Comment

The cover photograph for this issue and some of the photographs accompanying our photo essay “The Changing Campus Scene” help to highlight changes and developments in the University’s Medical Center. The accent falls, properly, on the healing arts themselves and on the extensive evacuations marking the first step of the Center’s development of facilities. There is another aspect of the Medical Center story just recently revealed which does not lend itself easily to pictures, but which, as it is of the gravest concern to the University and her alumni, deserves comment here.

To approach the matter from the angle of “hard news” at this writing, the President of the University, under the authorization of the Board of Directors, has appointed a special committee to “explore and make recommendations on the financial, educational, legal, and other factors involved in establishing a separate corporation for the Georgetown University Medical Center.” Among the areas to be explored are organization and leadership, academic relationships, finances, and property. This committee will submit monthly progress reports beginning March 1 and its final report on June 1.

So striking a change in a University relationship which has lasted for over a century does not, of course, come about without a context and a history. About five years ago the University began study of a master plan to fulfill the needs of Medical Center development through 1985. The construction now under way on campus implements part of that master plan. The plan calls as well for a major addition to the University Hospital, which although only twenty years old, is obsolete and inadequate in the light of the demands of the contemporary needs, in education and in patient care, of a first-class university medical center.

Toward the construction of this addition to the University Hospital, the United States Congress has awarded Georgetown an unusual grant of $7.2 million, with the University to provide $3.6 million, for a total of $10.8 million. A recently completed planning study of the projected hospital addition reveals, however, that total expenditure for the hospital and equipment will come to $19 million. Hence a $8.2 million gap, a matter of no small consequence to a university as slenderly endowed as Georgetown.

The alternatives which this situation presents were carefully studied by the Board of Directors. One alternative would be to cancel the hospital addition program. The consequences of such an action would be severe. This would be to impair seriously the educational programs of the Medical Center, particularly of the School of Medicine. Cancellation would do no more, perhaps, than postpone the construction of a hospital addition some five years hence, at greater cost and without assurance that an extraordinary federal grant would be forthcoming. Further, there would be the immediate burden of approximately $1.7 million to absorb in fees and other present commitments.

A second alternative would be to proceed with the plan for the hospital addition under the Medical Center’s present legal and corporate structure. To do this would be to invite the danger that the University would be assuming a staggering burden of indebtedness. It is not reasonable to expect that the University could raise the needed $12 million in the next two or three years. Consequently this sum would have to be borrowed and the general credit of the University pledged. Were this to happen—for the hospital’s success in generating the necessary interest and debt amortization could be prevented by unforeseen circumstances—the rest of the University would be impeded in development and seriously affected in morale. Such an obligation for the Medical Center would be disportionate and at the expense of the other segments of the University.

The remaining alternative, and the one now being explored by the special committee, is to proceed with the proposal for the hospital addition and to take steps to protect the University from possible adverse financial impact. The most viable means of achieving stability would, it would appear, be the separate incorporation of the School of Medicine, the School of Dentistry, the University Hospital, and, possibly, the School of Nursing. Such a corporation would operate under its own chief executive officer and board of directors. The degrees of these schools could continue to be granted through Georgetown’s educational charter. “It is our earnest desire,” Father Campbell has said, “that the future corporate structure will make it possible for Georgetown University and the Georgetown University Medical Center to move forward at a rapid pace and without impeding each other’s growth....”

Interestingly enough, a separate incorporation for the Medical Center would, in a sense, confirm an earlier relationship between the School of Medicine and the University. When, in 1849, in Father Ryder’s administration, the privately controlled school and infirmary became part of Georgetown University, the finances of the new unit were separate from those of the University as a whole; the full assimilation of the School was a later development. Thus in meeting the new challenges, financial and corporate, of our day, the University can be seen as returning to, rather than departing from, a Georgetown tradition. It is in this light that the Alumni, particularly those of Georgetown’s outstanding institutions of medical education and research, will wish to view this latest development in the University’s fulfillment of her responsibilities to the local community and to the nation.  ~ Riley Hughes, Editor
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Homily for the Mass of the Holy Spirit, October 2, 1967

"Get up and go into the city, and you will be told what you have to do." (Acts 9:6)

If I were to start this homily with an inner prayer, it would be a call to God to wash all jargon from my mouth and to help me say a few credible and necessary words about the University and the City.

This means speaking about you, each of you, and about your common enterprise of learning and living together here on this Hilltop. It also means trying to see today how you and I, and all the real and potential treasure of our Georgetown Hilltop, must somehow—through our wisdom and love—be transported out beyond our gates into the homes, streets, offices, and courts on which the face of the Healy Tower clock peers down.

In a word, how does Georgetown go down the hill to join the City?

The University and the City—this is our theme. Today, we know well, the University and the City cannot live apart.

In a brilliant address, delivered two months ago, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, insisted that where universities and cities were concerned good fences do not make good neighbors. Down with the fences, he said in effect, "We are called upon," said Mr. Howe, "to plan our campuses for community involvement."

Then he went on to state: "The American university cannot be a withdrawn, uninvolved intellectual enclave while there is violence in our streets. . . . We must take the best minds in our institutions and turn them loose on the complex of urban problems—housing, law enforcement, transportation, air pollution, water pollution, rats, jobs and job training and retraining, meaningful programs for undereducated adults and monosyllabic preschoolers."

Georgetown University has done a lot, and it plans to do more, to answer the Commissioner's challenge. But there is so much more to do.

Do you recall those old days when we thought that we in the U.S.A. were immune from the troubles of the rest of the world and were safe and secure in our wealth, health, and constitutionally guaranteed freedoms? Those days are no more. Today we have learned that we are in the world with everyone else—of all colors, beliefs, and national aspirations—and that they and we sink or swim together.

National isolation is dead. We know this now, as we did not know it fifteen or twenty years ago. We belong to the world community and today we admit that allegiance. So, too, isolation is now dead for the universities. The hour has come for them to end their stand-off stance with respect to the urban communities in which they exist.

No more fences. No more "gownies" vs. "townies." Any ivory tower we build from here on must be a condominium, whose title is held jointly by the professor and the man in the street.

If we take those ideas seriously, then a whole host of consequences spring up and demand attention.

First, consider the very way we shall plan our buildings, all those new structures we are going to need for the vastly greater number of students we shall soon be called upon to serve. Those buildings must be made to smile, not frown, on the city that surrounds them. They must look open, and be open, to the world.

Our use of space—whether it be lawns or playing fields or the square-footage of classrooms—must be plotted in such a way as to bring the community in, not barricade it out.

Our libraries have to learn to live with the needs of those who are not candidates for degrees. All the aids to education that are housed in them will have to be shared, from now on, with those who hunger for learning, but cannot pay for it.

Our various schools and departments will plan their course offerings in such a way that the windows of every seminar or classroom will be open to the air that blows in from the City. This means that to some real extent, no matter what the discipline may be that is learned in any class or lecture hall, there should be a part-time urbanologist—something, of Daniel Patrick Moynihan—in every professor and student.

There are no alternate choices. To lapse for a moment into the official jargon of the federal government, our options are not open.

If we have learned anything at all from Watts, Rochester, Milwaukee, Newark, Detroit, Chicago, and a dozen other cities, it is that we shall survive as a nation only if we reshape the souls of our cities in a
mould of justice, enlightenment, and Christian love. And the universities must help this dream to come true.

As the Fordham sociologist, Father Joseph Fitzpatrick, said not long ago to a teachers' conference, "We face the sad but growing possibility that the Negroes, in desperation, will embrace the only alternative that many members of our white family hold out to them—a separate Negro people, even a separate Negro nation. God deliver them and us from the failure of Christian love."

To us at Georgetown—to universities all over the country—this is a mountain-high challenge.

The problem is to learn how to harness all the good will and learning of our colleges and universities to the work of serving the needs of our teeming cities.

But even to pose this problem is to mouth a platitude. Indeed, it has been mouthed over and over again at educational conventions and in bull sessions in bright college cafeterias.

How are we going to break out of the realm of generalities and begin to get the job done?

Who will show us the way? Who will have the daring to carry on the truly remarkable work that some few have begun?

At Georgetown (and it is one of the reasons I am proud to be a member of the University's Board of directors) you own GUCAP, the Georgetown University Community Action Program, has shown the way. Almost 400 students, toiling in forty projects—tutoring Negro children, teaching English to Cuban youngsters, breaking through the loneliness of the mentally ill, nursing the elderly, counseling alcoholics—have spent thousands and thousands of hours to show us the way here in Washington.

