College and university administrators, faculty, students, and alumni share a growing concern over the current crisis in education. This crisis has made itself felt on every American campus. Soaring costs for buildings and equipment, the dollar rise in salaries and services, and the financial burden arising from sharp competition for faculty and student talent have all contributed to the present condition of expanding and seemingly prosperous institutions which find themselves in a battle for survival.

Georgetown is clearly among those institutions being caught in the squeeze between rising expenses and insufficient income, between the necessary steps in expansion to maintain leadership and the inadequacy of the means available to achieve these steps. Equally as clearly, the University's future direction will be largely determined by the response of her friends and alumni to the $26,000,000 Progress Fund Campaign and to the Alumni Annual Fund. In this issue of *Georgetown*, to help provide a focus on the problem, we present a special report on the financial crisis in higher education everywhere. A brief introduction to the Georgetown situation and a statistical follow-up are intended to assist our readers in relating the Georgetown crisis with the national crisis.

In the lead article of our last issue the Reverend Thurston N. Davis, S.J., director of the John LaFarge Institute, urged the University to "join the city." It is perhaps appropriate to note here that the University community is increasingly aware of the educational dimensions of the problems of poverty and discrimination in our deeply divided American society. In citing the "truly remarkable work" of GUCAP (the Georgetown University Community Action Program) Father Davis called for further imaginative programs and "happenings" in "the beckoning days that lie ahead for higher education." The University, there can be no doubt, will continue to respond to urban problems in activities proper to her resources in research and in teaching.

In this issue Father Fitzgerald, Academic Vice President, addresses himself in our lead article to this very problem. The following article, on the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area, describes how Georgetown, as part of the Consortium, participates in inner-city programs.

Thus the University is meeting an opportunity and a responsibility, quietly and effectively, in an area wherein a university can operate better than any other agency. So long as major financial support for these activities on behalf of urban problems can be forthcoming from governmental agencies and the foundations, Georgetown can continue to be a leader among private universities in bringing research and learning to bear on urban affairs. Much has been accomplished; much more remains to be done, at Georgetown and elsewhere, in the development of the "great reservoirs of freedom and flexibility" Father Davis urged upon us.

In this space last time we reported, in our guarded and tentative way, on the feasibility study being made to discover the most viable relationship of the Medical Center to the entire University structure. The emphasis now seems to have shifted from the question of separate incorporation to an examination of managerial and administrative structures within the Center itself. Whatever the final recommendations and outcome, we can predict that the special committee's deliberations over a wide range of interrelated problems will have beneficial results for the University and Center alike. ~ Riley Hughes, Editor
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COVER: A shovel and a platform: the breaking of ground at the new Law Center site.
At few universities has change been occurring more rapidly than at Georgetown. The clear distinction between the University's governing board and the Jesuit religious community has been achieved. The faculty's role in governance has been developing, chiefly within the framework of the Faculty Senate, which has now appointed representatives to all major policy committees of the University, including Budget and Rank and Tenure. Undergraduates are enjoying a freedom than ten or even five years ago would have been unthinkable. New buildings are rising. Quality of faculty is improving.

I will try to describe some of the changes in academic programs that are occurring on the main campus. They illustrate, I believe, that Georgetown is responding to the new intellectual currents and toward the social forces that surround it. May the changes continue to evolve through free choices based on rational discussion without the destructive turmoil that has afflicted the campuses of so many other universities.

In each of the undergraduate schools, programs are being reviewed. The presidents of Washington's five universities several years ago agreed that they should seek to pool their graduate resources. To achieve this they formed a new corporation, called "The Consortium of Universities." Georgetown's departmental chairmen are being urged to take the initiative in arranging meetings with the chairmen of the other four institutions in this Consortium. They should be prepared to suggest plans whereby responsibility for in-depth coverage of a whole academic discipline would be shared among the universities in order to avoid any needless duplication either of teaching personnel or of library holdings.

There are many reasons why a certain international orientation is becoming increasingly characteristic of Georgetown, and may even become one of its principal distinguishing qualities. We already enjoy the great advances made at the School of Languages and Linguistics, including work in some of the languages which are less prominent in American schools. These are Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Portuguese, for each of which we now have a staff. The School of Foreign Service has an outstanding history of 49 years' involvement in international topics and concerns, and Dean Guenther is convinced that what should be distinctive in the School of Business Administration—setting it apart from all other undergraduate schools of business—is an emphasis upon international business and finance.

Our present faculty is extraordinarily international in origin. Last year there were 107 faculty members, full- and part-time, throughout all schools of the Uni-
versity who held citizenship in 41 different countries. And Georgetown’s location in Washington offers special opportunities for an international emphasis.

Finally there is Georgetown’s own character as a university that, because Catholic, should be open toward all directions and thus catholic in all its interests and concerns.

Georgetown cannot simultaneously do all things and do them well. Certain forms of growth and development do, however, seem indicated. Two in particular suggest themselves: in Latin American area studies there is a great potential, in terms of staff already at hand. Significant planning is occurring but needs coordination. The departments of Spanish, Portuguese, economics, government, and history, and officials of the East Campus schools must talk much more to each other. Each has plans, but we need one plan, not many.

The Middle East is an important area of the world, but Middle East area studies are generally overlooked. We have started well in the department of Arabic; we have strength in the department of history. Our opportunity here is unique.

Universities should do all they can to resolve urban ills, but in ways that are in accordance with a university’s nature. Thus there is need for research concerning urban problems, and in Washington this is being done primarily by the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies. The local universities participate in the Center and even donate personnel. Currently Georgetown is offering support for a political scientist on the Center staff; last semester the University made available an economist.

Universities engage not only in research but in teaching. With its outstanding competence in teaching English as a foreign language, Georgetown may be able to develop programs that will help citizens of the inner city remove their deficiencies in spoken English. This may not seem significant, but poor spoken English can severely limit job opportunities, particularly in terms of continuing promotion. Only two months ago the United States Office of Education awarded Georgetown a grant of over $60,000 to mount a master’s program during 1968-69 in this field. Twenty-five teachers from inner-city schools across the country will be brought here on fellowships and given a new program in theoretical and applied linguistics that will prepare them to offer in their own schools special English programs for the culturally disadvantaged.

Georgetown also is seeking to develop programs that will train individuals of the city for new careers. With support furnished through the Scheuer Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1966, the University is already conducting one such program in downtown Washington. People now unemployed or in low-income ranges are being prepared for jobs, governmental and otherwise, in which they will work to ameliorate the physical, social, economic, and cultural condition of the inner city.

It is startling that so few are aware of the brilliantly successful College Orientation Program that is now four summers old. High-school students from the inner city were carefully selected. Those chosen were from groups that were not expected to succeed in college unless their preparation was strengthened, and during the summer weeks efforts were made, through various courses and outside activities, to improve knowledge, study habits, and motivation. Thirty-three of the 40 students who completed the program in 1965 are now enrolled in 14 colleges; of the 44 students who went through the program in 1966, 28 have begun their freshman year at 21 institutions.

It would be cruel to rush our disadvantaged youth into college without having prepared them, and thereby doom many of them to certain failure because they were not ready academically or psychologically. Moreover, there are many instances in which the student cannot succeed in college unless he can be removed from a difficult home environment and can become a resident student rather than a commuter. Even within our summer program of eight weeks this problem has arisen. The faculty of the 1967 program has recommended that, if possible, the next group of students be housed here for the summer. "Since most of the students live outside the area surrounding the University, they must travel sometimes as much as two hours to and from the campus. While the will to make this sacrifice is a good indication of the students’ determination, it is not conducive to the conservation of energies that should be spent on the program’s activities. Very often students did not have enough sleep and sometimes skipped breakfast to get the bus on time. The student’s full-time presence on campus would greatly increase the effectiveness of the program. Study habits could be improved since the exhausting trip to a noisy apartment house or neighborhood would be eliminated and quieter surroundings would encourage better concentration."

Other sections of the University are addressing the problems of the city. A walk through the out-patient clinics of the Medical Center will easily illustrate this. The Georgetown Law School’s District of Columbia Bail Project, Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure, and Legal Internship Program are other examples. The University is definitely concerned about the problems of the city; in ways that are appropriate to it as an institution of higher learning, it is responding. ~Thomas R. Fitzgerald, S.J.

Father Fitzgerald, ’42, is Academic Vice President of Georgetown University.
A Program's Progress

Four Years of Cooperation
Among Five D.C. Universities

In January 1964 the five major universities in the nation's capital decided to create a sort of pool of their graduate-school courses to offer their graduate students a richer program. The organization, created by the presidents of American, Catholic, George Washington, Georgetown, and Howard universities, was what is now called the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area, which allowed a graduate student working toward a degree to take courses at the other member universities, with the approval of his adviser.

During the four years of its existence, the Consortium has expanded both the number of its offerings and the scope of its activities. It has become, in addition, an agency increasingly devoted to community-oriented programs, being the District of Columbia agent for federal-government-sponsored work in this area.

The organization of the graduate "pool" was a difficult task for the administrations of the universities, but for the student involved it is simplicity itself. He notices a course offered at a Consortium university that he feels would enrich his program and is not given at his "home" university. Or perhaps he has a schedule conflict, with two required courses given at the same time on his campus. One of them is offered at a different time, or during a different semester, at another Consortium university. He consults with his adviser, who approves the choice of course and clears it with the university to be visited. The student then registers on his own campus and pays his own university's fees. No transcript or transfer of credit is required. He is ready to take the course at the other school.

The advantages of such a system, to both the university and the student, are as abundant as they are obvious.

The universities. In this age of scarce faculty specialists, sparse funds for enormously expensive laboratories and other equipment, and a knowledge and book explosion which threatens to overwhelm teachers and libraries, no university can possibly hope to be excellent in every field. The Consortium actually offers to its member universities both tremendous savings in dollar expenditures and achievement of programs and specialties that a single university could not manage.

It is wasteful and expensive to two or more universities to offer exotic courses taken by only a few students (such as Hindi, for example): cooperation under the Consortium plan obviates the necessity of duplicating courses like this. This policy has already paid off for departments in Consortium universities. When a specialist in Japanese history at one of the universities died, he was not replaced, because similar courses were offered by two other Consortium universities. To avoid duplicating scarce language spe-
cialists, the universities are working to restrict their language programs to specified languages. For example, only American and Georgetown will offer Japanese, only Catholic and George Washington will teach Greek, and Swahili is available only at Howard.

Certain graduate courses offered jointly by member universities are already in existence, and others are in the planning stages. In 1966, a series of 13 interdisciplinary lectures on research photobiology were presented, on the graduate level, in cooperation with the Smithsonian Institution. Speakers came from Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Carnegie Tech, University of Washington, Tufts, Berkeley, Oak Ridge, Beltsville, NIH, and the Smithsonian. A course in Elizabethan history is given at the Folger Shakespeare Library by Georgetown and George Washington professors. This semester, a similar lecture series is being conducted in developmental biology. Possibilities of developing a Consortium International Education Center and a Science Center are being explored, to be operated jointly by the five universities, and unquestionably out of range for any single school.

A combined union serial listing of all library holdings at the five universities was published recently under the auspices of the Consortium. This was an enormous undertaking, but it will be of great help to acquisitions librarians in avoiding duplication of expensive and rare items, particularly in serial back files being considered for purchase. One interesting innovation recently was a new joint contract among the five physics departments for the joint purchase of helium, thus enabling each university to take advantage of reduced costs. Joint purchases in other areas offer a large potential for savings.

With so many advantages for the cooperating universities, one might suppose—and some administrators and faculty members did—that there would be severe disadvantages as well.

One fear was that the central administration would be overbearing. But in its four-year existence, the downtown executive office has been faculty- and student-oriented rather than self-serving, and has won the admiration of many doubters. The executive director of the Consortium is Dr. Elmer D. West, a soft-spoken Harvard Ed.D. with 25 years of experience in teaching and almost all aspects of university and educational administration. He is the author of *Background for a National Scholarship Policy and Financial Aid to the Undergraduate: Issues and Implications*, and many articles. The Consortium has a board of trustees composed of the president and a trustee of each member university and five distinguished Washington community representatives. Significantly, administrative costs, which up to now have been met by foundation support, will next year be taken over by the cooperating universities themselves.

Another early fear was that some classes would be overrun or overcrowded by students from other universities. But this has not happened—the vast majority of classes have been “visited” by only one or two students.

Finally, some fear that the universities, by entering into a Consortium, will sacrifice their individuality. On the other hand, Dr. West points out that there is no individuality in being a mirror image of another university, and that by eliminating duplication and competition for similar empires, the universities will be better able to achieve true individuality by intensifying their strong areas and emphases.

The students. If the Consortium has proved beneficial to its member universities, it has given to the students of the five schools opportunities perhaps more extensive than in any educational complex. At first only graduate students were able to take courses at the other universities, and attention was directed toward the unusual or exotic course. But even so, many possibilities were immediately opened. In an area like Latin American studies, for example, individual university offerings ranged from four at one
A list of Latin American area courses—developed in September 1967—describes no less than 63 courses in Latin American area studies offered in that first semester to students of the five universities!

In September 1966, courses in graduate engineering were opened to students at other universities, and in September 1967 courses leading to the Master of Laws degree. And—a real breakthrough—for the first time undergraduates could take any language course at any Consortium university (with the exception of lower-level courses in French, German, Russian, and Spanish). A complete listing of all courses in languages and linguistics at the five universities has been compiled by a faculty committee; it comprises 44 pages and lists more than 600 courses in 30 languages from Amharic (an Ethiopian tongue) to Yoruba (a West African language). The possibility of unifying undergraduate curricula in other disciplines is currently being studied by faculty groups.

Two further extensions are approved for 1968. This summer, for the first time, courses in the summer schools may be taken on the same basis as during the academic year; and beginning in the fall, juniors and seniors will be allowed to participate.

In the seven semesters of its existence, 910 students have registered for 787 different courses not available on their own campuses. Multiple registrations in some courses raises the total number of registrations to 1,286.

Although the Consortium was designed to enrich the students’ academic opportunities, it has also, in some instances, served their convenience and budgets. Scheduling difficulties have been solved by courses given at different hours or different semesters on another campus. The campuses are a maximum of seven miles apart, and one student has actually taken courses at four of them in the same semester! In some cases, the Consortium plan has helped students get their degrees sooner than would have been possible otherwise. One American University education student, a retired colonel studying for a Master’s degree in order to teach, needed a course in counseling to complete his degree requirements. The course was oversubscribed at AU that semester, and he was unable to register for it. Ordinarily he would have had to wait a full year to take the course, delaying the degree, and incidentally involving another year’s residence fees. Under the Consortium, he took an equivalent course at Catholic University that semester, received his degree on schedule, and began his teaching career immediately.

Students who have made use of the Consortium plan have been asked to fill out questionnaires evaluating their experiences. The most frequently registered complaints dealt with parking and transportation, problems not inherent in the Consortium arrangement. Some had difficulty adjusting to an unfamiliar situation, and one girl wrote, “I had not anticipated the cultural shock of going to another campus.” But for the most part, students have pronounced their Consortium experience successful.

The Community. Increasingly, the Consortium, along with numerous other institutions, has come to realize that universities do not operate in a vacuum. They are part of their communities, and particularly urban universities must contribute to the solution of community problems.

Urban problems are unquestionably our society’s most pressing, as the summer of 1967 demonstrated all too clearly. In 1965, the federal government enlisted the educational resources and expertise of the universities to help solve urban problems such as civil rights, the control of violence, and community planning. It did this by establishing the Community Service and Continuing Education Program, under Title I of the Higher Education Act passed that year. The agent for Title I programs, as they are called, in the District of Columbia is the Consortium, which brings the five member universities right into the

Continued on page 25
The Georgetown Situation Is...

Georgetown's president, Father Gerard J. Campbell, S.J., first publicly revealed the extent of the financial crisis facing Georgetown in an address he gave on October 21, 1967. Speaking half a continent away from campus, at the John Carroll Awards Dinner in St. Louis, he called upon Georgetown's Alumni and friends everywhere for financial assistance to Georgetown "before it is too late."

On this occasion Father Campbell also revealed that the University had suffered an operating deficit of $1 ½ million the year before. He added that in any realistic view deficits were to be expected. "Time," he held the assembled Alumni, "is running out."

What had prompted the president of Georgetown to speak out, in an address of gracious reference to the host city and to its namesake saint, to whom he had devoted his scholarly career, was the steady increase in the problems of growth and identity affecting University decisions and actions. Georgetown was being caught, with increasing severity, in the familiar gap between income and expenses.

The Georgetown situation is, as the following special report on the crisis in higher education shows, part of the national pattern. The dollar demands being made on higher education are constantly on the rise, and for many institutions, Georgetown among them, the gap between income and outlay is getting wider all the time. The mounting crisis is, Father Campbell notes in the President's Report for 1966-67, "particularly applicable to Georgetown University today."

If one were to isolate a single controlling factor in the situation Georgetown finds herself in, it would be inflation. The initial costs in establishing a research or teaching program, for example, are substantially higher than they have ever been—ten times higher than they were 20 years ago. And the modern university needs equipment and facilities unheard of 20 years ago. To take an area in which Georgetown has pioneered—language laboratories are enormously complex and costly. Computers—and Georgetown has two giants—are a necessary part of the modern university; they make for efficiency, yet they add appreciably to the cost of institutional living. In fact, it is an observable phenomenon of any university structure today that the supporting staff for the modern machinery of institutional life is a tremendously increasing one; technical and nonteaching positions nonexistent a few years ago now add significantly to costs.

The University's location in Washington, D.C., for all its manifest advantages, itself carries an inflationary penalty. As an employer in the District, Georgetown is competing against government in office salaries. Living costs in Washington are high; thus the University is competing against the government scale not only in clerical areas but on every level of employment. The inflationary nature of housing and services in Washington has meant, along with other factors, that the marked increase in faculty salaries over recent years has not had the positive results anticipated by the administration and faculty. Inflation is constantly pushing, with an impact felt in Washington and other great metropolitan centers, to a degree unknown in the small college town.

What is the University's current response to this new and pressing financial challenge? The Georgetown response can be characterized as a dual one: retrenchment and a search for new sources of income. "We are making," said one University official, "every reasonable attempt to pull in our belts." This means a hard look at all of the University's current and projected programs and activities. Among the areas currently being studied for possible economies are academic programs, publications, and research. Several important research programs, funded by outside resources, are currently in operation and hopefully will continue. Ford Foundation grants alone account for $1,800,000 in revenue. Yet on the national scale grants are tending to dry up; this year, for example, for the first time in more than a decade, philanthropic foundations have not increased the total of their disbursement. In the new mood of government austerity, research and construction grants, even previously pledged ones, are already subject to scrutiny and may be seriously curtailed.

In the context of these discouraging problems and possibilities, the University is actively engaged in seeking new resources. Georgetown's $26 million capital campaign has as its object improving the University's physical facilities and upgrading faculty salaries. At this moment the campaign is nearly $11 million short of the announced goal; pledges total $15,200,000. These pledges derive from the following sources:

- **Alumni**
  - $4,330,000
- **Non-Alumni Individuals**
  - $8,700,000
- **Non-Alumni Parents**
  - $1,035,000
- **Corporations and Foundations**
  - $1,135,000

It will be noted that Alumni contributions toward the Progress Fund have been substantial and heartening. How can Alumni contributions help to enhance the University's resources toward the achieving of a viable position? It has been estimated that if 5 percent of Georgetown's Alumni could be persuaded to make a pledge of $10,000 each over the next three or four years, and if in addition the Progress Fund were successful in attracting from 20 to 50 major gifts, we would be over the top. The University needs the help of 100 percent of her Alumni in selecting the 5 percent who can give a pledge averaging $10,000. Consultation centers for this purpose are being organized in Washington, D.C., Boston, and the New York area. To "pass the word along" may be the greatest service any alumnus can perform for Alma Mater.

In the last analysis, the solution is to be found in people—Georgetown people. If enough people see enough people, convince enough people, this most challenging crisis in Georgetown's long history can be met. ~
The Plain Fact Is...

...our colleges and universities “are facing what might easily become a crisis”

Our colleges and universities, over the last 20 years, have experienced an expansion that is without precedent—in buildings and in budgets, in students and in professors, in reputation and in rewards—in power and pride and in deserved prestige. As we try to tell our countrymen that we are faced with imminent bankruptcy, we confront the painful fact that in the eyes of the American people—and I think also in the eyes of disinterested observers abroad—we are a triumphant success. The observers seem to believe—and I believe myself—that the American campus ranks with the American corporation among the handful of first-class contributions which our civilization has made to the annals of human institutions. We come before the country to plead financial emergency at a time when our public standing has never been higher. It is at the least an unhappy accident of timing.

—McGeorge Bundy
President, The Ford Foundation
A state-supported university in the Midwest makes a sad announcement: With more well-qualified applicants for its freshman class than ever before, the university must tighten its entrance requirements. Qualified though the kids are, the university must turn many of them away.

> A private college in New England raises its tuition fee for the seventh time since World War II. In doing so, it admits ruefully: “Many of the best high-school graduates can’t afford to come here, any more.”

> A state college network in the West, long regarded as one of the nation’s finest, cannot offer its students the usual range of instruction this year. Despite intensive recruiting, more than 1,000 openings on the faculty were unfilled at the start of the academic year.

> A church-related college in the South, whose denomination’s leaders believe in strict separation of church and state, severs its church ties in order to seek money from the government. The college must have such money, say its administrators—or it will die.

Outwardly, America’s colleges and universities appear more affluent than at any time in the past. In the aggregate they have more money, more students, more buildings, better-paid faculties, than ever before in their history.

Yet many are on the edge of deep trouble. “The plain fact,” in the words of the president of Columbia University, “is that we are facing what might easily become a crisis in the financing of American higher education, and the sooner we know about it, the better off we will be.”

The trouble is not limited to a few institutions. Nor does it affect only one or two types of institution. Large universities, small colleges; state-supported and privately supported: the problem faces them all.

Before preparing this report, the editors asked more than 500 college and university presidents to tell us—off the record, if they preferred—just how they viewed the future of their institutions. With rare exceptions, the presidents agreed on this assessment: That the money is not now in sight to meet the rising costs of higher education... to serve the growing numbers of bright, qualified students... and to pay for the myriad activities that Americans now demand of their colleges and universities.

Important programs and necessary new buildings are
ALL OF US are hard-put to see where we are going to get the funds to meet the educational demands of the coming decade.

—A university president

being deferred for lack of money, the presidents said. Many admitted to budget-tightening measures reminiscent of those taken in days of the Great Depression.

Is this new? Haven't the colleges and universities always needed money? Is there something different about the situation today?

The answer is "Yes"—to all three questions.

The president of a large state university gave us this view of the over-all situation, at both the publicly and the privately supported institutions of higher education:

"A great many institutions of higher learning are operating at a deficit," he said. "First, the private colleges and universities: they are eating into their endowments in order to meet their expenses. Second, the public institutions. It is not legal to spend beyond our means, but here we have another kind of deficit: a deficit in quality, which will be extremely difficult to remedy even when adequate funding becomes available."

Other presidents' comments were equally revealing:

- From a university in the Ivy League: "Independent national universities face an uncertain future which threatens to blunt their thrust, curb their leadership, and jeopardize their independence. Every one that I know about is facing a deficit in its operating budget, this year or next. And all of us are hard-put to see where we are going to get the funds to meet the educational demands of the coming decade."

- From a municipal college in the Midwest: "The best word to describe our situation is 'desperate.' We are operating at a deficit of about 20 per cent of our total expenditure."

- From a private liberal arts college in Missouri: "Only by increasing our tuition charges are we keeping our heads above water. Expenditures are galloping to such a degree that I don't know how we will make out in the future."

- From a church-related university on the West Coast: "We face very serious problems. Even though our tuition is below-average, we have already priced ourselves out of part of our market. We have gone deeply into debt for dormitories. Our church support is declining. At times, the outlook is grim."

- From a state university in the Big Ten: "The budget for our operations must be considered tight. It is less than we need to meet the demands upon the university for teaching, research, and public service."

- From a small liberal arts college in Ohio: "We are on a hand-to-mouth, 'kitchen' economy. Our ten-year projections indicate that we can maintain our quality only by doubling in size."

- From a small college in the Northeast: "For the first time in its 150-year history, our college has a planned deficit. We are holding our heads above water at the moment—but, in terms of quality education, this cannot long continue without additional means of support."

- From a state college in California: "We are not permitted to operate at a deficit. The funding of our budget at a level considerably below that proposed by the trustees has made it difficult for us to recruit staff members and has forced us to defer very-much-needed improvements in our existing activities."

- From a women's college in the South: "For the coming year, our budget is the tightest we have had in my fifteen years as president."

WHAT'S GONE WRONG?

Talk of the sort quoted above may seem strange, as one looks at the unparalleled growth of America's colleges and universities during the past decade:

- Hardly a campus in the land does not have a brand-new building or one under construction. Colleges and universities are spending more than $2 billion a year for capital expansion.

- Faculty salaries have nearly doubled in the past decade. (But in some regions they are still woefully low.)

- Private, voluntary support to colleges and universities has more than tripled since 1958. Higher education's share of the philanthropic dollar has risen from 11 per cent to 17 per cent.

- State tax funds appropriated for higher education have increased 44 per cent in just two years, to a 1967-68 total of nearly $4.4 billion. This is 214 per cent more than the sum appropriated eight years ago.

- Endowment funds have more than doubled over the past decade. They're now estimated to be about $12 billion, at market value.

- Federal funds going to institutions of higher education have more than doubled in four years.

- More than 300 new colleges and universities have been founded since 1945.

- All in all, the total expenditure this year for U.S. higher education is some $18 billion—more than three times as much as in 1955.
Moreover, America's colleges and universities have absorbed the tidal wave of students that was supposed to have swamped them by now. They have managed to fulfill their teaching and research functions and to undertake a variety of new public-service programs—despite the ominous predictions of faculty shortages heard ten or fifteen years ago. Says one foundation official:

"The system is bigger, stronger, and more productive than it has ever been, than any system of higher education in the world."

Why, then, the growing concern?

Re-examine the progress of the past ten years, and this fact becomes apparent: The progress was great—but it did not deal with the basic flaws in higher education's financial situation. Rather, it made the whole enterprise bigger, more sophisticated, and more expensive.

Voluntary contributions grew—but the complexity and costliness of the nation's colleges and universities grew faster.

Endowment funds grew—but the need for the income from them grew faster.

State appropriations grew—but the need grew faster.

Faculty salaries were rising. New courses were needed, due to the unprecedented "knowledge explosion." More costly apparatus was required, as scientific progress grew more complex. Enrollments burgeoned—and students stayed on for more advanced (and more expensive) training at higher levels.

And, for most of the nation's 2,300 colleges and universities, an old problem remained—and was intensified, as the costs of education rose: gifts, endowment, and government funds continued to go, disproportionately, to a relative handful of institutions. Some 36 per cent of all voluntary contributions, for example, went to just 55 major universities. Some 90 per cent of all endowment funds were owned by fewer than 5 per cent of the institutions. In 1966, the most recent year reported, some 70 per cent of the federal government's funds for higher education went to 100 institutions.

McGeorge Bundy, the president of the Ford Foundation, puts it this way:

"Great gains have been made; the academic profession has reached a wholly new level of economic strength, and the instruments of excellence—the libraries and
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EACH NEW ATTEMPT at a massive solution has left the trustees and presidents just where they started.

—A foundation president

laboratories—are stronger than ever. But the university that pauses to look back will quickly fall behind in the endless race to the future.”

Mr. Bundy says further:

“The greatest general problem of higher education is money . . . . The multiplying needs of the nation’s colleges and universities force a recognition that each new attempt at a massive solution has left the trustees and presidents just where they started: in very great need.”

THE FINANCIAL PROBLEMS of higher education are unlike those, say, of industry. Colleges and universities do not operate like General Motors. On the contrary, they sell their two primary services—teaching and research—at a loss.

It is safe to say (although details may differ from institution to institution) that the American college or university student pays only a fraction of the cost of his education.

This cost varies with the level of education and with the educational practices of the institution he attends. Undergraduate education, for instance, costs less than graduate education—which in turn may cost less than medical education. And the cost of educating a student in the sciences is greater than in the humanities. Whatever the variations, however, the student’s tuition and fees pay only a portion of the bill.

“As private enterprises,” says one president, “we don’t seem to be doing so well. We lose money every time we take in another student.”

Of course, neither he nor his colleagues on other campuses would have it otherwise. Nor, it seems clear, would most of the American people.

But just as student instruction is provided at a substantial reduction from the actual cost, so is the research that the nation’s universities perform on a vast scale for the federal government. On this particular below-cost service, as contrasted with that involving the provision of education to their students, many colleges and universities are considerably less than enthusiastic.

In brief: The federal government rarely pays the full cost of the research it sponsors. Most of the money goes for direct costs (compensation for faculty time, equipment, computer use, etc.) Some of it goes for indirect costs (such “overhead” costs of the institution as payroll departments, libraries, etc.). Government policy stipulates that the institutions receiving federal research grants
must share in the cost of the research by contributing, in some fashion, a percentage of the total amount of the grant.

University presidents have insisted for many years that the government should pay the full cost of the research it sponsors. Under the present system of cost-sharing, they point out, it actually costs their institutions money to conduct federally sponsored research. This has been one of the most controversial issues in the partnership between higher education and the federal government, and it continues to be so.

In commercial terms, then, colleges and universities sell their products at a loss. If they are to avoid going bankrupt, they must make up—from other sources—the difference between the income they receive for their services and the money they spend to provide them.

With costs spiraling upward, that task becomes ever more formidable.

Here are some of the harsh facts: Operating expenditures for higher education more than tripled during the past decade—from about $4 billion in 1956 to $12.7 billion last year. By 1970, if government projections are correct, colleges and universities will be spending over $18 billion for their current operations, plus another $2 billion or $3 billion for capital expansion.

Why such steep increases in expenditures? There are several reasons:

- Student enrollment is now close to 7 million—twice what it was in 1960.
- The rapid accumulation of new knowledge and a resulting trend toward specialization have led to a broadening of the curricula, a sharp increase in graduate study, a need for sophisticated new equipment, and increased library acquisitions. All are very costly.
- An unprecedented growth in faculty salaries—long overdue—has raised instructional costs at most institutions. (Faculty salaries account for roughly half of the educational expenses of the average institution of higher learning.)
- About 20 per cent of the financial “growth” during the past decade is accounted for by inflation.

Not only has the over-all cost of higher education increased markedly, but the cost per student has risen steadily, despite increases in enrollment which might, in any other “industry,” be expected to lower the unit cost.

Colleges and universities apparently have not improved their productivity at the same pace as the economy generally. A recent study of the financial trends in three private universities illustrates this. Between 1905 and 1966, the educational cost per student at the three universities, viewed compositely, increased 20-fold, against an economy-wide increase of three- to four-fold. In each of the three periods of peace, direct costs per student increased about 5 per cent, against a 2 per cent annual increase in the economy-wide index.

Some observers conclude from this that higher education must be made more efficient—that ways must be found to educate more students with fewer faculty and staff members. Some institutions have moved in this direction by adopting a year-round calendar of operations, permitting them to make maximum use of the faculty and physical plant. