In the crucial months just ahead, the University will seek the answer to her future. If the current capital campaign is the success we all hope for, the dimensions of that future will form a significant advance in Georgetown's march to greatness.

Within the contemporary context, the viability of an institution of higher education is increasingly interpreted in terms of wealth and power. Education has come a long way since the time it could be equated with a Mark Hopkins on the other end of a log. The complicated support apparatus behind each department of knowledge, the variegated tools of modern research, and the cost of obtaining a world-renowned faculty all require resources far beyond those normally open to institutions for which student tuition is the leading source of income.

From Alumni giving, from Foundation and Government grants, and from the generosity of her “constituency,” the local community and those professional communities of interests the University serves, must come the support in loyalty and monies without which Georgetown cannot move ahead. Even in a holding action, in staying where she is now, this University will continue to be distinguished and to reflect the dignity and character of generations. But in the context of a society served by the multiversity or the private university of great financial resources, Georgetown cannot hope to continue to exert leadership. Without a number of endowed chairs, without greatly expanded library and other research resources, without a faculty of international distinction, Georgetown cannot become, in the exacting terms of these times, “great.”

This issue of greatness—or perhaps the issue of the image of greatness, not nearly the same thing—can be a disturbing one to those who know and love Georgetown. When a national news magazine, for example, refers to Alma Mater as part of a “pony league,” one receives a jolt. For some critics, of course, anything but a multiversity in the nation’s capital would seem misplaced and minor. Yet one must indeed be cautious to wave aside as inconsiderable a University which is engaged in research projects amounting to ten million dollars annually, which has tripled its endowment in the past two years, and which has announced construction plans for a revolutionary new hospital unit for the critically ill and for disaster care, a facility which will be a model for hospital design throughout the world.

Georgetown is determined to remain a teaching university and one actively engaged in research, sharing its prominent faculty members with the undergraduate in the classroom and yet providing modern facilities for professional advancement. The problem facing Georgetown in maintaining a balanced growth is, quite frankly, one of money. Some of the dimensions of this problem are suggested in Father Campbell’s Presidential Report in this issue. “The future well being of private institutions,” Father Campbell writes, “depends largely on private support.” After the Report was written, word came of a case in point, of the generous bequest from the estate of the late Clay Frick Lynch, alumnus of the College, winner of the John Carroll Award in 1958, and recipient of an honorary doctorate in 1963. His bequest is of an unrestricted gift of one hundred thousand dollars. This bequest was, of course, but the last of a long series of generous actions by Clay Lynch as a Georgetown alumnus. The future of Georgetown is going to depend largely on bequests of this kind and on other forms of private giving. As Nathan Pusey, president of Harvard, has observed, from bequests will come the most significant support that private colleges and universities can expect to receive in the remaining decades of this century.

The future is not susceptible to formula, but it would seem that the greater Georgetown of tomorrow will of necessity be the result of generosity and vision. It will take vision to give—to participate meaningfully in the furtherance of educational pluralism—and it will take a corresponding vision on campus to make the translation into institutional greatness. A new Georgetown, in spite of all the claims of tradition—and they are many and valid—will perform the place of the Georgetown of today, for growth and development are the law of institutional life as much as they are the law of organic life. And for swift Potomac’s lovely daughter the future will, if generosity and vision are brought fruitfully to bear upon the present, be that which is implicit and contained in the promise of the past.

—Riley Hughes, Acting Editor
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Dear Friends: As alumnae and alumni of Georgetown University, we are again called upon, on Founder's Day, April 9, 1967, to pay our respect to Archbishop Carroll.

On Founder's Day we gratefully recall that Archbishop Carroll was the same John Carroll who founded Georgetown University in 1789. His life and career have gained for him recognition as one of the greatest figures of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. As a young man he was instrumental in activating the feeling for independence among the American colonists, foreseeing that it would mean greater religious freedom.

In his proposal for his projected institution, John Carroll wrote:

Agreeably to the liberal Principle of our Constitution, the Seminary will be open to Students of every religious Profession. They, who, in this Respect, differ from the Superintendent of the Academy, will be at Liberty to frequent the places of Worship and Instruction appointed by their Parents....

Today, as in 1879, Georgetown University exemplifies principles of brotherhood and intellectual freedom for her sons and daughters.

What must we do as sons and daughters of Georgetown? We must carry on the tradition of John Carroll and of those who received the torch and have carried it forth.

By our meeting with other Georgetown sons and daughters to observe Founder's Day, nationally and in our local clubs, we are strengthening our determination for the challenges of the continuing necessity of education as laid down by Archbishop Carroll, the Jesuit Fathers, and the teachers at Georgetown University.

I hope it will be your pleasure to exemplify your gratitude to the Founder and those who have carried on the traditions of Georgetown University by your participating with your sisters and brothers wherever you are.

Faithfully yours,

Louis B. Fine

FOUNDER'S DAY PRAYER 1967

We pray Thee, O Almighty and Eternal God, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, Assist the President of these United States and Direct the deliberations of Congress That they may preserve peace, promote national happiness, and Perpetuate for us the blessings of equal liberty.

We recommend likewise to Thy unbounded mercy All our brethren and fellow citizens, That they may be preserved in union, And in that peace which the world cannot give.

Finally, we pray Thee, O Lord of mercy, Grant to the souls of Thy servants departed A place of refreshment, light, and everlasting peace. Amen.

This is an abridged version of a prayer composed by Archbishop John Carroll. Recitation of this historic prayer seems an eminently fitting way of making his spirit present among us on this Founder's Day.
This is the story of the gift of an eminent alumnus of a Jesuit school. He cannot be claimed officially as a son of Georgetown, but, in another sense, he is closely connected with the Blue and Gray.

He is Alexis Carrel, the first medical scientist working in the United States to receive the Nobel Prize, accorded to him in 1912. In 1952, by the terms of his will, his still-unpublished manuscripts, laboratory reports, and biological specimens came to Georgetown University. He made the bequest as a token of his gratitude to the teachers of his youth. Born in 1873, he had attended the Order’s Collège de Saint Joseph in his native Lyon, France. Today, when incomplete definitions of education may underestimate the Jesuit contribution, the more flattering verdict of a world-famous scientist is significant.

The high value of the gift to Georgetown is suggested by Carrel’s position in the history of medical and biological science. He came to America from his native country in 1904, and from 1906 until his retirement in 1939 was at New York’s Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.

His work in wound-healing, carried on as early as 1905-1912, laid the foundations for modern cardiovascular surgery. In 1909 he was performing surgical operations which, more than fifty years later, surgeons regard with amazement. He was the first to give a direct blood transfusion. In 1906 he devised for the preservation of tissues and organs a method of cold storage not equaled in effectiveness until the early 1950’s. His techniques formulated in the first decade of the century for the cultivation of tissues and organs are, by the admission of today’s workers in the field, equal or superior to any method created since that time. At a period when the effort was considered to be impossible, he discovered the basic rules for a procedure of organ transplantation which contemporary practitioners have not notably improved. The modern use of the polio and other vaccines was made possible by his contributions in the field of tissue culture. Without his technique for the suturing of blood vessels, all modern surgery would be impossible.

Of these achievements the following were some of the contemporary professional evaluations:

From *American Medicine*, October 1912: “Carrel’s studies and researches are recognized as epochal. . . few discoveries since Harvey’s concerning the circulation have exerted more far-reaching influences on medicine and surgery than Dr. Carrel’s investigations in connection with blood vessel surgery.”

From the London medical journal *The Lancet*: “Carrel’s suturing procedure may almost be said to have created the surgery of the vascular system.”

From a statement of the famous American surgeon, Dr. William S. Halstead, referring to Carrel’s application of his special wound-healing technique to the wounded of World War I: “I am naturally enthusiastic on the subject of Carrel’s work, feeling that
there has been no contribution to surgery since Lister equal to this."

Carrel had even anticipated the modern "open heart" surgery. Utilizing his distinctive mode of suturing blood vessels, he successfully interrupted the circulation in an animal's heart for two minutes, cut the valves, and placed a patch over the opening.

His contribution in the form of the first reliable method of blood transfusion can scarcely be overestimated.

At the turn of the present century this procedure, so simple today, was highly dangerous and to be attempted only by a few specialists. No technique had been found for preventing the fatal clotting of the blood of the patient. Carrel solved the problem by devising a safe and effective way of sewing together the severed ends of the blood vessels. Henceforth transfusion was an operation within the capacity of any intelligent hospital aide.

The significance of this phase of Carrel's accomplishments for our own time is indicated by an opinion voiced by the present chief of the cardiovascular section of the Grace Memorial Hospital of Yale University: "With the recent remarkable progress in the field of cardiovascular surgery . . . the work of Alexis Carrel in the early part of the century . . . has assumed new importance. . . . I have been deeply impressed by the influence of Dr. Carrel's pioneer blood vessel work."

Today the transplantation of human kidneys is a dramatic triumph of surgery. Carrel, working with animals, was the first to perform—as early as 1909—an operation of this kind. "Thus," remarked the *Journal of the American Medical Association* in that year. "it has been shown also for the first time that transplanted kidneys functionate [sic], that an animal, having undergone a double nephrectomy [kidney excision] and the graft of one of his own kidneys can recover completely and live in perfect health for eight months at least."

In the 1960's, investigation in tissue culture employs Carrel's methods and findings as "the basis" for further work. (The quoted phrase is that of the eminent Dr. Raymond C. Parker, of the Connaught Laboratories of the University of Toronto.)

In this field Carrel attempted to devise, as mentioned above, a method for maintaining tissues in a state of latent life by means of freezing. A tribute to his genius is the fact that the technique was not seriously taken up again after his death until the early 1950's. It is now an indispensable part of the process of keeping in operation the modern blood and tissue bank.

The present relevance of his experiments in the cultivation of organs is shown by the following statement from the chief of the tissue culture division, Tissue Bank of the United States Naval Medical Research Institute at Bethesda, Maryland: "There have been many attempts with much more elaborate equipment to extend Carrel's studies, but none of the more recent efforts have succeeded in long term functional organ preservation. If only histological criteria of current techniques are compared with those published in Carrel's book, his results far exceed the best studies with the newer techniques."

In accord with the spirit of the foregoing compliment, some important experiments have been under way at Bethesda. Replicas of the famous Carrel-Lindbergh perfusion pump have been constructed, and Carrel's organ culture techniques extended. A
forthcoming report from these investigators will
describe in part what may well be a striking new
development of this phase of Carrel’s work.

The meaning of Georgetown’s Carrel Collection
for our own time has been summarized by Dr. Theo­
dore Malinin who, more than any other scientist, has
been exploiting the great Frenchman’s results and
insights. “The Collection,” he declared, “has an
enormous scientific and educational value to investi­
gators concerned with tissue culture and the preser­
vation of cells, tissues, and organs in vitro [i.e., out­
side the parent body].” He pointed out that the
Collection contains a complete set of photographs of the
original cell cultures maintained in Carrel’s labora­
tory. “Histological sections of organs,” he said, “cul­
tured in the Carrel-Lindbergh apparatus [developed
for Carrel by the famous aviator], and the notebooks
and protocols of the experiments are of great aid to
investigators who wish to reproduce the same experi­
ments and use his techniques.”

Besides the materials of proven worth, there are in
the Collection some “leads” of possibly great value
but as yet not exploited.

From 1929 until the end of 1934, Carrel conduced
at the Rockefeller Institute a series of physiological
and psychological experiments on mice. The results of
these studies have never been published.

Although Carrel did not claim that the investigation
had been completed to his full satisfaction, he re­
marked in 1936 that a further prosecution of the
experiments might lead to the discovery of substances
“which . . . could increase the efficiency of the end­
ocrine glands, and other tissues.” He noted also that
“this vast field has remained almost entirely unex­
plored.” He felt, moreover, that “the results already
obtained [by his studies on the mice] indicate that,
by artificial means, stronger resistance to disease,
greater prolificity, more muscular strength, and pos­
sibly more intelligence can be given to animals.”

Dr. Albert Ebeling, one of Carrel’s closest asso­
ciates at the Rockefeller Institute, though not directly
involved with the “mousy” project, assured the pres­
ent author a few years ago that, in his judgment, a
thorough re-examination of the records of these ex­
periments would be extremely likely to yield valuable
results.

In the summer of 1965, two researchers inspected
the Collection’s records relating to the exchange of
blood between animals and in particular the effect of
blood from young dogs when infused into the older
dog. This study was a part of an investigation of
the causes of senescence in human organisms. The
visitors were deeply impressed by what they found
in Carrel’s reports. “After going through the Collec­
tion,” they stated, “the work that Dr. Carrel did be­
comes more alive and meaningful.” They declared
that much of the Carrel findings and leads for fur­
ther experimentation in the field had not since his
time, as far as they knew, been duplicated in the
literature; and they felt that what they gathered from
the Georgetown archives would be of great utility for
their researches.

Carrel’s insatiable curiosity about nature carried
him into areas of investigation remote from his pri­
mary interests. During the late 1920’s and early 1930’s
he performed some experiments in the field of what
he called “tactile sensibility,” involving the special
ability of persons to experience sensations at a dis­
tance. For example, he asserted that subjects of pro­
nounced sensitivity could feel the prick of a knife
when the latter was pointed at them from a distance of several inches or even several feet.

At the time when he was engaging himself with these investigations, he had been strongly urged by Professor J. B. Rhine, the noted parapsychology expert of Duke University, to publish the findings. This Carrel never did, since he felt that the experiments required further confirmation.

The records of the work describing and summarizing his results are in the Carrel Collection. In the fall of 1965 they were read by an expert in the field, Dr. Carroll B. Nash, of St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, and evoked from him these observations: "I found Carrel's reports fascinating... His findings are original and should be published, as at some future time they will be fruitful for further work. While his methodology will have to be made a great deal more rigorous, his results are certainly valid as far as they go, which is to a considerable extent."

Dr. Malinin's work with the Collection has won praise from outstanding specialists in the field of tissue and organ culture. Among these scientists is the above-mentioned Dr. Raymond C. Parker, who declared that the Georgetown expert was doing "a grand job." The result, in part, of his investigations with the Collection, Dr. Malinin's recent book, *Preserving and Storage of Viable Human Tissues* has been warmly praised in professional circles.

Last December in the rooms of the Carrel Collection, in St. Mary's Hall, there was staged a laboratory demonstration on the use of the Carrel-Lindbergh method for culture of organs. The demonstration was unique inasmuch as these classical experiments of Carrel and Lindbergh originally performed in the late thirties were not repeated until 1964 by the scientists at the Tissue Bank, Naval Medical Research Institute. (Dr. Malinin serves as a guest scientist at the Tissue Bank.) The work with the Carrel-Lindbergh apparatus was initiated by Lieutenant V. P. Perry, M.S.C., U.S.N., with Dr. Malinin, and the first report of their success was given by these workers at the Tissue Culture Association meeting in 1965. For the demonstration there was used one of the rare duplicates of the Carrel-Lindbergh perfusion pump. (These replicas are valued at $1,000 each.) Placed in the apparatus was a monkey's heart extirpated from the animal's body a few hours before. As the watchers drew nearer to the display they could see the heart pulsating regularly, just as it would have done in its parent organism. This result was continued for several hours. Dr. Malinin has stated that such hearts can be maintained pulsating for two or three days.

In another respect Carrel is immensely important for the present age, and indeed anticipates one of its newest and most fruitful attitudes.

A bold and unconventional pioneer in a highly specialized field, he nonetheless displayed a keen interest in problems of philosophy and general education, as witness his internationally known book, *Man the Unknown*, published in 1935. Among his papers at Georgetown are hundreds of hitherto-unpublished manuscript drafts of his writings in these areas.

He held some convictions of which scientists as well as men of wisdom in all fields are becoming increasingly aware: that the chief aim of science and technology should be to serve and not to enslave man; that there is between science and the humanities not an antithesis but a harmony; that no problem involving human beings can be fully solved by one kind of mind alone, but requires the collaboration...
of many different types of mind.

Repeatedly he said first what sober and clear-seeing men are echoing today.

Writing in 1965, Dr. René Dubos, noted biologist of the Rockefeller University, remarked:

“Another cause of incoherence in our societies is that modern knowledge, especially scientific knowledge, relates less and less to human experience. In many cases, the technical apparatus of knowledge reaches into aspects of reality which are beyond human grasp. There is a distinction between scientific knowledge and direct human experience.”

Twenty-eight years before, Carrel had observed:

“The savants have succeeded in creating, even for themselves, a world dehumanized. . . . The scientists would have done better to make themselves complete human beings, and to place themselves in the conditions of normal life.”

Significantly, in the light of recent events, Carrel pointed to the danger inherent in the polluted air of our cities; he warned against the waste of our natural resources of rivers and forests; he foresaw the problems arising from automation in industry, from over-collectivization of society, and from conformism induced by mass communications.

Most relevant to our time, he urged that man should retain a high confidence in his own powers, and especially in his capacity to mould and control his environment. Man, he believed, was a complex of material and spiritual forces; and to undervalue either the one or the other was to court destruction.

Carrel was faulted for his frequent dependence on modes of knowing other than scientific and rational. He felt that we learn the nature of things not only by intelligence but by a spiritual intuition transcending logic or empirical proof. He insisted, further, that the mortal and emotional powers of man are as valuable as those that are intellectual.

Aware as we are of his prophetic insight, we are not surprised to hear his views on these matters reaffirmed today by one of our leading men of science. Said Professor Robert Oppenheimer in 1960:

“In 1945, in 1949, perhaps now, there have been crucial moments in which the existence of a public philosophical discourse, not aimed at the kind of proof which the mathematicians give, not aimed at the kind of verifiability which the biologists have, but aimed at the understanding of the meaning, of the intent, and of the commitment of men, and at their reconciliation and analysis, could have made a great difference in the moral climate, and the human scope of our time. The purpose is the exploration of meaning. The purpose is the exploration of what men wish, intend, hope, cherish, love, and are prepared to do.”