We are all proud of GUCAP. Justly so. We are happy, too, that all this work goes on here under the kindly, encouraging eye of an Archbishop who has not only worked hard himself, but shed blood, so to speak, in the cause of the City and of interracial justice.

Universities, like all human enterprises, tend to develop hardening of the arteries after a while. New ideas don't easily gush in. They seep in slowly like glucose into a patient at the hospital. A wit once said that changing a curriculum is as hard as moving a cemetery, and this is no overstatement.

So how do we get this University, or any university, to shake itself, get going, experiment, improvise, learn to grow limp, as it were, before the onrush of new ideas.

We need flexibility at an hour like this. We need to loosen up the structures so that something fresh and creative can get started.

In this respect, we can learn from our friends, the Hippies, over at Dupont Circle. We need not take off our shoes, smoke "pot," or paint flowers on our cheeks, but we can at least listen to them.

For we can let the Hippies teach us the one lesson they are trying to get across—that old structures and systems in which persons and ideas are shaped almost entirely by institutions must be changed.

If our universities are going to do what they must do for the cities, then they must break with the past. They must develop great reservoirs of freedom and flexibility. They must release the untapped energies of the persons who make up the university community.

Here, I agree again with Father Fitzpatrick, who insists we must have "systems in which persons work within flexible structures so that they may form themselves."

This will mean that our university communities have to think up hundreds of "happenings" in the beckoning days that lie ahead for higher education. Otherwise we shall fail the cities and we shall fail ourselves.

More important, we shall have failed that Holy Spirit of God whom we invoke at this Mass to guide us down the days that lie ahead.

And we shall have failed Christ Our Lord, at whose altar we gather today—He who once, in a great "happening" on the road to Damascus, said to his future Apostle Paul: "Get up and go into the city, and you will be told what you have to do."

Like Saul, who became Paul, let us rise up and go where we are bidden and do there what needs so desperately to be done!

∼ Thurston N. Davis, S.J.

Father Davis, C'37, G'41, also holds degrees from Woodstock College and Harvard. He has taught philosophy at Fordham, and was editor-in-chief of America and The Catholic Mind from 1955 to 1968. He is director of the John LaFarge Institute.
A Dialogue of the Decision-Makers

A great many questions are today being raised among the students and practitioners of American foreign policy. The questioners divide easily into two camps, those who favor continuation if not expansion of U.S. international commitments, versus those who favor their diminution or outright elimination. The central question is clear to both parties, "What constitutes the vital interests of the United States?"

The question is, of course, as old as the nation, but it has taken on a unique importance from the magnitude of the responsibilities now being borne by the United States. In broad brush strokes, the responsibilities include membership in four regional defense alliances, with active participation in a fifth, mutual defense treaties with 42 nations, and membership in 53 international organizations. A substantive complement to these 100 commitments are private and public overseas investments totaling a very minimum of $110 billion.

In an effort to provide each of these commitments with a credible amount of security, the United States has invested hundreds of billions of dollars in defense forces and materiel. Of the over 4.5 million civilian and military employees of the U.S. Department of Defense, more than one million are servicemen stationed outside the United States in 30 countries and on all the major oceans of the world. Combat forces are supported with about 1700 nuclear-tipped intercontinental ballistic missiles, both land- and sea-based, 600 long-range aircraft, and 1000 commissioned ships. It has been said that ours is the most formidable military force ever assembled by one nation.

The interplay of the theory, logic, and arithmetic of these facts constitutes a puzzle of almost infinite variety and fascination; but as a matter of practical management the puzzle is a morass of agonizing choices and obscure objectives in our age in which mismanagement can bring almost instant destruction to nearly any person or place on the face of the earth.

The persistence of the questions and the fearful consequences of wrong answers prompted Georgetown University five years ago to join with a group of concerned individuals headed by Admiral Arleigh Burke to form a new organization called the Center for Strategic Studies. Admiral Burke, former chief of U.S. Naval Operations and director of several of the nation's largest corporations, needs little introduction to Georgetown's faculty and alumni. But the Center of which he is director probably does.

The Center is a very small member of the new breed of institutions popularly called the "think factory." More
than 200 of these hybrid institutions have sprung up over the past twenty years, and in almost every instance they represent an effort to cross theory with practice. As its name would indicate, the Center concentrates its attention on problems of national security, which embraces not only the military, but many of the economic, political, and social aspects of our nation. While it has purposely leaned toward the practitioners' side of the policy process, Georgetown's Center has maintained its independence and flexibility by steadfast refusal to accept financial support from any branch of the federal government or contracts from any organization, public or private. Depending solely on contributions from private enterprise, foundations, and individuals, the Center has kept its administration and staff at a minimum. Its staff today numbers less than twenty.

Among the principals on the permanent Center staff are its executive secretary, David M. Abshire, who received his Ph.D. from Georgetown in 1958. A fellow Georgetown Ph.D. ('58), Cornelius D. Sullivan, a former Air Force intelligence officer, now heads Center research. Richard J. Whalen, author of the best-selling biography of Joseph P. Kennedy, _The Founding Father_, and former senior editor of _Fortune_ magazine, is presently holding the Center's first two-year writer-in-residence grant for work on a new book. James H. McBride, who received his Ph.D. from Georgetown in 1966, recently returned to the Center after completing publication of an exhaustive analysis of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Until his recent death, Dr. Halford L. Hoskins, the founder of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, and a Near East expert, shared the management of the Center's scholastic effort with Dr. Alvin J. Cottrell, author of _Politics of The Atlantic Alliance_. They have been regularly assisted by Georgetown faculty members, such as Henry W. Briefs, Karl H. Cerny, Jules Davids, Eleanor Lansig Dulles, Sigfried Garbuny, and Hisham B. Sharabi. Professors Briefs and Cerny edited the Center's 1965 book, _NATO in Quest of Cohesion_. Dr. Davids and Dr. Dulles have been valuable panelists in two of the Center's new report series: _Dominican Action—1965 and Panama: Canal Issues and Treaty Talks_.

Size alone would preclude the Center from addressing the full range of implications raised by the variety of U.S. policy commitments. Its purpose is much more modest. In principle, the Center is dedicated to a search for alternative solutions to the immediate and particular problems of U.S. national security. In practice, it brings together individuals from such diverse occupations as diplomacy, business, defense, and university education, allowing them to apply their specific talents and experience to select problems in an atmosphere of mutual criticism and advice.

The quality of this process and its wide significance was recently demonstrated in a Center panel study of the troubled relations between the United States and Panama. Much of the study's substance was developed in a series of face-to-face discussions among such panelists as former U.S. Ambassador to Panama Joseph S. Farland, Georgetown's Jules Davids, the University of California's Donald M. Dozer, Covey T. Oliver, since then appointed Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, former A.E.C. general manager Major General K. D. Nichols, the vice president and general counsel of the United Fruit Company Victor C. Folsom, and others. This panel's report on what could and could not be expected from the negotiation of new treaties between these two republics captured headlines in the Republic of Panama, drew a 16-page Congressional attack, and prompted commendation from the editorial pages of the _Washington Post_.

Less dramatic but equally significant results followed a Center panel study of the impact of the Vietnam war on the American economy. In this instance the panel was headed by Procter & Gamble Board Chairman, and former Secretary of Defense, Neil McElroy, and included Professor Otto Eckstein, President Allen Wallis of the University of Rochester, and former Defense Department Comptroller Wilfred McNeil.

A close look at the Soviet military technological challenge, another Center project just completed, has brought the recently retired head of the Air Force's research and development programs (Systems Command), Maj. Gen. Schriever, together with Dr. Harold Agnew of Livermore Laboratories, and the RAND Corporation's Soviet expert, Dr. Thomas Wolfe.

These are only a few of the more than fifty outside experts who have participated in the Center studies within the last twelve months. In the five years of the Center's existence, the work of these and other Center groups has attracted a wide audience, an audience that can best be divided into Washington and non-Washington categories. That in Washington is drawn from the Congress and the various agencies of the government's executive branch. That outside Washington is composed primarily of business executives and university faculties and students. The demands of each differ and, whenever possible, the Center has made special efforts to tailor the final form of its work to their special needs.

A case in point is the Center's one-year-old Special Report Series, designed to bring a subject of urgent concern before the policy-maker in a concise 100 pages of background and policy alternatives drawn up by one of the Center's expert panels. The reports are published as small paperbacks, and in order to make these studies more useful to the Washington audience, the conclusions and comment come first. This is somewhat disconcerting to the traditional book trader, but it is found to be of service to the policy-maker.

The Center shares with the University the advantages of being in Washington, close to the heart of the policy process, and at the same time to the wide variety of communications facilities linking the nation's capital to the nation.
Location also means that many people come to the Center as a natural part of their business activities in Washington, instead of the Center's having to go to them. The access the Center enjoys to the combination of resident policy practitioners and commuting consultants is among its unique characteristics. And again it gives the Center audience an additional dimension in cases where for example a group of young business executives, such as the 2300 Young Presidents' Organization, comes to the Center for a seminar and is given an opportunity to confront not only the government's full-time specialists, but perhaps the visiting and well-known specialist from the West Coast as well.

Seminars of this kind, conferences, and briefings are also part of the Center's work and have been ever since the Center mounted its first major effort in 1963, using its total first year's budget to conduct a three-day conference of about 200 experts on the prospects for national security in the decade ahead. The conference was the first of its kind in the country. The extraordinarily rich diversity of views that arose from those hours of direct confrontation and debate not only placed the Center in the front rank of the institutions addressing these problems, but eventually received wide acclaim when the papers and proceedings were finally published in a mammoth 1000-page compendium. This book is still the most comprehensive work in the field of U.S. strategy.

Subsequent Center efforts have been less herculean. Nevertheless, the fundamentals of live confrontation and the conscious search for diversity have been carried into every area of its work.

The role of the Center in the arena of policy debate varies with the character and intensity of public discourse. At its best, the Center's maximum impact is felt well before the event. The 1963 National Security conference heard a paper that stated "limited war" could cost the United States an additional annual $20 billion by 1967; and the Center's study of the Near East, a casualty of the recent Arab-Israeli war, drew attention more than one year ago to the dangers posed by conflict in that area. Current Center projects are turning special attention to the 1970's, and the particular problems that may arise from the future of the U.S.-Japanese treaty relations, the growth of the Soviet merchant fleet, and Brazil—Latin America's straggling giant.

The Center is not engaged in augury or preternatural perspicacity, but it is attempting to follow the projections of present events into the future and extrapolate from them the sets of assorted alternatives that today's decisions will force upon tomorrow's decision-makers. For as Admiral Burke has stated many times, distilling the years of major decision-making into a phrase, "policy goes wrong because the alternatives are not understood at the time a decision is taken."

M. Jon Vondracek and Harriet B. Hubbard
Mr. Vondracek, a former Washington correspondent for Time magazine, now heads the Center's Communications Department. Mrs. Hubbard is his assistant.
In late spring 1967 the Board of Directors of Georgetown University and the faculties of the various schools approved a constitution establishing the University senate, composed of fifty elective members of the faculties and twelve ex officio academic deans, the academic vice president, the administrative vice president, and the vice president for the Medical Center. Elections were held at the end of the spring semester, and the new senate was convened on September 21 by the president of the University. It has elected officers and approved the selection of its seven standing committee chairmen and faculty appointees to University committees, including Rank and Tenure, the University Budget, Scientific Research, and Planning and Building. The standing committees are now at work, and the full body met December 8.

Representation in the elected membership is assigned to each of three constituent units on the basis of full-time members of the faculty. The liberal-arts constituency (the College, the Graduate School, and the schools of Foreign Service, Nursing, Business Administration, and Languages and Linguistics) elects thirty members. The schools of Medicine and Dentistry elect thirteen, and the Law School, seven. Members of the faculty who are not senators have been appointed to serve on senate committees, or as senate appointees to University committees, since, at its organizational meeting in September, the senate concluded that it would be unwise to deprive itself of expertness not represented in the senate and highly useful to involve as many members of the faculty in University work as possible.
Some indication of the range of interests and functions of the senate can be obtained by examining the present agendas of standing committees. The Committee on Educational Affairs is studying the University's involvement in the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area, the development of a program of continuing education, and the contributions the University can make in finding solutions for urban problems. The Committee on University Budgets and Fiscal Affairs is beginning its work with a study of the University's budgeting procedures. The Committee on University Government is examining a proposed reorganization of the liberal arts schools and redefinition of the functions of deans and the academic vice president. The Committee on Student Affairs is investigating the possibility of extending the range of health services available for students, and is studying a student bill of rights. The Committee on Salaries and Fringe Benefits is working with the University's lawyers and actuaries to effect the transfer of faculty members from the Georgetown retirement plan to TIAA; it is also looking into the effectiveness of the New York Life health insurance plan which was introduced, in place of Blue Cross-Blue Shield, in May 1967. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility is devising procedures for hearings in the event a faculty member wishes to appeal a decision concerning his status. The Committee on Physical Plant is examining the merits of a complaint against the University by a citizen group that relocation of the proposed power plant will adversely affect Glover-Archbold Park.

A quarterly newsletter will cover the work of the senate. Members of the Alumni Association are invited to write for copies of the newsletter to the secretary of the senate, Dr. Keith Fort, Department of English.

Traditionally, college or university senates are bodies intended to provide a means of expression of faculty opinion on academic matters, i.e., those matters on which the faculty has particular competence and concern. Traditionally, also, they have often played an important role in the protection of academic freedom. To these established functions must now be added that of drawing into the management of the University a broad range of talents and a store of energy not previously tapped in systematic or institutionalized fashion. Long-range planning of academic programs and of physical facilities to carry out these programs has always been important. It has now become crucial, as demands upon the University for services multiply and diversify. Such long-range planning requires greater knowledge and imagination than can be supplied simply by deans and other administrators.

Sound planning of program must be supported by equally sound planning for use of financial resources, and by effective management. Here members of the faculty in economics, business administration, and public administration can provide knowledge, advice, and perspective.

But plans, however carefully worked out, can be worthless, if the University is unable to obtain and keep on its faculty and in administrative positions a very substantial number of talented human beings. The building of a strong faculty requires careful joint effort on the part of administration and faculty in recruitment, promotion, and granting of tenure. Equally careful joint effort should be applied to the selection of academic deans and vice presidents, and of the president of the University, who is both the chief academic officer of the University and the chief executive officer.

The preceding makes plain that the tasks of the senate are important, even formidable. I believe that members of the senate are aware of the gravity of their responsibilities, and that they will do all in their power to carry out their assignments. I also believe that neither faculty nor administration can provide all that George-town needs. We must turn to our alumni—and not simply for financial support, but for the incalculably valuable advice and assistance their talents can provide.

Some alumni will doubtless serve on the University Board of Directors from now on. In time, perhaps not very much time, the senate may invite alumni to membership in that body. On behalf of the senate, I express the hope that members of senate standing committees may meet and talk with committees of the Alumni Association about University concerns. We have already made a very good beginning on what it is hoped will be a close working relationship. Already members of the senate have met with the University Board of Directors and plans are being made for continuing contact.

In carefully considered fashion, we must turn also to our students. We cannot impose upon them responsibilities beyond their years, but from them we can determine the relevance of our teaching, and of our University's way of living, and from them we can draw idealism.

The term "creative federalism" may now become more meaningful. I have in measure twisted the definition of federalism, for there is in our University community no formal division of power, as between the nation and the states. There can be a sharing of influence and responsibility among the members of the University community, administration, faculty, students, Board of Directors, and alumni. There must be a sharing of talents, and a co-opting of efforts. This is what American federalism has become, a system in which sharing is the most notable characteristic, rather than an insistence upon formal allocation of power.

In the words of the statement on government of colleges and universities issued in 1966 by the American
Council on Education, the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and the American Association of University Professors, "The variety and complexity of tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others," certainly including alumni. Public and private universities have today become less autonomous institutions; they are pressed to undertake new responsibilities to meet social needs, and they are offered financial support, frequently difficult to decline, from a variety of sources. If the University is to cope successfully with these demands, it must be prepared to meet them with its own generally unified view. The formation of such a view—the evolving of a consciousness of what the University is and what it wants to be—requires the most careful thought and diligent effort on the part of all members of the University community. A constant vigilance over the quality and relevance of the academic program must be joined with rigorous examination of administrative or management practices, and determined efforts to keep abreast of resources available to the university and to interpret the university and its work to the world.

All parts of the University ought also to be participating in the discussion of the nature of the contemporary Catholic university, perhaps using as a starting point the statement issued at Land O' Lakes, Wisconsin, in July 1967 by leading Catholic educators, including the president and vice president of Georgetown. I share the belief of these educators that Georgetown can be a first-rate modern university, and still remain a distinctively Catholic university.

In brief, no longer may members of the faculty have their existence solely within the confines of the classroom and the study; no longer may administrators simply get through their daily tasks; no longer may directors meet briefly in quarterly sessions to ratify what administration and faculty propose; and no longer may alumni give only an occasional fond thought to the Alma Mater. No longer, that is, if what is wanted is an institution of the first quality.

I believe that is what we all most earnestly do want. To attain it, much is required—in money, of course, but also in diligent, devoted effort, in rigorous thought and application of talents, in sincere conviction that Georgetown University, already a good school, can become a fine one.

~ Valerie Earle

Dr. Earle received three degrees from the University of Texas. She has been teaching at Georgetown since 1955, is now associate professor of government, and was elected first president of the university senate.
The Changing Campus Scene

Georgetown University today is, through circumstance and intention, in a time of transition. The spirit of change immediately strikes the returned alumnus or visitor, no matter by which end of the campus he approaches the Hilltop. Physical changes—which are undergoing daily metamorphosis—impose themselves first. Then the perceptive observer discovers the more subtle changes of atmosphere, of the tone of campus life.

If one enters the campus through the main gate he will find that the 37th Street wall has been breached and that the whole area of the old tennis courts has been excavated. From the road at the south end of the Healy Building he can peer down, through peepholes in the construction fence, at the huge maw left by the prow of the bulldozer. Already the footings are in place, and the framework of steel is rising which will frame the first separate library building in the University's 179-year-old history.

At the other end of campus, as one enters from Reservoir Road, there is another vista of removed earth.

Here construction is going forward on what Father Campbell has called the “most ambitious plan” in the history of the Medical Center. A new classroom building, a new laboratory building, and a new Medical Center Library, along with replacement of antiquated facilities within the present structures, will rise to form a “medical city,” so to speak, on the north campus area.

Already up and in use is the large two-level parking garage directly in front of the University Hospital. Parking stations, complete with card-operated barrier arms, dot the campus. If the visitor comes by car, he pays 25 cents an hour to park, 50 cents to attend a basketball game in McDonough. The sentimental, or the sharply scrutinizing, will be quick to notice that nothing now remains of the famous campus Tree, a victim first of lightning and then of dry rot.

From outward appearance the undergraduate would seem much the same as always. The familiar button-down look of old can be seen everywhere. But the new “mod” subculture is in evidence too. One does see...
eighteenth-century sideburns on twentieth-century faces. Here and there male students set off for class sockless and with hair brushing their shoulders. At times, especially in the late afternoons and early evenings, there would seem to be an invasion of the East Campus streets of M Street types, complete with motorcycles. Are these, the visitor wonders, Georgetown students? Some are.

Whatever his (or her) mode of dress, today's undergraduate at Georgetown is very much a part of the contemporary world scene. Students packed Gaston Hall to hear King Hussein of Jordan give an important foreign-policy address. A display of photographs in the Hall of Nations showing the fifty years of Soviet rule in Russia drew a very large number of students. The same celebration caused other Georgetown students to turn up in the picket lines outside the Soviet Embassy. Classes in the "Free University" have attracted numbers of students to hear faculty members, and in some instances fellow students, conduct noncredit seminars in such noncurricular subjects as animal behavior, Shakespeare as propagandist, introductory theories of chess, and the explosion of postwar American poetry. So successful is this extension of the intellectual excitement of University life that it is now being made open to residents of the Georgetown neighborhood community.

If some of these student activities seemed to be aimed at "the establishment," it should be noted that the establishment itself is by no means static, but is sharing in, at times leading, the new ferment on campus. A new student-administration liaison, for example, has been set in motion with the appointment—the first in Georgetown's history—of a vice president for student development. Dr. Philip A. Tripp, the new vice president, sounded the keynote to his and the University's new approach when he said in a recent interview: "All of us—students, faculty, administrators—at Georgetown have one purpose, a common quest for truth and the fullest enrichment of our lives. We can promote these ideals by respecting each other. After all, Georgetown is more than a group of buildings. It's people."

We have brought together on this and the following pages some of the people—along with buildings and buildings-to-be—who are making the scene at Georgetown today. ~ R.H.
The Healy Building from a surveyor's eye view and from what will be an underground stack level in the library.

In the foreground, excavation for the Child Development Center of the expanded Medical Center complex. Darnall Hall, women's residence hall, looms in the right background.

The Schools of Medicine and Dentistry frame the scene of excavation for the basic science extension; the new medical library will be housed here.

A tracery of pipes, sticks, and wires marks the site of a wing of the new basic science extension; in the left background, the animal house.
7. and 8. Dr. Charles A. Hufnagel, Professor of Surgery, Georgetown University Medical Center, performs an intricate life-saving operation: implanting the most recent model of the artificial heart valve he developed sixteen years ago.

9. Assisting technicians operate the heart-lung machine as Dr. Hufnagel's operation progresses.

10. A new psychological touch in nursing at the University Hospital. As children fear women in white, pediatric nurses now don gay colorful smocks when in the children's ward.
11. Georgetown now has a “ham” radio station which allows for emergency consultations throughout the world. At the doorway to Station WA3FXJ for ribbon-cutting ceremonies stand (left to right) Dr. John Campion, Director of Clinical Investigation, Riker Laboratories; Dr. John C. Rose, Dean of the School of Medicine; and Dr. Patrick J. Doyle, Professor of Community Medicine and International Health.

12. The Reverend Gerard J. Campbell, S.J., President of Georgetown University, applauds the world-famous cellist, conductor, and composer, Pablo Casals, who came to campus to receive the University’s Axacar Award, in recognition of “signal contributions to cultural understanding among the people of the Americas, Spain, and the Hispanic world.”

13. Dean Rose (left) looks on as Fred Stock, senior vice president of Squibb and Sons, notes the fine points of the painting of the School of Medicine by the noted artist Gustave Nebel presented to the School by the pharmaceutical firm.

14. Gaston Hall was the scene of an important policy address by King Hussein of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (center). With him are James Symington, Chief of Protocol, and the Reverend Thomas R. Fitzgerald, S.J., Academic Vice President.

15. Washington area senior citizens were guests of the University at New South Dining Hall for Thanksgiving dinner, at which Father Campbell, seen here, spoke.
16. Over 900 Georgetown Alumni and friends attended a dinner for Georgetown's Chancellor, the Reverend Edward B. Bunn, S.J., honoring his 50th year in the Society of Jesus. In this picture taken at the event, are (left to right) Father Bunn; Eugene P. McCahill, '21, '22, hon. '55, Chairman of the Board of Regents of the University; the Reverend Gerard J. Campbell, S.J., President of Georgetown; and Mrs. McCahill.

17. The Hall of Nations was the scene of an exhibition of photographs on Soviet history and life, marking the recent Soviet semicentennial. A student is shown getting a better look at a queue at Red Square.

18. Other Georgetown students helped picket the Soviet Embassy.

19. Mask and Bauble performers pose for a scene from the student production of Peter Weiss' avant-garde play "Marat/Sade."
20. A student-conducted "free university" on campus offers a wide range of informal, noncredit seminars. Here Dr. Wilfrid Desan (center), Professor of Philosophy and author of books on Sartre and other modern philosophers, leads the discussion. Among the 64 courses this semester: Japanese Calligraphy, Classical Greek for Beginners, and An Outdated Catholic Looks at His Modern Church.

21. A greatly expanded Department of Fine Arts is one of the College's important curriculum developments this year. Here Joan L. Caryl, Lecturer in Fine Arts, works in her campus studio.

22. Another Gaston Hall overflow was caused by the visit to campus of pop singer Dionne Warwick, whose coming is signaled by a banner stretched from Healey to Copley.

23. "The Future of the Atlantic Community and NATO" was the subject of the student-run CONTAC conference in the Hall of Nations. On the platform (left to right): Michael C. Osaida, Chairman; Dr. William V. O'Brien, Professor of Government and Director of the Institute of World Policy; and John Leddy, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs.

24. Another broadening of the curriculum has occurred in the Department of Theology, with the addition of clergy of other faiths to the teaching staff. Seen at a reception for the new Georgetown faculty members are the Reverend William C. McFadden, S.J., Chairman, Department of Theology; Rabbi A. Nathan Abramowitz; and Rabbi Samuel Kraft.
5. Homecoming Day, November 18 (Fordham 20, Georgetown 18) attracted a mostly chilled but thoroughly appreciative crowd, some of whom watched the game.

6. "Jack II," the new mascot, was on hand for Homecoming.

7. At Homecoming halftime Athletic Director John L. "Jack" Hagerty was presented with a plaque honoring his playing and coaching career and with a lifetime membership in the Student Athletic Association.

8. A nostalgic moment at Homecoming: the members of the 1940 Orange Bowl team assemble with their coaches. Left to right: Julius Koslup, '41; Jim Castiglia, '41; Joe McFadden, '41; Ed McMahon, '41; Marc Ostinato, '41; Jack Hagerty, '26, head coach; Bill McLaughlin, '43; Maurice ("Mush") Dubofsky, '32, line coach; Ben Balvin, '42; Angelo ("Pat") Paternoster, '45; Joe Daniels, '41; Jack Doolan, '43; and George Murtagh, '26, end and center coach.

9. A sign of spring and contests ahead: the new baseball field—the old one was displaced by Medical Center excavations—with the Reiss Science Center in the background.

10. In the gymnasium trophy room, Harry Costello, L'13, former football great of Georgetown, reminisces, naturally with football in hand, on the day of the 56th anniversary of his spectacular 70-yard punt against West Point.
31. An unplanned change in the campus scene: a ceiling in New South falls as the result of a predawn explosion one fine October morning.

32. and 33. New to campus is the machinery and gadgetry of Parking Management, Inc., operator of Georgetown's pay parking lots and, located in front of the Hospital, the parking garage.

34. Remember Tehaan's? It's now renovated, automated, and known—after a contest won by a hungry undergraduate—as "'89 East."

35. The Alumni Lounge of McDonough Gymnasium was the scene of the recent Washington, D.C., regional telethon for the Alumni Annual Fund. The statistics: 25 telephones, 30 volunteer workers, 10 working hours, and $12,334 in pledges from 1,329 donors.
My heart flipped over when, out of the corner of my eye, I saw the speedometer—130! It couldn't be! The small new Toyota had taken all the steep, curving mountainous roads like a gazelle. But 130!

"Relax, that's kilometers. I'm no Dan Gurney." The driver, a priest in his late thirties, graying, built like a halfback, flicked the cigar ashes into the tray. He is Father Blase Bonpane of Maryknoll, Los Angeles, son of a federal judge, and a Georgetown M.A. '66. He was taking me to the National Hospital in Huehuetenango, Guatemala, a five-hour drive through the mountains from Guatemala City. I was there for a number of reasons: to follow-up on a White House Committee assignment on research problems in mental deficiency; to explore the possibility of exchange programs with medical students; to keep a promise made to Blase on the Georgetown campus that "one day soon I'll go see what the health problems are in your adopted country." It was the last reason that had broken my inertia.

"This next curve will bring us to our highest point, a bit over 10,000 feet."

The Guatemala mountain air was cool, thin, and dry. In Quito and La Paz, there are breathing problems, but there was none here, just the ears popping as the pressure tried to equalize. Maya-Quiché Indians walked along the roadside in pairs, regular family-size groups, extended-
family size, council-size. Some of them spoke Spanish. The majority might speak one or more Maya-Quiche languages, each with many subdialects. Almost 54 percent of Guatemala is Indian. The Ladinos (local term for Indian-Spanish ancestry) made up 44.4 percent.

Each new turn of the road offered new and more exciting vistas: menacing, heaven-high volcanoes, well-rounded, cloud-enshrouded mountains, verdant, undulating hills. The volcanoes in view had names: Pacaya and Agua. The last time Pacaya had erupted was in 1775. Thirty-three volcanoes within Guatemala's borders are still active. Santa Maria and Fuego are continuously erupting, but not these two now in sight from our mountain road. They stood tall, ominous. Agua's tip barely showed, the rest completely surrounded by a thick, heavy, white cloud. Clear sky and colorful Indian costumes dominated the landscape.

"Each village has different dialects and different dress. We'll see up ahead one where the men wear colorful skirts. See that man lying by the roadside? He's drunk from the fire water. This is market day." A stoical, tired woman sat by his side.

"She won't nag or scold him. She'll wait for him to sober up and take him back to the village. It might take a day or two."

"Not quite like our Saturday nights at the country club," I remarked.

"A cultural anthropologist's dream, but a politician's nightmare," Blase replied.

At the hospital the next day, some Irish-born Sisters, members of an American order based in Houston, Texas, made rounds with us. Each sounded like Barry Fitzgerald. Four years before, the hospital was under the supervision of local authorities. The Minister of Health had invited the Sisters to "take over." Now in four years, they had cleared out the local prostitutes, renovated, scrounged, set up a record system, all the while laughing, singing, sweating, sometimes fighting, the way a good Irishman does. They were proud of the progress, especially in cleaning out the "women of the night." Some of these had worked days on regular hospital chores and then spent their evenings moonlighting at the most ancient trade, unashamedly using the hospital wards as rooms.

Over tea and cookies, the nuns took turns telling of their victory. I couldn't keep their names straight. The one with the bright pink face and the silver eye-glasses was talking:

"One of the local doctors tried to run us out. We threatened his little empire. The lovely little Minister of Health came up from Guatemala City, stood up in a public meeting and backed us to the hilt. After that we had no more trouble."

Our tea was interrupted by a small old Indian woman. "Sister, excuse me, the drugs have arrived from Houston."

The head Sister beckoned to me:

"Come, Doctor, they're opening the boxes and crates from Houston." Near a small shed, a few Indian nurses and hospital workers were gathered around an orderly who was swiftly and efficiently opening half a dozen large wooden boxes, crates, and barrels. The head Sister explained:

"It's like Christmas and Fourth of July combined when the 'goodies' arrive. We have many good friends in the States who send us surplus drug samples, syringes, rubber gloves, bandages—you name it. This shipment is from a group of doctors in Santa Barbara, California. Some of it is worthless, but most of it is useful."

The old Indian orderly kept extracting different items from an opened barrel. He held each item over his head for all to see. Gleeful shouts accompanied each new item. First there was the large package of rubber surgical gloves; next, a huge packet of cotton balls; then the sheets, the antibiotics, and the old but sturdy sterilizer.

"God bless all our good friends," one of the Sisters said.

"Come now, Doctor. We'll make rounds."

Dozens of quiet, polite Indians, all sizes and ages, waited in the warm sun for admission to the out-patient clinic. The Directress explained:

"Some of them wait all day and then have to go home to try again tomorrow. We just don't have enough help." Every few minutes an Indian nurse, hospital worker, or patient would grasp the friendly Sister's hand. She responded warmly to each, speaking in Spanish or one of the Indian dialects.

"And here's our modern laundry," Sister laughed as she pointed to the row of happy Indian girls pounding the wet linen on large smooth rocks.

"Next week we're getting a small wringer washing machine. The Jet Age, you know."

It was now time to go indoors and see some of the bed patients. I counted the cases: ten typhoid, one tetanus, twenty-plus malnutrition with and without diarrhea, eight tuberculosis—the list was long. Few of the Stateside diseases. No one dares have a neuritis. The scene was a familiar one in developing countries. Half the children in Guatemala don't reach age five. We saw some under and over five who might or might not make it. At least, if they didn't, they would die in a hospital. Poverty, ignorance, overcrowding, malnutrition—all were the handmaidens of disease. For many, it was the first time in their lives they had seen a nurse or a doctor.

When we left, the four nuns crowded around the Maryknoller to remind him of all the things in which they were conspiring. As we walked to our car, a half-dozen dirt-covered urchins ran to us yelling: "Padre, Padre!" They weren't looking for money. They wanted Father to play soccer. I was reminded of the first time I had met Father Bontpane on the Georgetown campus, a year before, when he was a graduate student. As we walked past Healy, we were interrupted by a student or a group of students every few yards.

"Now that you have become an Instant Schweitzer, you must come see the main reason I am in this country.
I'll pick you up tomorrow afternoon," he said now.

The next afternoon at five, Blase called for me. We were both well rested from our arduous trip to the mountain hospital.

"Did you have a good sleep?"

"Except for the explosion at 3 a.m."

"You'll get used to that. We have daily murders and bombings." His voice was not casual. He seemed deeply concerned. "The situation is bad. For a while the guerrillas were very active with daily incidents of terrorism. Now there is a small extreme right-wing group which has the guerrillas on the run. The killings are not indiscriminate. You have to get on one or the other’s lists. Then, of course, the majority of the people stand by, mute and very much afraid. And all around you lie the reasons for the upheaval: the poverty, disease, the 85-per-cent illiteracy rate, the hunger, the overcrowding. Guatemala is, second only to Haiti, the 'sick man' of the Americas." His voice was tired as he told me some of the prominent people who had been marked for death.

I had heard this story before on my other trips into Latin America. Throughout Central and South America most of the land lies either in the hands of a few wealthy owners or else is parcelled out into literally thousands of small plots, too small to be farmed productively. Land distribution, mainly feudal in nature, is inherited from the Spanish. In addition, there is the population explosion. All countries in Latin America are undergoing periods of social tension. Some will have bloody revolutions, others will have more peaceful changes. The peaceful kind are not forecast for Guatemala.

Father Bonpane weaved through the late afternoon traffic. We were now three miles from the main part of Guatemala City. The dirt road was rough and narrow. Children and dogs were everywhere. Naively, I asked:

"This is the slum?"

He laughed. "This is the good section."

Ten minutes later we were on another road where the holes were so big they could have been bomb craters. Fifteen bumpy minutes later we were at the end of the street. He stopped the car and said:

"Here's where we get out."

We walked to the top of a sharp hill. Row on row of wooden shacks clumped together, indescribably filthy, and smelling like nothing I've smelled, shocking the eye. At the bottom of all this, a dirty, narrow, winding stream further jarred the sensibilities. All the waste from the tuberculosis sanitarium and the local industry are in that stream, he told me. I thought I had been hardened by the favell as of Rio and the barrios of Caracas. This was worse than any of them.

"Many wealthy people have never seen these slums." His tone was matter-of-fact.

I remember what my physician host had said the day I arrived:

"There is much to do in my country. We are all concerned. Change must come. We can only hope it will be without too much blood."
On the way back to the house, Blase told me what he was doing about these massive problems. The students, as in many parts of the world, were restless for fast social change.

"Many of the students have strong feelings about these problems. They want to see them corrected. Being young, they want it done yesterday. They want to wipe out the diseases, the illiteracy. But they want to cure the causes of poverty, not just the effects, as some of the charities do. At times they become frustrated and thrash out blindly. Some take to the mountains with the guerrillas."

Blase continued to explain why he was there. Besides his regular parish work for the National University (San Carlos) parish of 10,000 students, he is in charge of the Cursillos de Capacitación Social (Courses in Social Action). He has an office and student center for this movement in downtown Guatemala. The purpose of the Cursillos is to expose the interested students to the realities of the situation and to get them to work toward a solution. The course of study includes political theory as well as community development. It is geared toward action—to get them interested and involved in how to change the causes of poverty and disease.

"We help them find direction in their quest. Positive social action. It isn't enough just to be against communism."

There are about two hundred or more students involved, he explained. First there is the orientation program lasting a week, with lectures, seminars, discussions on the meaning of communism, socialism, and Christian social doctrine.

"We lose a few after the first week or two. But not many." After orientation, the students move off in teams, mostly to the rural Indian villages.

"Last month one team of eight students organized a credit union in a small Indian town about eighty miles from Guatemala City. Now they are showing other teams how to do this. They work on weekends in these villages. During the week in Guatemala City we hold working lunches at the Student Center."

He then told me about the student team that was interested in a health program north of the capital city. Several of the team members were medical students. They had free professional consultation from the office of the Minister of Health and the Medical School. He showed me the simple basic health manual in Spanish.

"They had this printed at their own expense. Not only do they distribute it, but they spend many hours explaining to the villagers."

This health team did other things: collected and distributed clothes and vitamins, and provided milk; brought in sanitation experts who gave free advice; helped set up visiting health worker programs.

"What amazes me," the Maryknoller said, "is the fact that they can do this on a shoestring. Basic public health—no intensive care units here."

There were other teams: some specialized in problems of illiteracy, others took more interest in agricultural problems; one of the teams knew how to organize labor unions. Experimentation, improvisation, all backed up by great resourcefulness, energy, and endurance.

Blase wanted me to understand fully it wasn't all as easy as it sounded.

"At times even this form of Christian social action is viewed with great suspicion by the rabid anti-Communists. I've been warned by a number of people to take it easy. Don't rock the boat. The greatest satisfaction is seeing some of the students come to a feeling of accomplishment, of involvement. It may not work in the long pull. It all could end in smoke tomorrow. But whatever happens, these students have not spent their time carrying protest signs. They've been down where it smells the worst. As for me—where else could you get a good paying job like this?"

Blase was aware of a bigger picture. The "Catholic Revolution" in Latin America is generally peaceful. Nevertheless it does aim at a total change of structure. The political arm is made up of the various subspecies of the Christian Democratic Party. The social change arm is a host of institutes, projects, and programs with strong backing from West Germany, Belgium, and the United States. They work with U.S. government aids, Peace Corpsmen, and Quakers in the area. The intellectual arm of the "Revolution" is a mixture of priests, sociologists, students, and economists. One of their inspirations is Jacques Maritain. It is purposeful, and it is moving.

On departure from this troubled land, the Pan American jet made a half turn around the city. Off to the left, the volcanoes we saw two days before were now clear and plane high. They seemed peaceful in the clear thin air. But then, all volcanoes look peaceful most of the time. That's what Blase told me the day I arrived.

P. J. Doyle, M.D.

Dr. Doyle is chairman of the Department of Community Medicine and International Health, Georgetown Medical School. He is a member of President Johnson's Committee on Mental Retardation. Father Bonpane has recently returned from Guatemala.
Alumni in the News

In this election year, we present the eleven Georgetown Alumni currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate as our Alumni in the News. Included along with personal and political biographical material are both the conservative rating by Americans for Constitutional Action and the liberal rating by Americans for Democratic Action. Much of this information is taken from an article in the February 1967 issue of the Courier, which we gratefully acknowledge.

Three Georgetown alumni who served in the 89th Congress lost their seats in the 90th. Carlton Sickles (B.S. cum laude ’43, LL.B. ’48, formerly adjunct professor at Georgetown Law School), a Maryland Democrat, relinquished his seat to seek his party’s gubernatorial nomination — unsuccessfully. David S. King, L’42, a Utah Democrat, and Robert E. Sweeney, ’46, an Ohio Democrat, ran for reelection in 1966 but were defeated.

Of the 14 Georgetown alumni who have served in the last two Congresses and Senate, the following observations may be made:

Only three Republicans are serving, and these three are the only ones who are rated more conservative than liberal.

Of the Democrats, most are moderate liberals. Only a few show up with overwhelmingly liberal records, and two of these (King and Sickles) did not return to the 90th Congress.

Most of these men served in the armed forces during World War II, the Korean War, or both.

The Law School is by far the best represented school of Georgetown University in Congress. The Foreign Service School is second.

The average number of children these men have is 4.8, twice the national average, although most of them are not Catholic.

IN THE HOUSE:

Lawrence J. Burton
Republican from Utah

Mr. Burton studied political science at Georgetown, but received his B.A. from the University of Utah and his M.A. from Utah State University. He resides in Ogden with his wife Janice and four children.

Mr. Burton has been a college professor, a magazine editor, and a member of the board of directors of a community theatre. Before his election to the 88th Congress, he served successively as legislative assistant to Congressman Dixon, assistant professor of political science at Weber College, Ogden, and administrative assistant to the governor of Utah.

Congressman Burton is a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the newly organized Public Land Law Review Commission. He was selected as an assistant Majority Whip by the Republican House leadership.

Representative Burton has received a “Watchdog of the Treasury” award, presented by the National Associated Businessmen, Inc. in recognition of his “economy voting record.” He also has received a scroll from the National Right to Work Committee for his work against the effort to repeal Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Law. The A.C.A. rates him 79 percent conservative; the A.D.A. rates him as 8 percent liberal.

John D. Dingell
Democrat from Michigan

Representative Dingell received a B.S. in chemistry from Georgetown in 1949 and also his Bachelor of Laws from Georgetown University Law School. He served as a page in Congress and later served in the army for two years in World War II. He succeeded his father, also John D. Dingell, in a special primary election in 1955 and has been reelected continuously since. Mr. Dingell is married to the former Helen Henebry and is the father of three children.

The Congressman is a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries (chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation), and the Select Committee on Small Business (chairman of Subcommittee on Activities of Regulatory and Enforcement agencies).

