without reference to Georgetown trainees, graduate or undergraduate. The school is pleased to announce that such a program will be launched with Providence Hospital in Washington in the academic year 1966-1967.

**Special Programs and Courses**

Our school is constantly engaged with the community practicing physicians through a variety of general and special programs of continuing medical education conducted on the University campus. Service to the profession is the only reason for these programs, consuming as they do a great amount of faculty energy. The following are some recent examples.

**Seminars for Aviation Medical Examiners.** Once each year, Georgetown University and the Federal Aviation Agency sponsor courses for physicians who are licensed to examine candidates for pilot licenses. Two to three hundred practitioners from all parts of the country attend these three-day programs conducted by the ablest teachers on the Georgetown faculty. Here indeed is a service to the nation as well as to the profession.

**The Heart.** At intervals, Dr. W. Proctor Harvey, Professor of Medicine, stages a unique program of instruction for practicing physicians which is sponsored by the American College of Physicians. Utilizing some extraordinary techniques of teaching, including an electronic stethoscope in the ears of each physician seated in the Gorman Auditorium of the Hospital, Dr. Harvey and his outstanding staff present hundreds of patients with diseases of the heart and blood vessels, with an analysis of physiologic changes in the circulation correlated with heart sounds. This program has received worldwide notice. Thousands of physicians are now serving their patients better because of the efforts of this dedicated group of teachers.

Every Thursday night, without fail, Georgetown's Cardiovascular Conference attracts one hundred and fifty to two hundred physicians of the Washington metropolitan area. Dr. Charles Hufnagel (Professor of Surgery) and his renowned cardiovascular surgical team join with Dr. Harvey's group to discuss problems and instructive cases of diseases of the heart and blood vessels. For many physicians this is the postgraduate educational event of the week.

The variety of continuing educational programs and special scientific meetings in any one year at Georgetown is astounding. On one day last year, May 15, 1965, the Association of Southern Railway Surgeons was meeting in the Gorman Auditorium while a special Colloquium on the Pupil was meeting in the Auditorium of St. Mary's Hall. The highly specialized colloquium attracted eighty scientists from all parts of the country; the railway surgeons were represented by more than two hundred physicians from the Southern states. These physicians now serve their patients better because of Georgetown's service to the profession.

**Editors and Officers**

The mainstay of continuing medical education is the medical scientific journal. Several journals are edited at Georgetown, and thirty-five members of the full-time faculty serve on the editorial and consulting staffs of twenty other journals. The official publications of the American Academy of General Practice, GP and *The American Family Physician*, have their medical editorial offices at Georgetown. Articles in these journals reach over one hundred thousand physicians each month. Equally important highly specialized scientific publications also have their editorial offices at Georgetown. Prime examples are, Cryobiology, and the *Transactions of the American Society for Artificial Internal Organs*.

A final form of service to the profession is through participation in the affairs of professional and scientific societies. Here are a few examples:

Robert J. Coffey, M.D., Ph.D. (Professor of Surgery), is President of the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, and President of the Southeastern Surgical Congress. (Eleven of the last twenty-five presidents of the Medical Society of D. C. have been members of the Georgetown faculty.)

Andrew Marchetti, M.D. (Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology), is President of the American Gynecological Society.

Lawrence S. Lillienfield, M.D., Ph.D. (Professor of Physiology and Biophysics), is Chairman of the Eastern Section of the American Federation of Clinical Research.

George E. Schreiner, M.D. (Professor of Medicine), is Secretary-General of the Third International Congress of Nephrology.

Richard Steinbach, M.D. (Professor of Psychiatry), is president of the Association of Southern Professors of Psychiatry.

The list is long.

**Service to the Nation**

The President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke stated: "The physician supply is beyond question the most critical single element in manpower for health services." Certainly the greatest service to
the nation performed by any school of medicine is the production of physicians. Georgetown's output of physicians is now one hundred to one hundred and ten a year. In September 1968, the entering Freshman Class will increase from one hundred and sixteen to one hundred and forty-five. Then, of course, there are hundreds of other physicians and health workers who receive postgraduate training each year at Georgetown. They and the new graduates leave Georgetown for all corners of the country to provide the medical care needed in their communities.

Every medical school, in fulfilling its educational objectives, is making a significant contribution to the nation.

There are, however, other specific activities to be found among Georgetown's programs that are of direct service to the Government and the nation. Here are some cases in point.

Clinical Pharmacology Laboratory

The late Senator Estes Kefauver reawakened the people and the Government to national problems of research, production, distribution, advertising, and use of the potent pharmaceutical preparations now available to the medical profession. The further efforts of then Senator, now Vice President, Humphrey have stimulated new studies, new regulations, and the strengthening of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

The field of human pharmacology is a rapidly developing area of study in our great medical institutions. Georgetown has established a Laboratory of Clinical Pharmacology, under the direction of Dr. Christopher Martin. It was developed in response to increasing professional, public, and federal awareness of the need for higher standards of drug investigation and increased knowledge about new drugs and their effects in man. It is an interdisciplinary, interdepartmental program sponsored jointly by our departments of Medicine and Pharmacology, and Dr. Laurence H. Kyle and Dr. Theodore Koppanyi, chairmen of those departments, have actively participated in this development.

This laboratory has been selected by the Federal Food and Drug Administration as its own scientific arm. Under the terms of a major contract, Georgetown's medical faculty and other resources are available to serve the FDA's needs for animal or clinical investigations of drugs in connection with FDA regulatory activities. FDA professional personnel will receive postgraduate training at Georgetown with the aim of developing higher standards of excellence in discharging their vital FDA responsibilities.

This strong direct tie between a federal agency and a private university provides a model of a relationship that furthers the objectives of both institutions and the health of all citizens.

Federal Aviation Agency at Georgetown

When should the pilot of a jet liner be told he is "too old for the job?" What methods of evaluation and standards can be applied to assure the safety of the "human factor" in commercial aviation? What is "normal" in relation to the safe performance of aviation tasks? Certainly these questions are of importance to the health and safety of the nation. The federal agencies that regulate aviation in the United States need the answers.

In a fine example of federal farsightedness, the Federal Aviation Agency established the FAA Georgetown Clinical Research Institute at Georgetown in 1961. Under the direction of Dr. Arthur Wentz, the Institute's objectives are the answers to the questions given above. Working in the academic atmosphere of the university, the twenty-man professional staff of the Institute participates in the educational programs of the School of Medicine. The research program of the Institute is enhanced by frequent interchange of ideas made possible by the location of the Institute in the center of a busy university medical center. Here is another example of a government-agency-university cooperative program that fosters research in the nation's interest.

Government Consultation

Fifty members of the full-time faculty of the School of Medicine and many members of the part-time faculty serve as consultants and committee members in the health and other agencies of the United States government. Many are members of committees and clinical study panels of the National Institutes of Health. Others serve the Armed Services, the Veterans Administration, NASA, the Social Security Administration, CIA, and the Civil Service Commission. All serve at significant material and temporal sacrifice. All feel the obligation to assist in the smooth functioning of governmental operations by lending "know how" to the government's programs in health, education, and research.

Service to the World

International medical education programs have been under discussion at Georgetown for a long time. This is a most appropriate mission for our school. Georgetown is an internationally-minded University. Its School of Foreign Service was the first such school in the nation. Its institute of Languages and Linguistics is unique in its objectives and its accomplishments. The location of Georgetown University in Washington, the center of Government, obviously enhances its international atmosphere. Peace Corps units train on our campus. Many educational and research relationships exist between the various schools of the university and the government departments and agencies with international missions.