For a university there is no more primary function than the stimulation of creative thinking by vicarious association with the performance of great mind. This is why the Carrel Collection is, by those with eyes to see, regarded as an educational instrument of the highest order, a scientific workshop and archival resource unsurpassed on the campus. It has been Georgetown’s first contact, to this degree of intimacy, with a Nobel Prize-winning scientist.

The lectures and demonstrations of Dr. Malinin have evoked excited interest on the part of students in the area. Research projects by our candidates for higher degrees in the social sciences have uncovered fascinating insights from the unpublished manuscripts in the collection.—Joseph T. Durkin, S.J.
Magee telephoned Army coach Bob Knight and talked with him about Purdue's Boilermakers. The Big Ten club had beaten the Black Knights 69-59 in overtime and were 6-1 after an opening loss to VPI. "They go 2-3, eh? If I put three men by the line... How often do they run? Every time? Well, we'll do what we can with them. They're not going to murder us off the boards... my back court's not strong, kind of weak, as a matter of fact. Got a forward playing back court and another one at center... you've got to pressure the ball with them, eh? Then I've got to play Syracuse, they're a tough club, and are they good!"

In contrast to his assistant's early career, which included All-American honors as a high school quarterback, Magee hadn't the opportunity to perform at that age. He was working afternoons and thus didn't go out for basketball at "If I win, they'll love me!" Cardinal Hayes in the city. He tried out his senior year, but the coach wasn't prone to keeping upperclass newcomers. So, upon graduation, Magee tried his talents in the rugged Parish League filled with ex-college greats and the best of the scholastic ranks. He held his own and polished his back court abilities. A Boston College alumnus caught him in action, and the next thing Magee knew he had earned a scholarship to play ball at the Heights. Basketball had never been the top sports attraction at BC, but as a highscoring guard Magee led the Eagles into their first post-season tourney, losing to Maryland in the NCAA first round, as a junior. BC has been to the NIT twice in the last two seasons.

He played a season with the Trenton (N.J.) Colonials of the Eastern League and then after a stint with Uncle Sam returned to Boston College as a freshman coach. In his first season with a youngster named John Austin, Magee's frosh were 17-0. The great Bob Cousy was named head coach the next year and named Magee as his assistant. He remained in that capacity until last spring and the GU post.

Stories have varied as to just how valuable Magee was to the former NBA playing great. There seems to be no in-between. For the record, a dynasty is in the process of being firmly established in the previously unheralded sport at BC. And clearly on the record are Magee's recruiting activities and his talent in getting some of the best players in the East to play at Boston College. His achievements will no doubt haunt him when BC comes to Washington.

Before O'Keefe's final season at Georgetown (16-8) the cumulative record for the previous twenty years of Hoya basketball showed but 123 victories and 11 losses per annum. On only one occasion since 1906-07 has a GU five won twenty or more games, and that was back in 1942-43 when Elmer Ripley's charges produced the all-time 22-5 mark. Thus, Magee comes to an environment somewhat similar to
the one he found when he arrived at BC.

"I try to do whatever is necessary to win. What a coach must do is try to develop an attitude where each player is completely dedicated to the job he's supposed to do in each game, offensively and defensively. This is an extremely difficult job to get them 'up' mentally and physically each time. Anyone can keep his team alert physically," Magee believes. "Basketball is basically a simple sport. Too many people try to jazz it up and complicate what should be a smooth pattern. If you do a few things right you don't have to worry. If you run an offensive pattern or two and execute them very well, this makes it possible for a coach not to worry about a lot of things."

And during the workout, to a junior guard: "You've been loafing now for three games on defense. You've got speed, strength, and all you're concerned with is shooting." He asks only that his players listen and enact their role as part of a five-man unit. The team. Balance. Some shoot, but only if talent permits. The defensive wizard, he has to cover the opposing hot-shot. You do not dribble if you're a player with poor ball-handling capabilities. Essentials. Listen, react, perform but put out. The challenge is a deep one, and the critics are always quick to point at the vast things.

The talent has been great but in turn it has not achieved court greatness, for whatever elusive reason.

The prematurely gray mentor who holds the reins of Hoya basketball destiny at the moment was named some 56 days after his predecessor announced retirement following six straight winning years.

That Magee has courage can easily be attested to by his keeping a senior captain and his tallest player, a 6-11 senior center, on the bench for most of December. The pair was simply not cutting it out there on the court, and this was not acceptable or tolerable in his philosophy of dedication to excellence. He asks not for the impossible but just the feasible. His players respect him and appear to be willing to make what sacrifice they are capable of in putting out their best and learning it his way. This is essential.

A McDonough veteran who has seen the last four GU coaches makes no comparisons but simply states: "He knows basketball. He teaches fundamentals. Unfortunately, he's going to be judged on the basis of how many games we win. I will say he's one of the most dynamic and fiery coaches we've ever had here. What the future holds, who can tell?"

The subject was switched from personalities to players and their limitations at all schools. "Does the kid want to win? Will he put out? Certainly a coach has to make his players in college believe that pride and desire in winning is what this game demands," the veteran concluded.

Going into the Kodak Classic the Hoyas were 4-3, exactly where they had stood at the same time the previous December. The schedule that far had been curious. Given different fate, the record could have just as easily been 0-7 as 7-0; each contest presented cliffhanger overtones. Magee predicted early his team would win just a few and not by very many points, and that in most instances a loss would not be overwhelming. He had delivered. He was getting decent mileage after the first five encounters. Depth was lacking. Shooting was adequate. Speed was nowhere.

Earlier in the fall he had shunned an invitation to speak before a students' seminar and exchange ideas. What did they know? Magee felt. "Leave the coaching to me. If I win, they'll love me. If I don't, no matter who I am, what's the difference?" Sometimes later he recanted and spoke with them candidly. "Gentlemen, we do not have a good team this year. The talent is short. The depth isn't there." Many eyebrows were raised. This certainly wasn't an indication of confidence.

No matter. Georgetown's coach is a neo-realist and a pluggers. He has made up his mind not to expect more than those he has on his team can produce. But they must try to the best of their ability; nothing less will be acceptable. For Magee, all alibis cease with the center jump.

The Season's Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's University</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph's College</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canisius College</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eastman Kodak Tournament

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairleigh Dickinson</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter's College</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Naval Academy</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan College</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola College</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield University</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Hall University</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do You Know Your Georgetown?

A quiz, based on the latest figures supplied by John J. Pateros, Vice President, Business and Finance, on some of the aspects of the unseen world of the University's support services. Prepare to be surprised now and then when you look at the answers contained in the last box on this page. If you score ten or better, you are definitely vice presidential material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Correct Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many beds are there in Georgetown University Hospital?</td>
<td>a) 850 b) 1,400 c) 7,000</td>
<td>a) 850 b) 1,400 c) 7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University's Planning and Physical Plant employs how many people?</td>
<td>a) 60 b) 1,500 c) 3,800</td>
<td>a) 60 b) 1,500 c) 3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is Georgetown's budget for the current fiscal year?</td>
<td>a) $9 million b) $15 million c) $6 million</td>
<td>a) $9 million b) $15 million c) $6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown's 1965-66 fiscal year ended with a surplus, balance, or deficit?</td>
<td>a) $100,000 surplus b) balance c) $200,000 deficit</td>
<td>a) $100,000 surplus b) balance c) $200,000 deficit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown dormitories house about how many people?</td>
<td>a) 8,500 b) 8,000 c) 4,000</td>
<td>a) 8,500 b) 8,000 c) 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown cafeterias serve how many meals a day?</td>
<td>a) 29,000 b) 6,000 c) 9,000</td>
<td>a) 29,000 b) 6,000 c) 9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many dollars' worth of grants and contracts with federal agencies and private foundations does Georgetown have?</td>
<td>a) $10,000 b) $9,000,000 c) $14,000,000</td>
<td>a) $10,000 b) $9,000,000 c) $14,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many individual grants and contracts are held by Georgetown faculty?</td>
<td>a) 108 b) 516 c) 288</td>
<td>a) 108 b) 516 c) 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many of them are from government agencies?</td>
<td>a) 64 b) 289 c) 505</td>
<td>a) 64 b) 289 c) 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which school has the most grants and contracts?</td>
<td>a) Institute b) Law c) Medical</td>
<td>a) Institute b) Law c) Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the total amount paid annually in salaries and wages at Georgetown?</td>
<td>a) $22.5 million b) $28 million c) $32 million</td>
<td>a) $22.5 million b) $28 million c) $32 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the endowment of the Georgetown Student Aid Program?</td>
<td>a) $750,000 b) $1,000,000 c) $1,500,000</td>
<td>a) $750,000 b) $1,000,000 c) $1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much money is available for graduate fellowships?</td>
<td>a) $400,000 b) $500,000 c) $1,000,000</td>
<td>a) $400,000 b) $500,000 c) $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many students are there at Georgetown?</td>
<td>a) 8,000 b) 7,700 c) 11,500</td>
<td>a) 8,000 b) 7,700 c) 11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many full-time faculty members does Georgetown have?</td>
<td>a) 600 b) 1,500 c) 8,000</td>
<td>a) 600 b) 1,500 c) 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many total faculty members (including part-time)?</td>
<td>a) 800 b) 1,500 c) 8,000</td>
<td>a) 800 b) 1,500 c) 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many people populate the &quot;small metropolis&quot; that is Georgetown University?</td>
<td>a) 8,000 b) 11,000 c) 16,000</td>
<td>a) 8,000 b) 11,000 c) 16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many nonacademic employees?</td>
<td>a) 800 b) 2,400 c) 5,600</td>
<td>a) 800 b) 2,400 c) 5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many automobiles are driven to the campus each day?</td>
<td>a) 1,800 b) 5,000 c) 7,000</td>
<td>a) 1,800 b) 5,000 c) 7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many acres comprise Georgetown's campus?</td>
<td>a) 50 b) 110 c) 340</td>
<td>a) 50 b) 110 c) 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many buildings?</td>
<td>a) 14 b) 34 c) 55</td>
<td>a) 14 b) 34 c) 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many acres of parking are there on campus?</td>
<td>a) 4 b) 16 c) 24</td>
<td>a) 4 b) 16 c) 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many miles of roads?</td>
<td>a) 1.5 b) 8.5 c) 4.5</td>
<td>a) 1.5 b) 8.5 c) 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many telephone extensions?</td>
<td>a) 1,800 b) 6,000 c) 8,000</td>
<td>a) 1,800 b) 6,000 c) 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the University's power load?</td>
<td>a) 2,000 hp b) 6,000 hp c) 15,000 hp</td>
<td>a) 2,000 hp b) 6,000 hp c) 15,000 hp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRIVATE EDUCATION:
OPPORTUNITIES & PROBLEMS

Higher education today faces problems and opportunities unprecedented in our history. As a nation, we have fallen in love with universities and, quite understandably, we seem to think that there is nothing they are incapable of doing. We always tend to believe that those we love can do the impossible. In view of these developments, the universities need to strive hard to maintain their sense of balance. They must retain broad horizons and lofty visions, yet keep a proper perspective and a sense of reality.

It is ironical that during this time of prosperity for higher education, the private universities are under unprecedented pressure. Public educational institutions of all kinds have increased enormously in size and number, and this increase is certain to continue. A 1963 statistical study by the Fund for the Advancement of Education illustrates this development, pointing out that while in 1950 the college population was divided about equally between public and private education, since then the proportions have changed to sixty-five percent enrollment in public institutions, thirty-five percent in private education. The study projects a continuance of this trend, in the coming decades, to a stable point of about eighty percent-twenty percent division between the two systems of education. Let it be said that this development was necessary and providential. Without the great impetus given to higher education by public institutions, we would never be able to meet our national and international needs. Rather than deploiring this turn of events, we applaud it.

The difficulty is that the very success of this movement may constitute a serious threat to our pluralistic system of higher education. In a certain sense, we have no “system” of higher education in America. There is a bewildering variety of institutions, public and private, capable of meeting a diversity of needs, and having many kinds of sponsorship and support. Our national preference has been to retain this pluralism in our colleges and universities. There are, however, voices which cast doubt on the wisdom of continuing this course. I have vivid memories of an educational conference I attended last year. One of the chief participants in this conference, a member of a large nationally-known research institution, disposed of all private education with a wave of his hand.

Fortunately, this attitude is not universally accepted. Private education has found many strong and vocal supporters. Individuals, corporations, and foundations have expressed their concern lest Americans lose the possibility of exercising the options now open to them. One of these, the Ford Foundation, put the matter thus:

“The case for the maintenance and strengthening of private colleges and universities rests largely on the value of pluralism in higher education. A diversity of concepts, ideals, and approaches contributes to the vitality of the entire system. Publicly supported institutions also embody great diversity. But private institutions and colleges generally have greater flexibility and freedom to innovate—to set new goals and undertake new departures.”

The future well-being of private institutions depends largely on private support. True, private universities do receive grants and loans from state and federal governments, just as public institutions are receiving an increasing measure of private support. Nevertheless, it is the private dollar which will make the vital difference. In his address to the National Industrial Conference Board, Neil McElroy, Chairman of the Council for Financial Aid to Education, said:

“The protection of the independence of our colleges and universities—the institutions which prepare our young people for the fulfillment of our own destinyswill come from generous private giving, yours and mine, as individuals and as corporate executives. The importance of this can hardly be overemphasized, because from it higher education will retain its essential margin for freedom.”

Like every other university, Georgetown is also presented with many opportunities and problems. During the past three years, a great deal of time and
study has been devoted to an appraisal of our situation in the light of both needs and opportunities. In last year’s report, I spoke at length of our requirements and plans for the Law Center, the Medical Center, and the University Library. Beyond these, one of our most pressing needs is for substantial additional endowment to enable us to increase faculty salaries and provide more adequate aid to needy students.

Progress Fund
The final determination of a goal for the campaign calls on the University to raise $26,000,000 in a three-year period, beginning in 1966. The campaign will seek funds for several projects and programs:

- **Endowed Chairs** ............... $3,000,000
- **Maintenance of Faculty Excellence** .... 3,000,000
- **Scholarships and Fellowships** ....... 4,000,000
- **President’s Progress and Venture Fund** .... 2,400,000

**Buildings**
- **Law Center** ................. $4,000,000
- **University Library** ........ 4,200,000
- **Medical Center Library** ..... 870,000
- **Enlarged, modernized Dental Clinic** .... 1,760,000
- **Medical-Dental Teaching Auditorium** .... 240,000
- **Basic Science Laboratories Building** .... 2,530,000

We are fortunate in having been granted federal funds, available under various Acts of Congress, in the amount of $7,851,000. This money, together with the $26,000,000 to be raised in our own Progress Fund, will greatly aid Georgetown in realizing this first phase of her priority needs.

On March 25, 1966, it was my pleasure, in the presence of the Vice-President of the United States, to announce our plans formally to the whole Georgetown community at our Progress Fund for Wisdom and Discovery Inauguration Luncheon. Hundreds of Georgetown’s Alumni and friends gathered there heard Vice-President Humphrey pledge his support to Georgetown and call on all “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” he continued “and be remembered as one who carried the torch of learning; be remembered as one who contributed to a living memorial for yourself. The continuity of civilization, the continuity of learning itself; what greater thing could you do?”

“I only hope that the words of the President of this University will be taken very seriously; whatever you planned on doing, redouble it.”

Even before the formal announcement, much had been done. Our Executive Committee, under the able chairmanship of The Honorable John Snyder, together with the Development Board and the Major Gifts Committee, had been working tirelessly with the General Chairman, Raymond Reiss, C’19, to lay the groundwork for the success of our efforts. To each of these dedicated friends and Alumni, and to the entire staff of the Development Office, go my thanks and my prayers for continued hard work rewarded by success.

By the close of the fiscal year 1965-66 on June 30, the Progress Fund had already realized in cash and pledges $4,000,000 of our stated goal. Much, of course, remains to be done. All of us—Jesuits, lay members of the faculty, administration, Alumni, and friends—must pledge with me today ceaseless effort, untiring labor, full measure of devotion, and sacrificial giving to this our most ambitious and most essential effort in Georgetown’s history. We must join together as one in this labor. The next few months will be of vital importance for our Progress Fund. Twenty-two million dollars, over 20,000 gifts, and more than 3,500 volunteers are still needed. I pledge to you that I will expend every effort and make every sacrifice to attain this goal. I call on you to do no less.

The Alumni Association
The Alumni Association continued in 1965-66 the forward progress made in the previous year. President Eugene L. Stewart presented the John Carroll Awards at the 14th Annual Awards Dinner held in Bridgeport, Connecticut, to Joseph P. Cooney, C’26; Frederick F. Ehrsam, L’26; Rosalia L. Dumm, N’48; John F. Donahue, C’22, L’25, and Walter B. Schubert, C’51. On that occasion it was my happy privilege to address the more than four hundred members of the Georgetown family gathered to salute these outstanding Alumni.

The Association’s program of interviewing prospective students was expanded to include three hundred volunteers, completing two thousand interviews, by the addition to the program of the Washington Metropolitan Area Interviewing Committee. With this addition, thirty-three local Alumni clubs in most of the major metropolitan areas of the country are constantly involved in the Alumni interviewing program.

Again in 1965-66 the 12th Alumni Annual Fund brought evidence of the generosity, support, and interest of our Alumni in the programs and objectives of the University. Amounting to more than $350,000, the fund was participated in by 7,700 donors. This increase in the number of donors is indicative of the increased involvement of our Alumni in Alma Mater’s work. To the National Chairman, Edward B. Williams, L’44, to the staff at Alumni House, and to the workers in the field, go my thanks and with them the appreciation of all at the University who will benefit from this Fund Campaign.
March 20 was a significant date in the annals of the Association and of the University. On that day, thirty-six Jesuits attended Communion Breakfasts in as many cities to visit with our Alumni and to hear via national telephone hook-up my own remarks and the especially pertinent messages of our three other speakers, Jacob E. Bindeman, L'37, who spoke for our Alumni of the Jewish faith; Rev. John M. Corn, L'55, of the Episcopal Church; and Rev. Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., C'40, L'56, for the Catholic Church. This, the Second Annual Founder's Day Alumni Commemoration, provided all of us an opportunity to pause in our daily schedule to thank God for the founding of Georgetown and to pray for His continued blessings on each of us and on our University.

Again the reunions at the Hilltop were most successful. During Commencement Weekend it was my honor, together with the Chancellor, Father Bunn, to greet the members of the Class of 1916 and their families at the Golden Jubilee Reunion and to present to them their Golden Jubilee Citations. One of their number was further honored by the Board of Directors of the University when he received the John Carroll Medal of Merit. It was a special pleasure for me to confer that award on Leo V. Klauber, C'16, who for fifty years has been among Georgetown's most loyal sons.

The following weekend the campus was visited by more than 1,000 Alumni and their wives for the quinquennial reunions. The deans greeted them at receptions on Friday, and I welcomed each of them to the campus at the President's Luncheon on Saturday and addressed them formally at the Reunion Banquet on Saturday evening. At that banquet the Association recognized one of Georgetown's truly distinguished Alumni-educators by conferring upon Rev. Frederick Hickey, O.P., A.B.'26, Vice President for Development, Providence College, the William Gaston Award for outstanding contributions to higher education.

The reunions, as they do each year, sounded a final note to the Association's programs. This year brought to a close the splendid administration of Eugene L. Stewart, C'48, L'51, as President of the Association. To President Stewart and his fellow officers the University will always be grateful for their devoted labors in the building of a greater Georgetown. From Mr. Stewart's successor, Louis B. Fine, L'25, we confidently expect a continuation and expansion of the progress of the Alumni Association.

School of Medicine

In March of this year, the School of Medicine received a grant of $302,000 to establish a Laboratory of Clinical Pharmacology. Created to stimulate and assist high
quality fundamental and clinical research in the entire area of human pharmacology and to develop research, training, and teaching in this field, in cooperation with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health, this interdisciplinary and interdepartmental unit will promote research within the existing framework, complementing rather than competing with already established departments.

Georgetown has long been aware of her international role in all areas. For that reason I was happy during the past year to establish the Department of Community Medicine and International Health, under the direction of Dr. Patrick J. Doyle. This new venture projects Georgetown into the forefront of American medical schools as a leader in an emerging program of medical education and adds to our already existing roles of service to our community and to the world.

During the past year Dr. L. S. Lilienfield, Professor and Chairman of the Department of Physiology and Biophysics, visited the faculty of medicine at the University of Saigon, at the request of the Agency for International Development and of Dr. John Rose, Dean of the Medical School. It is our hope that out of this initial contact will grow a program of increased cooperation between Georgetown and the University of Saigon in the training of physicians for that country, in further illustration of Georgetown's international influence on medical education.

Medical research has always been, and continues to be, an important work of the University. To direct our many programs, I appointed Dr. Clifton K. Himmelsbach to be Associate Dean of Medicine and Dentistry for Research. Dr. Himmelsbach will direct the many and varied programs being conducted in our Medical Center.

Additional Foundation Support
In the past year, we received support to continue and expand two programs initiated under Ford Foundation grants. The Ford Foundation awarded an additional $700,000 grant to our Center for Population Research, which has conducted vital research in population control and the life sciences. The Center's initial study will be expanded for another five years—an indication of the progress made by the Center and of the value of the results thus far achieved.

The Ford Foundation also extended an additional $275,000 to the Institute of Languages and Linguistics, for developing English language programs in several universities in Spain, in cooperation with that country's Ministry of Education. To establish and direct these programs in Madrid, Dr. Robert Lado, Dean of the Institute, has been granted a year's leave of
absence. During this time, his office will be under the direction of the Acting Dean, Father Francis P. Dinneen, S.J.

Library Building

In my last report to you, I announced our plans for the construction of a new and badly needed University Library. Since that time, our architects, John Carl Warnecke and Associates, and the Library Planning Committee, under the Chairmanship of Father James B. Horigan, S.J., have prepared and presented preliminary plans and sketches which fulfill our needs, with a building which is at once functional and architecturally compatible with our campus. Few building designs, if any, have ever excited my imagination, but when I reviewed these plans and sketches, I was genuinely excited. We plan to begin construction in early 1967, for completion in the spring of 1969.

We are, therefore, presently three years way from the completion of a building which will give us space for one million volumes and will seat 1,500 students and members of the faculty, as well as providing adequate space for the professional staff of the library. We envision an expansion of our audio-visual department and photo-reproduction department. Space will be available for urgently needed graduate carrels, faculty study rooms, typing rooms, and discussion and seminar facilities. The building will permit us to inaugurate the latest system in library service and provide us with facilities for the development of one of the finest university libraries in the country. Our archives and rare and special book collections will be adequately displayed and available for use by scholars.

The Law Center: Building & Program Development

In my last report to you, I noted the acquisition of a site for the new Law Center facilities. Since that time, Edward Durrell Stone, one of the foremost American architects, has begun to develop detailed plans for the buildings which will provide Georgetown Law Center with one of the finest physical plants in this country. It is still my fervent hope that in 1970 we shall celebrate the 100th Anniversary of the school of law in its new facilities.

Despite the lack of adequate facilities, the academic programs and special institutes of the law school have kept pace both with the expanding needs of the law and with Georgetown’s desire to be of service in the profession.

In August of 1965, we were pleased to receive a five-year $1,000,000 grant from the Ford Foundation for the establishment of an Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure. This Institute, through research and demonstration projects, seeks to improve the administration of criminal justice, with special emphasis on the determination and solution of the underlying problems in our present system of criminal justice. Through the demonstration projects the solutions proposed will be tested and refined in areas not now available for public funds. Under the direction of a policy board of eminent jurists, legal scholars, and public officials, a permanent Secretariat has been established under the direction of Professor Samuel Dash of the faculty of Law. Several research and demonstration projects are already under way, with many to be added in the five-year grant period.

In this endeavor, as in many others, Georgetown seeks to fulfill many purposes—the education of her student body, the improvement of the law, and a role of public service.

This past year, additional funds were secured to continue the Legal Intern Program begun in 1960. Training thirty-four young attorneys as expert trial counsel in criminal law, it provides 16 per cent of the counsel assigned by the Courts for indigents in the District of Columbia. The additional funds provide not only for the continuation of this vital program but also for the establishment of an optional second year of internship for civil law.

Under the direction of Dean McCarthy and Professor Richard R. Molleur, Georgetown administers the D.C. Bail Project. In the months of its operation, great success has been achieved. Congress enacted the Bail Reform Act of 1966 and the Bail Agency Act for the District of Columbia, both of which will eliminate many gross inequities in the administration of bail in criminal cases. This badly needed reform will come about largely owing to the study by Georgetown’s D.C. Bail Project.

In the past year, I was pleased to announce the establishment of the Institute of Law, Human Rights, and Social Values under the direction of Father Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., of the Law faculty. In accordance with Georgetown’s commitments to explore those areas of human experience which involve the fundamental rights of man and his relation to the rest of the world, the Institute will assist the lawyer and the student to come closer to modern social problems. Through this program we can better perform our function of preserving, developing, and transmitting to the legal profession the moral and ethical insights which are special to Georgetown. Group discussions, The Law and Morals Forum, and a lecture series will be the features of the Institute, and a specialized library in jurisprudence will be developed.

The future of this Institute and its anticipated re-
sults are unlimited. As Dean Dean aptly puts it, "We have here the beginning of perhaps the Law Center's most significant educational effort."

Graduate Consortium

In my last report, which detailed the first full year of functioning of the Graduate Consortium, in which we are joined by American University, the Catholic University of America, the George Washington University, and Howard University, I pointed out the success this experiment in education had achieved for the mutual benefit of each of the participants. This past year has brought increased success and greater participation by the member universities and the graduate students enrolled in them. We were happy in May of this year to achieve our goal in the grant of a charter as an independent, tax-exempt, educational corporation, known as the Consortium of Universities of the Metropolitan Washington Area. This corporate status assures autonomy for the Consortium, independence from each of the participating universities, and thus affords it the opportunity of seeking grants, contracts, and financial support for its own operations.

At the present time, my fellow presidents and I, as charter members of the Board of Trustees, are selecting a truly eminent group of individuals to join us as trustees in the coordination and guidance of this important educational innovation. We are fortunate in having as our Chairman, Father Edward B. Bunn, S.J., whose initial involvement in the formation of the Consortium assures our continued success.

Provisional Faculty Assembly

In the spring of 1965, at a meeting of the Faculties, I proposed the formation of a Provisional Faculty Assembly, with the hope that this Assembly would lead to the creation at Georgetown of a Faculty Senate. The response of the faculty was one of overwhelming interest and support. Father Fitzgerald, Father Panuska, Dr. McTighe, and Dr. Herzbrun began work on the proposals necessary for the establishment of a Faculty Assembly. Their work was extensive, and they consulted with several officials from our sister institutions. At the conclusion of their detailed study, they submitted a report to me which called for the selection of a Provisional Faculty Assembly. The purpose and function was described in their report as follows:

This provisional body and its permanent successor should insure full faculty participation in university-wide academic matters, as distinguished from issues which are the concern of individual schools. The permanent senate, although consultative, should, in accord with the powers to be specified by its constitution and bylaws, share responsibility with the administration the burden of government, ultimate authority residing in the President and Board of Directors.

On October 25, at the Fall Faculty Convocation, I was able to report the nearly unanimous vote of support and approval given the report by the Faculties. On November 22, elections were held and the Provisional Faculty Assembly was chosen. I called the first meeting for December 6 and presided pro tem until the election of a Chairman. Dr. Thomas McTighe was elected and presided over the remainder of the meeting, which elected Professor John W. Whelan as Vice-Chairman and Dr. John J. Peradotto as Secretary.

At this writing Committees of the Provisional Faculty Assembly are hard at work considering a number of problems of general interest. A joint committee of the Assembly and the Board of Directors is working on the constitution and bylaws of a permanent Faculty Senate. It is my hope that the labors of this dedicated group of faculty members will prove fruitful to the mutual benefit of the faculty and the University we all serve.

Administration

As the University moves forward to meet the continuing demands placed on higher education in today's world, increased demands are placed upon the University's administrative officers. In June of this year the Board of Directors authorized me to take several steps essential to insure not only the success of our educational objectives but also the efficient operation of the University in the climate of the work surrounding the Progress Fund Drive. To accomplish these ends, I appointed Father Brian A. McGrath, S.J., as my first deputy, with the title of Administrative Vice-President. Into his capable hands I have placed several urgent matters. For some time it has been felt that the statutes of the University were in need of
revision. Father McGrath will be responsible for work in that area. In 1970 Georgetown will have its periodic visitation by the Middle Atlantic States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. In anticipation of that visit, we at Georgetown will conduct our own evaluation, as has been our practice in the past. Again, Father McGrath will undertake the immediate direction of this study. In these two areas alone the experience Father McGrath gained as a member of the faculty, Dean of the College, and Academic Vice-President for the past eleven years, will be of great value to the University. Father McGrath will also direct the Faculty Health Service and the Office of the Director of Public Affairs, which was created in June. Over and above this, Father McGrath as Administrative Vice-President will assist me in many of the duties incumbent upon the President.

To replace Father McGrath, I have appointed, with the approval of the Board of Directors, Father Thomas R. Fitzgerald, S.J., for two years the Dean of the College, as Academic Vice-President. Father Fitzgerald will continue the duties that have been normally those of the Academic Vice-President and the Dean of Faculties.

In an attempt to provide my own office with the essential staff necessary to fulfill our duties to the University, I have appointed Mr. Daniel J. Altobello, C'63, until recently Assistant Executive Secretary of the Alumni Association, as Assistant to the President. Mr. Altobello will provide me with the additional staff assistance deemed necessary. He will be assigned special projects and will direct the clerical and administrative staff under my immediate jurisdiction.

These appointments have been made after careful study and are intended to strengthen the service of the President's Office and the top administration of the University for the greater good of Georgetown.

**Business and Financial Organization**

In August of 1965, after a five-month study by Cresap, McCormick & Paget, Inc., I laid before the Board of Directors a detailed report and several recommendations concerning the organization and administration of the business and financial affairs of the University. For several months I had been concerned that the administration of the University in this vital area was overburdened and understaffed. Since we were about to announce our plans for the $26,000,000 Progress Fund, which would aid us in better fulfilling our educational objectives, we needed also to provide the business and financial leadership to insure the best, most economical, and most efficient administration of our fiscal affairs available. With budgets in excess of $34,000,000, fiscal affairs demanded careful attention. With a proposed building program in excess of $21,000,000, even greater attention, supervision, and control were necessary in the area of planning and physical plant.

When the report was approved by the Board of Directors, I was pleased to be able to relieve Father Collins and Father Haller of many of their duties, affording them each an opportunity to attend to more specialized areas of vital importance to our University. Father Collins assumed all responsibility for the planning, construction, and maintenance functions as Vice-President for Planning and Physical Plant. Father Haller continues to serve as Treasurer, but without the former burden of the controller's duties. This new reorganization gives Father Haller more time to devote to management of our investment portfolio, internal auditing, staff insurance and retirement programs, and grants and contracts administration.

The many other areas, formerly under the direction of Father Collins and Father Haller, were placed under the direction of a new University officer, the Vice-President for Business and Finance. We were fortunate to secure for appointment to that position Mr. John J. Pateros, whose experience in business, finance, and educational administration will bring, and indeed has already brought, many benefits to Georgetown.

With the appointment of Mr. Pateros, we were able to centralize the business functions of the entire University under one person's direction. By reassignment of qualified personnel, and in a few cases by employing new people, we completed our staff with a University Budget Officer, University Controller, and directors of nonacademic personnel, central purchasing, data processing, and auxiliary and service enterprises.

We have now, with the appointment of the Vice-President for Business and Finance, the Vice-President for Planning and Physical Plant, and the revision of the duties of the Treasurer, the necessary staff, professional talent, and outstanding leadership in business affairs so essential to the successful operation, maintenance, and sound fiscal control of a large and complex university.

I have noted this reorganization as an indication that we are not only seeking from our Alumni and friends the financial support we so badly need but that we are also striving to administer available funds in a careful and sound manner. We are providing for our students the quality of education that they and our times demand, for our faculty the compensation and facilities which their high degree of competence and large measure of dedication deserve, and for our
University the time-honored place she has had and still has in the American private educational system.

**Academic Appointments**

In academic leadership, as well as in top administration and financial matters, the 1965-66 school year brought change to Georgetown. In the fall, Dean Rault indicated his desire to retire after his distinguished career in the Naval Dental Corps and his outstanding service to Georgetown. On January 1, I appointed Dr. Charles B. Murto, for thirty-one years a Professor of Crown and Bridge in the School of Dentistry, as Dean. At that time, too, I appointed from among the faculty three Associate Deans of Dentistry: Dr. Robert J. Taylor, for Clinics and Continuing Education; Dr. Gustav O. Kruger, for Curriculum and Graduate Education in Clinical Dentistry; and Dr. George E. Emig, for Admissions and Student Affairs. This new leadership team in the School of Dentistry has provided us with excellent administrative potential in this important professional school.

On January 3, I was pleased to be able to announce that the search for a Dean of the School of Business Administration had been successfully concluded with the appointment of Dr. Harry P. Guenther to that position. The stewardship which Father Joseph Sebes, S.J., had graciously and competently undertaken for eighteen months continued, however, until July 1, when Dr. Guenther assumed the Deanship. Dr. Guenther came to us from our own faculty eminently qualified for the new responsibilities and with outstanding potential for the direction of the rapid progress of the School of Business Administration to the position of excellence so earnestly desired by all.

Father Sebes looked forward to his return to the classroom and to the resumption of his full teaching schedule in the fall. I was again, however, compelled to call upon his administrative talents and vast knowledge of foreign affairs in a leadership post by appointing him Dean of the School of Foreign Service, following the resignation of Dean William E. Moran, Jr.

Concurrently with the promotion of Father Fitzgerald to the Office of Academic Vice-President, Father Royden B. Davis, S.J., was appointed Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Mr. John Burgess, C'63, G'66, was promoted from Executive Assistant to the Dean to the position of Dean of Freshmen of the College. Both Father Davis and Mr. Burgess, as Father Fitzgerald's assistants in the conduct of the affairs of the College, demonstrated the competence and leadership ability which will continue to serve well the educational aims of the College.

On February 1, Dr. Charles D. Shields, who for five years was the Executive Director of the University Hospital and was responsible for both administrative and medical matters in that University division, asked to be relieved so that he could accept the Chairmanship of the Department of Physical Medicine at the University of Vermont. While I was aware that Georgetown would miss the valued services of Dr. Shields, his desire to return to research compelled me to accept his resignation.

At the same time our consultants made several recommendations regarding the organization of the administration of the Medical Center. They pointed out several areas in which a strengthening and clarification of responsibilities in each of the four divisions of the Medical Center would better equip this University division for even greater excellence in its educational and public service.

The study indicated that the extensive duties per-
formed by Dr. Shields could better be undertaken if two positions were created, namely, that of Administrator and that of Medical Director. On February 1, I announced the appointment of Mr. John F. Imirie, Jr. as Administrator; shortly afterward, I appointed Dr. Desmond O'Doherty as Acting Medical Director of the Hospital.

Mr. Imirie's duties include the daily administration of hospital operations, long-range planning, implementation of patient care policies, objectives, and budget preparation and administration.

As Acting Medical Director of the Hospital, Dr. O'Doherty is the Chief of Staff. In this position he is responsible for the development of policies and programs to ensure high quality medical care; he operates and coordinates with the Administrator on medico-administrative matters; coordinates the graduate medical education of interns and residents; coordinates House-Staff relations and ensures their professional direction; and enforces the rules and regulations of the medical-dental staff.

We have in this reorganization achieved a closer operating relationship among the schools and the Hospital to the mutual benefit of both the educational and patient-care functions of our Medical Center.

To supply necessary support to certain administrative areas, several other appointments were made effective July 1. Included in these were the University Editor, Dr. Riley Hughes (as of February 1); the Director of Public Information, Mr. Hal V. Kelly; the Manager of Central Services, Mr. Jack J. Dotsey; the Assistant to the Vice-President for Planning, Dr. Walter C. Hess; the University Administrator of Grants and Contracts, Mr. Harris North; Assistant to the Director of Student Personnel, Rev. Edward A. Geary, S.J.; Associate Dean of the Institute of Languages and Linguistics, Dr. James Alatis; and Mr. John McGee, Head Coach of Basketball.

One appointment is of special note because it gave me an opportunity to recognize the excellent work of the Director of Public Relations, Father Daniel E. Power, S.J., who in his many years of service at the University has contributed greatly to Georgetown's progress. On June 1, Father Power relinquished the position of Director of Public Relations to devote his full energies and time to areas in which his special talents have gained for him and for Georgetown national recognition. With the title Director of Public Affairs Father Power will devote full time to the radio and television Forums, University special events and lectures, the annual film, and the broad field of University-community relations. In his new position, Father Power will report directly to Father McGrath and will be available to lend his many abilities to special projects for Georgetown. For his continuing service, we are all most grateful.

On January 1, Father John Devine, S.J., returned to graduate studies after three and a half years as Director of Student Personnel. At that time, I asked Father Anthony J. Zeits, S.J., who had been serving as Director of the Alumni Annual Fund, to assume the position of Director of Student Personnel. In this new and difficult assignment, Father Zeits is responsible for the life of the student body, dormitories, discipline, and extracurricular activities. While I am well aware that his valued services will be missed among the Alumni, I am confident he will make an even greater contribution to Georgetown in his new position.

Faculty Promotions during 1965-66 included:

**Professors:** Dr. James D. Atkinson (Government); Dr. Mary C. DeRisi (Prosthetic Dentistry); Dr. Louis K. Dupre (Philosophy); Dr. Victor E. Ferkiss (Government); William S. Greenhalgh (Law); Dr. Stefan F. Horn (Translation and Interpretation); Dr. Otto E. Landman (Biology); Dr. Jesse A. Mann (Philosophy); Dr. Thomas P. McGlone (Philosophy); Dr. William J. O'Brien (Government); Thomas J. O'Toole (Law); Dr. Estelle R. Ramey (Physiology and Biophysics); Dr. Bruce Shnider (Medicine).

**Associate Professors** (with tenure): Dr. Thomas K. Burch (Sociology); Dr. Everett N. Cobb (Operative Dentistry); Dr. Rita R. Colwell (Biology); Father Juan B. Cortes, S.J., (Psychology); Dr. James L. Foy (Psychiatry); Dr. William S. Hammond (Philosophy); Dr. Wade B. Irwin (Operative Dentistry); Dr. Alfred J. Luessenhop (Neurosurgery); Father Joseph A. Panuska, S.J., (Biology); Dr. Joseph K. Perloff (Medicine); Dr. Donald C. Reynolds (Medicine); Dr. Paul A. Treado (Physics); Dr. Nathan Z. Zwaifler (Medicine).

**Associate Professors** (without tenure): Dr. John C. Houck (Biochemistry); Dr. John F. Kuritzke (Neurology); Dr. William McFarland (Medicine).

**Tenure (following previous promotion):** Dr. Barry Kibarian (Marketing); Dr. Lutz Leopold (Physics); Dr. Robert B. Lytle (Prosthetics); Dr. Irfan A. Shahid (Arabic).

**Assistant Professors:** Dr. Alexander M. Burnett (Obstetrics and Gynecology); Dr. Hall G. Canter (Medicine); Dr. Jay N. Cohn (Medicine); Dr. Armando G. DiBiasio (Surgery); Dr. William E. Flynn (Psychiatry); Dr. Vincent F. Garagusi (Medicine); Dr. Luke F. Grande (Psychiatry); Dr. George L. Hall (Psychiatry); Dr. Anne Jackson (Microbiology); Dr. Micheline S. Levy (Pediatrics); Dr. Donald J. Massaro (Medicine); Dr. William C. Maysed (Surgery and Urology); Dr. Walter J. Mazella (Period.
$33,880,088, and resources. The operating budget for the year was Our of Mathematics. Dr. Andrew A. Marchetti, who resigned as chairman. During the year, total current income climbed to $34,000,000, or slightly over $86,600,000, with significant increases in Loans to Students, Investments, and in our Campus, Plant & Equipment account. Loans to Students reached an unprecedented total of $2,683,000. We accomplished this through a 40% increase in our Student Loan Funds with the receipt of $727,000 in Federal student loan funds, together with $80,000 in matching contributions from University resources. As of June 30, 93% of our Loan Funds of $2,900,000 was outstanding to over 2,650 present and former students, with 914 loans now in the repayment stage, of which number, only 46, or 5%, are considered seriously delinquent.

The University's Investments increased a little over $3.6 million, principally owing to an increase in the category of Real Estate holdings, with the acquisition of a new office building at 1717 Massachusetts Avenue in Washington, D.C., by assuming outstanding mortgage notes. As of the end of the fiscal year, the market value of our Investments was estimated at $17,021,000, with a book value of $15,517,359, accounted for as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Category</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Commercial Paper</td>
<td>$1,195,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>2,668,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Stock</td>
<td>4,677,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgages &amp; Notes</td>
<td>1,203,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>5,771,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,517,359</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this pool of Investments, our Endowment Funds participate to the extent of their book value of $7,519,000, with an estimated market value participation of $8,553,000. The balance of the pool represents participation by University funds temporarily functioning as Endowment of $4,898,000, by other miscellaneous funds, and by mortgage notes of $2,400,000.

The University's Plant, Campus & Equipment assets increased $3,091,468 to $63,278,827, reflecting the acquisition of the new Law Center site at a purchase price of $2,325,000, as well as the cost of several new construction projects in progress totaling $759,000.

**Fund Balances**

The University's Fund Balances (or what might be termed its Net Worth) increased by almost $3,600,000 to just over $66,704,000 during the fiscal year.
In addition to an increase of $825,000 in Student Loan Funds previously referred to, and an increase of $400,000 in our Endowment Funds, the most significant contributing factor in increasing the University's Fund Balances is our $26,000,000 Progress Fund Drive, which seeks to underpin the University's strained resources in its continuing commitments to academic, faculty, and facility excellence.

**Summary Statements**

The following three statements have been condensed from the University's detailed certified annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966.

**Summary I**

**Balance Sheet**

**June 30, 1966**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$1,341,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>2,628,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans to Students</td>
<td>2,683,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td>434,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>15,517,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Held in Trust by Others</td>
<td>333,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus, Plant &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>63,278,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous Assets</td>
<td>426,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$86,644,392</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$2,812,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes and Mortgages Payable</td>
<td>3,625,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds Payable</td>
<td>10,024,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits &amp; Advances Received</td>
<td>3,478,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,940,332</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Balances</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Funds—Restricted</td>
<td>$ 620,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Funds</td>
<td>2,900,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus, Plant &amp; Equipment Funds</td>
<td>49,924,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Funds</td>
<td>7,519,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Functioning as Endowment</td>
<td>4,897,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous Funds</td>
<td>841,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Balances</strong></td>
<td><strong>$66,704,060</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary II**

**Current Income & Expenditures**

**Year Ended June 30, 1966**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>$10,531,926</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment &amp; Other Fund Income</td>
<td>426,518</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements—U.S. Gov't.</td>
<td>6,182,797</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Support Gifts</td>
<td>2,466,204</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts for Current Use</td>
<td>689,168</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>4,342,416</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital &amp; Clinics</td>
<td>8,800,170</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>440,889</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,880,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>$20,495,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Benefits</td>
<td>1,105,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies, Repairs &amp; Other Exp.</td>
<td>10,718,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Purchases</td>
<td>732,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>614,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>380,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>168,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,216,312</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| University Deficit              | $336,224     |

**Summary III**

**Endowment Funds**

**June 30, 1966**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Amount</th>
<th>Annual Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships &amp; Fellowships</td>
<td>$642,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes &amp; Medals</td>
<td>47,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation Support</td>
<td>3,518,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>100,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Support</td>
<td>734,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Support</td>
<td>357,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose Funds</td>
<td>1,993,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Endowment</td>
<td>124,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,519,066</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The estimated market value of the University’s Endowment Fund of $7,519,066 as of June 30, 1966 was $8,553,280.*
When the S.S. Hope first weighed anchor off the coast of Peru, a dozen people and a "sick-looking cow" were present to witness the arrival of the world-famed hospital ship with its complement of doctors and nurses. And one of the Peruvians held aloft a sign calling Georgetown alumnus and faculty member Dr. William B. Walsh, founder and president of Project HOPE, and his shipmates "Yankee Warmongers"!

Ten months later, after effectsing a quiet revolution for health by means of hospital care on board, the setting up of clinics on land, and the training of Peruvian doctors and nurses in modern methods—part of the time while a political revolution was going on around them—the staff of the S.S. Hope left Peru. This time it was to the cheers of forty thousand people, with the blessing and appreciation of Archbishop Perez Silva, and a testimonial volume containing ten thousand signatures.

As though symbolically, the joyous leave-taking ceremonies were turned into tragedy; several people were injured on the pier, and the ship's hospital was quickly reactivated for a parting mission of mercy. When the ship sailed away, it was gaily decorated with colored streamers and signs "Adiós, Amigos."

Since its first healing and training mission in 1958, Project HOPE and its hospital ship have experienced triumphs and problems, successes and reverses. In addition to visiting Peru, Project HOPE ("Health Opportunity for People Everywhere") has brought modern medical techniques to Indonesia, South Vietnam, Ecuador, Guinea, and Nicaragua. Thus the world's three "have-not" continents, Asia, Africa, and South America, have experienced the ministrations of this particular American mixture of head-headed know-how and humanitarians.

HOPE is on the seas again. On February 7 the S.S. Hope left Philadelphia on a ten-month mission in Colombia. Once again, the physicians, dentists, and nurses of the S.S. Hope, a 15,000-ton former Navy hospital ship, will be, as Archbishop Perez Silva put it, "spreading their goodness" in "a gigantic campaign of goodness and help."

If past history can serve for prognosis, HOPE, after whatever difficulties and setbacks, will add another glowing chapter to what the Archbishop called its "prosperous pilgrimage throughout the seas of the world."

"It was the maiden voyage of a unique idea," Dr. Walsh says of his first mission, to Sumbawa in Indonesia. "We were a people-to-people mission to heal, and to train men and women in the emerging nations to heal their own."

As for problems of adjustment: "We learned from everything that happened, and rarely made the same mistakes twice. Our beginnings in Indonesia and Vietnam were dramatic, and the impetus is still felt in the East—as well as sending us on to other continents. Now we know that we must go on, and on; that we are needed and wanted all over the world in the years to come."

The statistics of HOPE's achievements are impressive. In six years, HOPE teams have trained more than 3,000 physicians, dentists, and para-medical personnel. Further, they have treated more than 100,000 persons, conducted some 8,000 major operations, and vaccinated more than one million people.

A significant aspect of the mission of HOPE is that it is not simply a matter of cure-and-run. HOPE maintains activities in all areas it has visited. The permanent medical staff of the S.S. Hope serves for token compensation and is supplemented by volunteer physicians, surgeons, and dentists who serve for two-month periods on a rotating basis. In addition to classroom instruction and on-the-job training aboard the ship, HOPE teams work in shore-based clinics, hospitals, and medical schools, all with the cooperation of local medical organizations.

HOPE, the complex organization of a simple idea, is the brainchild of a remarkable physician who went, in what now seem to be imperceptible steps, from private practice to a full-time involvement with a worldwide clientele. It is a busy life, from surgery on shipboard or demonstrating the ship's "Iron Cow" (a machine that makes milk by combining sea water with a special powder) to briefing and planning sessions with physicians and governmental figures of host countries to HOPE. Yet through it all—and of course because of it all—Dr. Walsh has found time to write two books: A Ship Called HOPE and Yanqui, Come Back!, both published by E. P. Dutton.

Born in Brooklyn, N. Y., in 1920, William B. Walsh received his B.S. degree from St. John's University in 1940. He then began his long association with Georgetown, graduating from the School of Medicine with an M.D. in 1943. Dr. Walsh, the father of three young sons, began private practice in Washington in 1946, following three years in the Medical Corps of the Naval Reserve. He received the Alumni Association's John Carroll Award in 1961, and in 1962 Georgetown University awarded him the degree of Doctor of Science, honoris causa.

Among his other citations and awards are Knight of the Magistral Palms from the government of Peru, the Humanitarian of the Year Award (1961), the National Citizenship Award (1963), and, early this year, the International Education Award. When Dr. Walsh received this award, Ambassador Eugene M. Anderson, of the United States Mission to the United Nations, spoke for multitudes when she said: "We salute Project HOPE for its compassionate dedication to mankind, for literally bringing hope to thousands of people, and for having become a symbol of American international good will." ~
Nominations

Dear Alumnus: The Constitution of the Georgetown University Alumni Association, Inc., grants each alumnus the right to participate in the election of officers and members of the Board of Governors of the Association by secret written ballot.

The procedure for elections specified in the Constitution calls for four steps:

1. A Nominating Committee appointed by the President submits to the Executive Secretary a list of nominees for the various offices and vacancies on the Board of Governors to be filled by election.

2. The Executive Secretary is then required to publish and circulate among all the members of the Alumni Association the list of nominees suggested by the Nominating Committee.

3. During the period ending two months before the date of the election, upon the petition of 50 members filed with the Executive Secretary, the name of any member eligible for election to office shall be added to the list of nominees for that office. The date of the election is June 30. Consequently, petitions signed by not less than 50 members for the addition of nominees to the ballot must be received at Alumni House no later than April 30, 1967.

Positions to be filled include that of Vice President for the College of Arts and Sciences, the Graduate School, the Schools of Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Law, Foreign Service, and Business Administration, and the Institute of Languages and Linguistics. In addition, there are 19 Regional Board members to be elected. To qualify for the Vice Presidency or Regional Board Membership, the nominee is simply required to be an alumnus of the University.

4. Each alumnus will receive a ballot listing all nominees on or before May 20 and returnable on or before June 30. An Election Committee appointed by the President will receive, preserve, and tally the results with the Executive Secretary.

This letter constitutes the publication by the Executive Secretary of the list of nominees suggested by the Nominating Committee under the chairmanship of Leo A. Codd, L'22, G'23. The nominees are listed to the right.

Cordially,

Bernard A. Carter
Executive Secretary
Georgetown University Alumni Association, Inc.

1967 Nominees

for Alumni Association Officers and Board of Governors

Vice President-College

Vice President-Graduate School
Captain Rita Lenihan, USN, G'45, 4000 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Wash., D. C. Director of WAVES and Asst. Chief, Naval Personnel.

Vice President-School of Medicine
Dr. Francis E. Barse, M'S0, 315 Knoll Top Lane, Haddonfield, N.J. Member, Alumni Senate. Active interviewer, Physician.

Vice President-School of Dentistry
Dr. Adrian J. Levesque, D'33, 12 Amherst St., Nashua, N.H. Member, Board of Governors. Active Fund worker and interviewer. Former President, New Hampshire Alumni Club. Dentist.

Vice President-School of Nursing

Vice President-School of Law
Jacob E. Bindeman, L'37, GL'39, 3020 Brandywine St., N.W., Wash., D. C. Member, Board of Governors. Member, G.U.A.A. Athletic Committee. Active Fund worker. Attorney.

Vice President-School of Business Administration
George R. Houston, B'61, 6212 Madawaska Rd., Wash., D. C. Member, Board of Governors. C.P.A. Active Fund worker and interviewer. Instructor, School of Business Administration.

Vice President-School of Foreign Service
Edward M. Castle, FS'40, 4805 Drummond Ave., Chevy Chase, Md. Member, Alumni Senate. Active Fund worker. Builder.

Vice President-Institute of Languages & Linguistics
Larry H. McReed, BSLA'61, 600-D Hibbard Drive, Chapel Hill, N.C. Active Fund worker. Class Representative. Assistant Professor.
Board of Governors-Region I
Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont.

Dr. Paul J. McQuillan, FS’52, L’56, 120 Sylvan Road, New Britain, Conn. Active Fund worker and interviewer. Attorney.

Dr. William F. Duyer, D’50, 20 East Main St., Waterbury, Conn. Active Fund worker and interviewer. Dentist.

Dr. Francis A. O’Toole, C’31, 270 Chestnut St., Clinton, Mass. Member, Boston Club Admissions Committee. Physician.

Terrence J. Murphy, Jr., C’52, 20 Honey Hill, Norwalk, Conn. Former President, Connecticut Alumni Club. Active Fund worker and interviewer. Attorney.

Board of Governors-Region II
Delaware, Maryland (except the counties of Prince Georges and Montgomery), New Jersey (except the counties of Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Passaic, and Union), Pennsylvania.


Board of Governors-Region III
The five Boroughs of New York City, plus Nassau, Westchester, Rockland, and Suffolk counties of New York State, and the five Northern New Jersey counties of Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Passaic, and Union.


Dr. John R. Zoonz, C’46, M’47, 501 Saddle Ridge Road, Woodmere, N.Y. Active Fund worker. Physician.


Board of Governors-Region IV
Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin.


Board of Governors-Region VI
District of Columbia plus Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties, Maryland, and Arlington and Fairfax counties and the free cities of Alexandria, Virginia, and Fairfax, Virginia.

Dr. John C. Rose, M’50, 3900 Reservoir Road, N.W., Wash., D. C. Active in Fund Programs. Dean of G.U. Medical School.

Thomas N. Exarhakis, FS’48, 5012 Euclid Drive, Kensington, Md. Member, Alumni Senate. Former Secretary and President, Alumni Club of Metropolitan Washington. Vice President, Government Employees Insurance Co.

Daniel J. Altobello, C’63, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. Assistant to the President, Georgetown University.


Dr. Gerald H. McAteer, M’37, 3220 Cathedral Avenue, N.W., Wash., D. C. Member, Capital Campaign Executive Committee. Surgeon.

Board of Governors-Region VII
Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia (except the counties of Arlington and Fairfax, and the free cities of Alexandria and Fairfax), and West Virginia.

Nicholas J. Lombardi, C’38, 1879 Mt. Royal Drive, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia. Systems Manager, Walker Division, ITE Circuit Breaker Co.

*Regions not listed have no vacancies this year.