Representative Dingell is a member of the V.F.W., Knights of Columbus, Dearborn Chamber of Commerce, Polish Legion of American Veterans, Polish National Alliance, and the Polish Roman Catholic Union. He received an Outstanding Alumnus Award and the John Carroll Award from Georgetown's Alumni Association. He also has received numerous awards for outstanding service in the field of conservation. The A.C.A. lists him as 8 percent conservative. The A.D.A. ranks him 81 percent liberal.
Ed Edmondson
Democrat from Oklahoma

After receiving his B.A. from the University of Oklahoma, Representative Edmondson studied law at Georgetown Law School, receiving his Bachelor of Laws in 1947. He began his career as a newspaperman, with the Muskogee Daily and the United Press. While studying law at Georgetown he served as Washington correspondent for several Oklahoma newspapers. He served with the F.B.I. for three years, and served in the U.S. Navy for three years during World War II.

Mr. Edmondson and his wife June have four sons and one daughter.

The Congressman is a member of the Committee on Public Works, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (chairman, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining) and has been the assistant Democratic whip of the House since 1953.

Ed Edmondson is a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, First Presbyterian Church of Muskogee, Masonic Lodge, Elks, Kiwanis, Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity, Phi Beta Kappa, and Phi Gamma Delta. He has been elected to represent his district for nine consecutive terms. The A.C.A. and the A.D.A. rate him, respectively, 16 percent conservative and 58 percent liberal.

James Kee
Democrat from West Virginia

Congressman Kee finished his education at Georgetown’s School of Foreign Service. He served in the U.S. Army Air Force briefly and then became a career foreign service staff officer with the State Department. Since becoming a Representative, Mr. Kee has remained involved in foreign relations, and in May 1966 he served as a member of the Ninth Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference. An Episcopalian, Congressman Kee is married to the former Helen Lee Chapman and has three daughters.

Kee is a member of the House Public Works Committee, Subcommittee on Flood Control, Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, the Ad Hoc Committee on Appalachia, and Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs.

A past commander in the American Legion and past national president of the Conference of State Societies, Mr. Kee was chosen West Virginia Son of the Year in 1962, and West Virginian of the year in 1964 by the District of Columbia Democratic Club, of which he is a vice president. After serving as administrative assistant to his mother, Congressman Elizabeth Kee, for twelve years, he succeeded her in 1965. (She had succeeded his father, Congressman John Kee, earlier). His respective A.C.A. and A.D.A. ratings: 13 percent conservative; 69 percent liberal.

Richard L. Ottinger
Democrat from New York

Representative Ottinger received his B.A. at Cornell, his Bachelor of Laws at Harvard, and did graduate study in international law in 1960-61 at Georgetown. He served as a captain in the Air Force for two years after Harvard. He and his wife Betty Ann, a former social worker, have three sons and a daughter.

Congressman Ottinger’s present committee assignment is on the Committee for Banking and Finance (Small Business and International Finance Subcommittee).

After extensive legal experience in corporate and international practice, Mr. Ottinger became contract manager for the International Cooperation Administration (now Agency for International Development). In 1961, he became a founder and the second staff member of the Peace Corps, in which he served as director of programs for the West Coast of South America until his election to Congress in 1961.

Representative Ottinger is a member of numerous organizations, including the Bronxville American Legion Post, the Scarsdale Elks Lodge, the National Lawyers Club, Temple Beth El, and the American Civil Liberties Union.

His uncle, Albert Ottinger, ran against FDR for New York’s governorship in the closest race ever run in that state.

The A.C.A. and the A.D.A. rate the Congressman 31 percent conservative and 89 percent liberal, respectively.
J. William Stanton
Republican from Ohio

Mr. Stanton was educated at Culver Military Academy and Georgetown University (B.S.S. '49). He was president of his senior class at Georgetown and president of the International Relations Club in his junior and senior years.

He distinguished himself militarily in the Pacific theater during World War II, being honorably discharged in 1946, with the rank of captain, at the age of 21. He was awarded the Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Purple Heart, the President's Unit Citation, and three major campaign ribbons. He is married to the former Peggy Smeeton. They have a one-year-old daughter, Kelly Marie.

Mr. Stanton is a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and serves on the Domestic Finance, Consumer Affairs, and Small Business subcommittees. A past president of the Painesville Chamber of Commerce, he was an automobile retailer in Painesville for 16 years before he was first elected to office in 1956 as Lake County Commissioner. He was reelected to this office in 1960 by a landslide vote, and was elected to Congress in 1964.

He is ranked as an 81 percent conservative by the A.C.A. and as a 3 percent liberal by the A.D.A.

Alan Bible
Democrat from Nevada

The Senator, a graduate of the University of Nevada, obtained his law degree at Georgetown University Law School in 1934. Senator Bible and his wife, have four children.

The Nevada Senator is a member of the American Bar Association, Nevada Bar Association, Lambda Chi Alpha social fraternity and Phi Alpha Delta legal fraternity.

The Reno lawyer's earlier public offices include District Attorney of Storey County (1935-40) and Attorney General of Nevada (1942-50). He was first elected to the U.S. Senate in 1954 to finish the unexpired term of the late Senator Pat McCarran.

He was subsequently reelected for two full terms.

Senator Bible is a member of the Appropriations, Interior, and Small Business committees, and is chairman of the District of Columbia Committee. Within the Appropriations Committee, he is on the following subcommittees: Interior and Related Agencies, Labor and Health, Education and Welfare, State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary and Related Agencies, Military Construction, and Public Works. Within the Interior Committee, he is chairman of Parks and Recreation, and a member of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels. A.C.A. ranks Senator Bible 38 percent conservative. A.D.A. rates him 41 percent liberal.

J. Caleb Boggs
Republican from Delaware

Senator Boggs is another Senatorial graduate of Georgetown Law School ('37). He practiced law in Dover, Delaware, before being called to military service during World War II, in which he distinguished himself with the Sixth Armored Division in Europe. Among his decorations are the Croix de Guerre, with palms; the Legion of Merit; Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster; and European Theatre Operations ribbon, with five campaign stars. He and his wife, the former Elizabeth Muir of Dover, have one son and one daughter.

Elective offices Senator Boggs has held are: U.S. Representative from Delaware, three terms (1947-52); governor of Delaware, two terms (1953-60); and U.S. Senator, 1961 to the present.

The Senator's committee assignments are Public Works (ranking Republican of Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution), Post Office and Civil Service, Agriculture and Forestry, and the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. He was also a member of the bipartisan group headed by Senator Mansfield which reported findings on the Vietnam conflict after a study mission.

The A.C.A. rates Senator Boggs 63 percent conservative, and the A.D.A. rates him 39 percent liberal.
Philip A. Hart
Democrat from Michigan

Senator Hart received a *cum laude* Bachelor of Arts degree from Georgetown in 1934. Later, after studying at the University of Michigan Law School, from which he received the J.D. degree in 1937, he served as a lieutenant colonel in the army during World War II. Senator Hart and his wife, the former Jane Briggs of Detroit, have four sons and four daughters.

The Senator is a member of the Michigan and Federal Bar associations, the American Society of International Law, and the American Judicative Society. His long record of public service includes positions as commissioner of the Michigan Corporation and Securities Commission, director of the Michigan Office of Price Stabilization, a United States District Attorney, legal adviser to the governor of Michigan, lieutenant governor of Michigan, and finally two terms as United States Senator.

Senator Hart is active on the Senate Committee on Commerce, on the Judiciary Committee, and is a member of the Democratic Policy Committee. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly and is an assistant majority whip in the Senate. He is rated 92 percent liberal by the A.D.A. and 0 percent conservative by the A.C.A.

Joseph M. Montoya
Democrat from New Mexico

Senator Montoya received his Bachelor of Laws degree from Georgetown in 1939. He and his wife, the former Della Romero of Santa Fe, have three children. Montoya is the only Senator of Spanish descent and has made Latin America his major field of interest.

At the age of twenty-one, Senator Montoya was the youngest elected state representative in New Mexico history. He served twelve years in both houses of his state legislature and also served four terms as lieutenant governor. In 1957, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, where he served on the Judiciary Committee and the Appropriations Committee. In 1964, Montoya was elected Senator for a full term; he also served out the late Senator Chavez's unexpired term. In the Senate, he is a member of the following committees: Agriculture and Forestry, Public Works, Select Committee on Small Business, and Government Operations.

Senator Montoya has played an important role in Latin American relations as a delegate to Inter-American conferences. He is a member of the executive committee of the Inter-American Parliamentary Organization.

Ranked 9 percent conservative by the A.C.A., he is 78 percent liberal by A.D.A.'s standards.

Harrison A. Williams
Democrat from New Jersey

Senator Williams, a graduate of Oberlin College and the Columbia University Law School, undertook graduate study at the Georgetown School of Foreign Service. A practicing attorney and former steelworker, he was a Navy pilot during World War II. He is married and the father of five children.

Senator Williams is a member of the Advisors Committee of the Unitarian Layman's League, the New Jersey Bar Association, the Elks, and various civic, fraternal, and veterans groups.

Harrison Williams is serving his second term in the U.S. Senate, following three years in the House of Representatives. The Senator is a member of the powerful Senate Steering Committee, the standing committees on Banking and Currency, and Labor and Public Welfare, and of the Special Committee on Aging and the Select Committee on Small Business. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Frauds and Misrepresentations Affecting the Elderly, the Migratory Labor Subcommittee, and the Subcommittee on Securities.

Senator Williams is rated 8 percent conservative by the A.C.A., and 89 percent liberal by the A.D.A.
BOOK REVIEW

Nuclear War, Deterrence, and Morality
William V. O'Brien
$3.75

Currently the Chairman of Georgetown's Institute of World Polity, Dr. O'Brien took his baccalaureate and master's degrees in foreign service at Georgetown, also earning his Ph.D. here in 1953. He has written and edited many books and articles in the fields of international law and relations.

This small book is an attempt to apply the traditional Catholic concept of the Just War—which can be traced back to St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, the Scholastics, and Diego Suarez, one of the founders of modern international law—to modern strategic dilemmas.

Dr. O'Brien's position is that of the Christian realist, in that he recognizes both moral imperatives and political realities, and is similar to the position taken by the Protestant thinker Kenneth Thompson. It is unrealistic, he feels, to assume that men can be made to be completely peaceful, or that we can ever expect a world without war. Therefore, the aim of the moral man should be to limit war and the methods of fighting war, rather than to devote himself entirely to preventing the outbreak of war.

He comes to five specific conclusions as to what could be included in a contemporary Catholic position on U.S. defense policy—or, in other words, an updated just-war doctrine: (1) no first recourse to armed force of any kind, (2) no first use of nuclear weapons, (3) no counter-city warfare, (4) a reasonable response to nuclear attack that is not the Old Testament "eye for an eye," and (5) encouragement of arms control and disarmament.

This is a valuable handbook on the interaction of Catholic thought and the political imperatives of a world that relies for peace on nuclear weapons as deterrents. Two useful appendixes—Vatican II's Draft Schema 13 and Excerpts from the Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World, both relating to questions of modern warfare—and a good bibliography are included.

Peace and the Strategy Conflict
William R. Kintner
Praeger, 264 pp.
$6.95

W illiam R. Kintner, G'48, G'49, a well known strategic specialist and deputy director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania, has written a book with a very simple thesis: that responsible American military planners must treat as the major potential enemy the state that has the greatest capability to do it physical—perhaps fatal—harm. Basically this means that strategic planning should be based on examining capabilities—not intentions.

With this thesis few students of military strategy would quarrel. If this book had been tightly reasoned, well documented, and calmly presented, it could have been both a scholarly contribution and perhaps even an important public service. A lucid description of the strategic dilemmas of the 60's is certainly needed.

Instead, the author has put together in one pot a number of undigested and perhaps indigestible ingredients: strategic theory, ideological analyses, history of weapons development, alliances, theories of arms control and disarmament. All these are didactically presented and used not because of the inherent merit of the material, but rather as a springboard to attack the cost-effectiveness system of decision-making introduced to the Depart-

ment of Defense by former Secretary Robert McNamara.

Col. Kintner attacks the system by attacking the decisions made under it, claiming that these decisions were made more on the basis of cost than on the basis of military effectiveness. He would correct what he sees as McNamara's mistakes by restoring every reduction or elimination of weapons-system development ordered by the Secretary. (Incidentally, the author attacks as an example of a poor decision made under cost-effectiveness analysis the refusal to develop and deploy an ABM system—a criticism now obsolete, since McNamara has recently ordered development of a "thin" ABM system.) Col. Kintner would restore deployment of several hundred additional Minuteman missiles, accelerated production of Minuteman III and Poseidon missiles, rapid development of improved missiles, retention of all existing manned bombers, development of an advanced manned bomber, speeding up the civil defense shelter program, and increasing underground nuclear weapons testing. Quite an extensive — and expensive — list! What Col. Kintner does not seem to understand is that in the real world no nation, not even one so rich as the U.S., can pursue simultaneous development of all potential weapons systems. It was McNamara's intent in employing cost-effectiveness analysis to reduce possible weapons systems to feasibility. Perhaps cost-effectiveness is not the last word in decision-making tools—although Col. Kintner's critique is not convincing — but to argue for restoring every cut is surely extreme.

Robert L. Friedheim

Dr. Friedheim, a political scientist who specializes in international relations, is currently a strategic analyst with the Center for Naval Analyses.
Dear Alumnus: The Bylaws 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 Bylaws 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 a 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, 1968.

Positions to be filled include that of President, Secretary, and Treasurer. In addition, there are 22 Regional Board members to be elected. To qualify as an officer or Regional Board member 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 Dr. Adrian J. Levesque, D'33. The nominees are listed on the following page.

Cordially,

Bernard A. Carter
Executive Secretary
Georgetown University Alumni Association, Inc.
1968 NOMINEES

President

Secretary
Mary Virginia Ruth, N'53, 8418 Loch Raven Blvd., Baltimore, Md. Active in affairs of Alumni Association. Member of Alumni Senate. Assistant Professor, Georgetown University; Maternal and Child Nursing Program, Chairman.

Treasurer
George D. Crowley, C'34, 610 Forest Ave., Wilmette, Ill. Member of Alumni Senate. Active supporter and worker, Alumni Association. Attorney.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Region IV
New York State except the five boroughs of New York City and the Counties of Westchester, Nassau, Rockland, and Suffolk.


Region VI
District of Columbia, the Counties of Prince Georges and Montgomery in Maryland, and the Counties of Arlington and Fairfax and the free cities of Alexandria, Virginia, and Fairfax, Virginia.

Dr. Herman F. Bernstein, D'26, 3726 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. Dental Reunion Treasurer. Member of Dean's Council, Active Fund worker. Dentist.

Paul Regis Dean, L'46, 3313 Garland Ave., Falls Church, Va. Active Fund worker. Class Representative. Dean, Georgetown Law Center.

John Dennis Lane, FS'43, LLB'48, 5045 Van Ness St., N.W., Washington, D.C. Class Representative. Lawyer.

Dr. Charles B. Murto, D'32, 1223 Noyes Drive, Silver Spring, Md. Active Fund worker. Dean, Georgetown University School of Dentistry.

Region VII
Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia (except the Counties of Arlington and Fairfax).


Region VIII
Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico
Rev. Charles Bernard King, Jr., C'53, Holy Trinity Seminary, Dallas, Tex. Club Officer, Fund worker. Interviewing Chairman.

Laurence Francis Rooney, Jr., C'49, 7 Spring Creek Road, Muskogee, Okla. Active Fund worker and supporter. President, Manhattan Construction Company.

Region IX
Colorado, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming

Robert Delphis Marcotte, C'48, 3528 Dodge St., Omaha, Neb. Fund worker and active supporter. Insurance broker.

Region X
Arizona, California, and Nevada


Region XI
Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington
Dr. Malcolm Oliphant, C'47, Dean, Hawaii Loa College, Honolulu, Hawaii. Active supporter of Georgetown.


Maurice Cavanaugh, LLB'38, LLM'39, 8019 W. Hamlin, Chicago, Ill.

Region XII
Insular possessions of the United States and foreign countries

Dr. Marcelo Nubla, GL'23, 85 10th Street, New Manila, Quezon City, Philippines. President, Georgetown Alumni Club of the Philippines. Vice-Chairman of the Board, China Banking Corp.

Peter J. Tanous, Jr., C'60, 8 rue Chartran, Neuilly sur Seine, France. President, Georgetown Club of France. Vice President, Smith, Barney & Co.
"We Meet Again
Tonight, Boys . . ."
The Georgetown Chimes
Founded 1946

Available for Alumni Social Events
Hear them on their latest album—
"Chimes ’66"
(Price $4.00)

For engagements or albums, write or call:
David J. Cosco
3421½ M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007
Tel. (202) 338-6382 or
Reverend Gerard F. Yates,
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C. 20007
Tel. (202) 337-3300, ext. 706