International programs of great importance are emerging in the medical schools of the United States. Many formal and informal arrangements have been made by schools of medicine, several involving government agencies, by which the faculties and facilities of the schools can help medical education, research, and patient care in the less developed parts of the world. The American Medical Association and the Association of American Medical Colleges have established divisions that devote themselves to problems in international medicine and international medical education.
Department of Community Medicine
and International Health

Within this context, our Department of Preventive Medicine has undergone radical transformation. It is now titled the Department of Community Medicine and International Health. The Chairman is Dr. Patrick J. Doyle, eminently qualified for this new and important post in our school. Probing deeply into this new field of medical education, undergraduate and graduate teaching programs have been developed in principles of international preventive medicine, in communicable diseases, sanitation, nutrition, and population dynamics. The possibilities of exchange programs with foreign medical schools are being explored. A graduate degree program in International Health is being devised. Medical research projects in global epidemiology, nutrition, and population are under development. Our school has a total commitment to the concept that international health and international medical education are appropriate areas of study for every American medical school. This department is the first in any medical school of the United States to bear the title and the emphasis linking the American community and the world.

Foreign Trainees

Sixty-five residents, postdoctoral fellows, and graduate students of the medical school have come from overseas to train at Georgetown in the present academic year. They come from more than twenty-five nations. They will return to serve their peoples in a great variety of medical specialties.

These men and women are carefully selected for their potential in their own country. They do not come to Georgetown to serve, but to learn.

Special International Activities

The school and members of the faculty are frequently asked to serve brief assignments as consultants on special overseas and foreign projects. In addition, fundamental research programs have been developed which involve facilities and physicians in foreign countries. Here are four examples of recent programs.

Thailand. Dr. Laurence H. Kyle, Professor of Medicine, has served as a consultant to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in the development of a clinical research center in Bangkok, Thailand. Dr. Kyle studied this complex problem in an area that shows promise of becoming the political, cultural, and intellectual center of Southeast Asia.

U.S. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Under the auspices of the Department of the Interior, which administers this vast area of the world for the United Nations, the Dean and Dr. Bruce I. Shnider, the Associate Dean, have studied the problem of continuing medical education for Micronesian medical practitioners of the Marianas, the Caroline and Marshall Islands. Recommendations have been made concerning qualifications of the graduates of the Fiji School of Medicine and similar schools of medicine, forms of continuing education that would be feasible in these islands, leadership in the medical programs of the Trust Territory, supporting services and facilities and long-range plans.

Vietnam. Under the auspices of the Agency for International Development, Dr. Lawrence S. Lilienfield has worked on the scene with members of the University of Saigon Faculty of Medicine for the purpose of developing programs for improving the basic medical science education of Vietnamese medical students, especially in the field of physiology. Dr. Lilienfield has developed recommendations which should serve as the bases for collaboration between a basic science department of an American medical school and a basic science department of a foreign medical school which lacks the resources to which we are accustomed.

Chile. Dr. John Canary, Associate Professor of Medicine, with Dr. Jorge Litvak, Associate Professor of Medicine at the University of Chile in Santiago, has developed an intercontinental study of Vitamin D metabolism in rickets. Rickets is rare in the United States, common in Chile. Chemical and physical measurements that have been developed in the endocrinology laboratories at Georgetown are applied to the patients in Dr. Litvak's clinic, before and after treatment.

Medical schools are ancient institutions, older than liberal arts colleges, law schools, graduate schools. While their origins are lost in antiquity, their presence is felt by every man. He feels it through his physician and the knowledge his physician applies—itself the product of our medical schools. But further, he feels the presence of the medical schools through their service to people and communities. Georgetown University School of Medicine has assumed its obligation in the modern world to its own community, its nation, the profession it serves, and the world. Through its service it leads in the gradual but inevitable progression to the day when every man will not only be entitled to, but will receive, the best health care. This medical school, as others, is one of man's most effective instruments of social betterment.

Contributor's Note:

JOHN C. ROSE, M.D., was appointed Dean of the School of Medicine in 1963, after serving for five years as Professor and Chairman of the Department of Physiology and Biophysics. Following service as an air navigator in Italy in World War II, Dr. Rose received his B.S. at Fordham and M.D. magna cum laude at Georgetown. He is a member of the American Physiological Society, a diplomate of the American Board of Internal Medicine and Fellow of the American College of Physicians. He is medical editor of GP and author of 60 papers in the field of cardiovascular physiology.
FATHER SWEENEY, ADMISSIONS DIRECTOR, OUTLINES POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

At the January meeting of the Alumni Association Board and Senate, the Reverend Joseph F. Sweeney, S.J., Director of Undergraduate Admissions, addressed Board/Senate members and the assembled Local Club Presidents on the policies and procedures of his office. His subject—an examination of the criteria and decision-making underlying the acceptance of Freshmen at Georgetown's five undergraduate schools—proved to be of considerable interest, particularly to the Alumni parents present, and elicited much favorable comment.

Father Sweeney began his talk with three rhetorical questions: “What is our Freshman class like? How do we select students? What is our policy for Alumni families?” He revealed that 71% of the students now in the Freshman class come from the top 40% of their high school graduating classes and that 98% of their College Board scores were over 500 (on a 200-800 scale). He reported the average scores, of all five Schools, as a verbal aptitude average of 625 and a mathematical ability mean at 629. A further breakdown of the “profile” of the Class of 1969 shows the following geographical distribution: 52% from the Middle Atlantic States; 14% from New England; 9% from the South; 2% from the West—and 30 students from foreign countries. About 13% of the members of the Class of 1969 are receiving grants, including athletic grants; 10% are borrowing money to finance their education.

Eight criteria—four academic and four biographical—are the raw materials for decision-making in the Admissions process at Georgetown. The academic criteria are these: secondary school grades, rank in the graduating group, College Board scores, and a predicted quality point average of college performance based statistically upon the performance records of 2,500 Georgetown undergraduates. The biographical materials include reports from the candidate's school principal or guidance counselor (4,000 of these reports were processed for this year's entering class); a teacher's report; an interview-report from an Alumnus or Alumna (over 1,000 such rating interviews were filed for this year); and the report of the Admissions office interview (over 1,800 applicants were evaluated through office interview for this year's Freshman class). From a careful appraisal of all these criteria by the faculty admissions committees of the five Schools the candidates are divided into three general groupings: “the readily acceptable, the doubtful, and the students who could not succeed at Georgetown.”

After the preliminary screening by the five faculty committees, the Admissions officers begin to read the folders and (this year starting March 1; next year and thereafter, January 15) to make up the acceptance rolls for the ensuing September class. Electronically fed information on the applicants (schools designated, majors selected, languages elected, etc.) now pour in; for the Class of 1970, entering this September, over 4,500 prospective Freshmen have filed their applications. Among the academic criteria, says Father Sweeney, “the heaviest weight is put on the student's rank in class.” More complex, perhaps, are the biographical factors which must be weighed to determine who will be taken as “future Ladies and Gentlemen of Georgetown.” Among the many facets of personality looked for and appraised are “sense of humor,” “reaction to set-backs,” “warmth of personality,” “originality,” and “leadership.” “We do not expect each young person to be outstanding in all these qualities,” the Director of Undergraduate Admissions told his audience, “but an over-all picture of promise must come into focus if a student is to be accepted.” The student's personal statement about his college and career goals is important; sometimes—particularly in a marginal case—it is decisive.

“Because the children of Alumni are already related to the University,” Father Sweeney told his
hers, "Georgetown has a special interest in them. For the maintaining of the solid and wise, as well as genial and generous, traditions of our University, nothing is as helpful as the children of our children." Hence, he went on to say, "to ensure a long line of Georgetown families" the Admissions office has a special policy and procedure for Alumni families.

First to be reviewed in the Admissions office will be the files of those candidates who come from Georgetown families, who are sons and daughters of Georgetown Alumni. Of those accepted from Alumni families will be about 10% who might not have succeeded in the usual competition. They will, nonetheless, rank in the top 40% of their graduating classes, and their College Board score average will range from 525 to 575. Thus Alumni sons and daughters will be good college risks whose kinship to Georgetown will be weighed as a factor to their advantage. At the moment, the sons and daughters of Georgetown's sons and daughters, in the entire University, graduate and professional schools as well as undergraduate, add up to 286. Of these, 45 are Freshmen in the College of Arts and Sciences, 7 in the School of Foreign Service, 12 in the School of Business Administration, 4 in the School of Nursing, and 4 in the Institute of Languages and Linguistics.

In a subsequent interview in his office Father Sweeney characterized the interviews of prospective students in the field by Georgetown Alumni and Alumnae as "an invaluable service" in the selection process. Noting that 844 such interviews were conducted in their first year of organization and over 1,000 in their second, he stressed their importance in acquainting the prospective student with Georgetown and Georgetown with the prospective student. "We are competing with the Ivy League in admissions," he said, "and it is here that our Alumni in professional and business fields are our most effective 'salesmen.'"

The personal interview on campus is highly recommended but not required of the prospective Freshman. In response to the interviewer's question, Father Sweeney said that most of the time both parents come to Washington with the young candidate, but normally the student is alone for the interview. Many students, he finds, are quite at ease during interviews and sophisticated in interviewing techniques. Among the questions they ask showing a highly serious and informed attitude toward college life are questions about the relationships of students to faculty, the accessibility of faculty to students, and the amount and kind of publications of our faculty.

High school counselors come to the Georgetown campus too; in April of this year they came in hundreds, bused in, in groups from the American Personnel Guidance Association meeting in Washington. Throughout the year high school juniors arrive for interview or for campus tour, regularly provided weekdays by the Collegiate Club. And of course the Admissions office staff is on tour of the country at high school College Nights. Georgetown, considered an Ivy League school, is well known for being in Washington, and frequently known because it prepares for foreign service careers.

In some 85 high schools which have been sending their students to Georgetown there is deposited a 10-minute color film with accompanying recording. This film tells the Georgetown admissions story; it shows in its survey of the undergraduate, graduate, and professional divisions of the University the reasons why students come from all over the country and all over the world to Georgetown. In the film Father Sweeney enunciates, as he does in campus interviews, at College Nights, at talks with guidance counselors, with students, and with parents, what might be called Georgetown's philosophy of admissions. Beyond the machinery of admissions, he explains, there is the university itself, ready to assist students "to see the world with a questioning eye, to learn more, to impart through education the beginning of a search for knowledge, of a purposeful view of the world which will give the student a sense of dignity in his role and a set of values for developing his full potential."

---

**JACK MAGEE APPOINTED HEAD BASKETBALL COACH**

Basketball at Georgetown should have a new look next winter as a result of the late-April appointment of Jack Magee as head basketball coach. Magee will replace Tom O'Keefe, '60, who resigned at the end of the 1965-66 season.

Magee, a 30-year-old native of New York City, was assistant coach at Boston College for three years prior to his appointment at Georgetown, and came to the Hilltop with glowing recommendations from BC Coach Bob Cousy and from Cousy's former coach, Arnold (Red) Auerbach.

At a press conference held shortly after his appointment was announced, Magee said he hoped to develop a "running game" at Georgetown similar to that employed so successfully by Cousy at Boston College.

One of 80 applicants for the Hilltop opening, Magee graduated from Boston College in 1959 after shattering several of the school's scoring records. He played one season of professional basketball in the Eastern League after graduation, then returned to BC as Cousy's assistant.
FOUNDER'S DAY COMMEMORATION: CAMPUS LINKED WITH COUNTRY FOR SPIRITUAL RENEWAL

On March 20, 1966, Georgetown's sons and daughters—from the Hilltop campus to Vietnam—came together in spirit in an act of faith and love to commemorate the 177th anniversary of the University's founding. The Very Reverend Gerard J. Campbell, S.J., President of Georgetown University, began the second annual Commemoration observance on campus with the celebration of Mass in McDonough Gymnasium. At the breakfast following in New South Cafeteria, a 28-minute telephone conference call linked the campus breakfast with commemoration breakfasts in 37 cities in the United States. A member of the Georgetown Jesuit community was present at each of these breakfasts. Three breakfasts—in Mexico City, Montreal, and Saigon—made the occasion international.

The three-fold theme developed by the telephone call embraced the observance of the University's establishment as a God-centered institution of higher learning, of the selfless devotion of the long line of Jesuit Fathers to the cause of youth who are best equipped for spiritual renewal and rededication. To one who devoted some of his happiest years to the study of Medieval History, this theme is a very familiar one. Rather than a modern invention, the notion of renewal is virtually as old as man. It represents the recognition of mankind that a rebirth of ideals, a rejuvenation of personal dedication, a re-forming of one's objectives are constant needs. One who looks carefully at the full meaning of these notions gradually realizes that they do not represent a mere return to what is past and now obscured by time. The renewal we seek is, in fact, a new, a more profound and intimate grasp and realization of truths long known, but never fully implemented.

"It is in this spirit that we gather together today to celebrate this Founder's Day Commemoration. Sons and daughters of the great University which John Carroll established in 1789, we reach across the land and join hands in this moment of prayer and reflection. Our founder was a man of great vision who was deeply devoted to God and to his country. Before Washington was the nation's capital, he saw the important place his small school would occupy in the future.

"We see today in Georgetown a partial realization of his dream. I say 'partial' because it will never be complete. No matter how great her achievements, there will always remain much to be done. The mounting importance of our nation in the world places increasing demands on us to serve her, and, yes, to help guide her path. Conscious that all of us are the children of God and bear His image, we lovingly render our homage to Him. As we of Georgetown's family gather together in this spiritual bond, let us earnestly pray for each other. Let us ask Him to render His divine assistance so that we may be made new again in Him. Let us pray for all of those who have formed our university, the teachers and the administrators, for all of our alumni, living and dead. Let us ask God to make us worthy to be known as the spiritual children of John Carroll."

National President Eugene L. Stewart, C'48, L'51, was Toastmaster. Richard J. McCooey, C'52, National Chairman of the Commemoration program opened the telephone hook-up with a greeting to the participating cities. Breakfasts were held in the following places: Albany, Albuquerque, Baltimore, Boston, Binghamton, Cedar Grove (N.J.), Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Erie (Pa.), Fairfield (Conn.), Garden City (N.Y.), Houston, Indianapolis, Kansas City (Mo.), Los Angeles, Louisville, New York City, Mexico City, Montreal, New Orleans, Norfolk, Pittsburgh, Providence, Richmond, Rochester (N.Y.), St. Louis, St. Paul, Saigon, San Francisco, Scarsdale (N.Y.), Seattle, Sheboygan (Wis.), Tulsa, Washington (D.C.), Wilmington, and Worcester (Mass.).

TO ALL GEORGETOWN ALUMNI:

The purpose of this letter is to announce that this year the Official Ballot for the election of officers and members of the Board of Governors of the Alumni Association is contained in this magazine on the following page. Please complete it, tear out the page, and mail to: Election Committee, Georgetown University Alumni Association, 3604 O Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007. Ballots must be returned by June 30.

The duly constituted Nominating Committee of the Board of Governors, under the chairmanship of Mr. Paul R. Obert, C'50, received 174 nominations to fill three officer vacancies and thirteen vacancies on the Board of Governors. The slate of nominees was duly published and circulated in the Winter issue of Georgetown, together with information regarding the process of the addition of nominees through petition; no petitions were received. Each nominee was carefully considered by the Committee before making the final selection contained on the following page.

One final reminder ---- the 1965/66 Alumni Annual Fund concludes its campaign on June 30. As of April 21, we had received $297,475.18 in gifts and pledges from 6,111 alumni. If you have not given yet, please do so, enclosing your check with the ballot.

Sincerely,

Eugene L. Stewart

May 1, 1966
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY ALUMNI ASSOCIATION, INC.
OFFICIAL BALLOT

For the election of a President, Secretary, Treasurer, and thirteen members of the Board of Governors of the Georgetown University Alumni Association. The officers will serve until June 30, 1968. Board members will serve until June 30, 1969.

To vote for the complete slate as recommended by the Nominating Committee, mark ballot here.

**OFFICERS**

**PRESIDENT**

**RECORDING SECRETARY**

**TREASURER**

**BOARD OF GOVERNORS**
(Note: Members of the Board of Governors represent specific regions. Vacancies have occurred in the regions listed below.)

**REGION I**—One Vacancy: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont.
Dr. Roland M. Barrette, C'50, Newton, Mass.  □

**REGION II**—Two Vacancies: Delaware, Maryland (except the counties of Prince Georges and Montgomery), New Jersey (except the counties of Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Passaic, and Union), Pennsylvania.
Dr. Joseph Riggs, C'55, M'59, Haddonfield, N. J.  □

J. David Glasgow, B'61, Altoona, Pa.  □

John J. Regan, F'S'49, Montclair, N. J.  □

Frederick C. Kentz, Jr., C'44, Summit, N. J.  □

Dr. John H. Malfetano, C'43, M'47, Garden City, N. Y.  □

**REGION IV**—One Vacancy: State of New York excluding the Metropolitan Area of New York City as defined above.
Dr. Peter V. Primomo, D'58, Albany, N. Y.  □

**REGION V**—Three Vacancies: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin.
J. Vernon McCarthy, C'51, St. Louis, Mo.  □

Harrison P. Dilworth, III, C'55, St. Paul, Minn.  □

J. Theodore Dailly, C'49, Glencoe, Ill.  □

**REGION VIII**—One Vacancy: Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico
Robert J. Hogan, C'49, Houston, Tex.  □

**REGION IX**—One Vacancy: Colorado, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.
Col. Arthur Barry, L'51, Denver, Colo.  □

**REGION X**—One Vacancy: Arizona, California, Nevada.
Edward M. Kovach, C'57, L'60, Berkeley, Calif.  □
TRAGEDY AND HOPE

Rare are the scholarly works in which an author brings to bear on problems in his own field the special knowledge and insights of several other disciplines. There are good reasons why this is so in the social sciences. Most of us are ill at ease outside the specialized field of our graduate training, and we have more than enough difficulty in keeping up with the flood of publications in it. Moreover, though their common subject is man and his behavior, the interests of scholars working in the separate disciplines are so divergent that seldom does their work converge on the same problem.

All the more impressive is the multi-disciplinary achievement of Dr. Carroll Quigley, professor of history at Georgetown University. The analysis he has made of the history of our time shows the extraordinary breadth of his scholarly interests and makes this a very stimulating book.

One of the great themes of contemporary history is the impact that western civilization is having on the rest of the world. Dr. Quigley deftly summarizes the stages by which the West modernized itself, and he shows the consequences of the fact that its achievements have been diffused in a different sequence from that of the non-European world. Historically, the West avoided the worst of the problem we know as “the population explosion” by the fact that the food-producing revolution began before the sanitation and medical services revolution caused a sharp decline in the death rate. The sequence was reversed in the non-European world, with results that we are now having to cope with in our aid to under-developed nations. In our attempts to alleviate their food shortages by fostering improvements in agriculture, one hopes we will also learn from the history of the West that universal elementary education is one of the most effective catalysts for rapid change. If fundamental changes in food production in the under-developed countries are to be carried through with all due speed, their peoples must be educated up to the level where they can absorb training in the new techniques, where their outlook makes them receptive to the learning and the cooperation needed to transform their agricultural system. In broader terms, recent research shows that there is (and historically has been) a close correlation between the rate of economic growth and the percentage of a country’s population to receive an elementary education. This is the type of lesson suggested by Dr. Quigley’s cogent and very perceptive analysis of the history of the West and its impact on the non-European world.

About one third of Dr. Quigley’s book is devoted to the world since 1945. His narrative of the development of nuclear weapons makes a difficult technical subject understandable to the general reader. His analysis of the international political consequences of nuclear stalemate is brilliant; it makes more comprehensible the crisis in NATO, the Sino-Soviet dispute, and the growing importance in the United Nations of the emerging countries, whose actual power is so much less than the influence they are able to wield. Analysis of contemporary affairs is always risky, and few scholars have the nerve to undertake it. Yet we need such informed analysis and skilful speculation if our government’s policies, and public support for them, are to be effective.

From nuclear stalemate to contemporary American social trends, Dr. Quigley has something significant of his own to say. The outlook of today’s college students, the all-too-frequent phenomenon of the “under-achiever,” the reasons why girls are pushed to maturity so rapidly in our society while the maturing of boys seems slower than a generation ago, all are analyzed with a lack of clichés and a clarity of perspective for which many readers will be grateful.

Why tragedy and hope? “Two world wars sandwiching a world economic depression” are tragedy enough for a half century. Carroll Quigley shows what the attitudes were that led to the tragedy. He offers an antidote to the feeling that man is helpless to control the destiny of his civilization, that history is shaped by impersonal forces beyond man’s control. His greatest achievement in this work is not only to show the causes of the tragedy but also point out the historical, moral resources of our civilization that rightly should give us hope for the future.

RICHARD B. SIMONS
Dear Sir:

I am writing to congratulate you on the Winter issue of your magazine. I received my copy of the GEORGETOWN, and I am happy to see that so much care has gone into its production. It is a credit to the Association. I also received this week the March 9th issue of the National Catholic Reporter, and on page five I read about Professor McCall, who is leaving, and charging the University with a "lack of administrative goals, no faculty voice in university affairs, and inadequate pay."

I hope that whatever the justice of Professor McCall's charges, I will not have to depend on the public press for a full report of the conditions at my alma mater. As a member of the Georgetown family, I feel that the Alumni Association has the obligation to inform the alumni so that we can attempt an informed judgment ourselves. I ask you, therefore, to devote some space to this issue in the next number of GEORGETOWN, setting forth the facts that you are able to discover, and drawing the conclusions that you think are warranted. As much as I enjoy reading the prose of my old teacher, Dr. Hughes, with such charges being aired, this is hardly the time for an article on "Georgetown's Nerve Center," the SPO.

Yours faithfully,

Gerald W. Scott, Lt. (j.g.), USNR
Graduate School, '62

Editor's reply:

It is often difficult, sometimes impossible, for a quarterly magazine to keep abreast of the news as it breaks. The SPO article was written and set in type long before the news story to which Lieutenant Scott refers became a matter of public record. The Professor McCall story was, of course, covered fully by the campus undergraduate newspaper.
Alumni Calendar  June-September, 1966

JUNE 4-6  Golden Jubilarian Reunion, on campus
JUNE 6    177th Annual Commencement Exercises, Healy Lawn
JUNE 10-12 Quinquennial Reunion Weekend, on campus
JUNE 30   Closing date for 1965-1966 Annual Alumni Fund
JULY 1    New officers of Alumni Association and new members of Association Board of Governors take office
SEPT. 9-11 108th meeting of the Alumni Board of Governors and Senate, Sheraton-Palace Hotel, San Francisco
SEPT. 10  15th Annual John Carroll Awards Dinner, the Garden Court, Sheraton-Palace Hotel, San Francisco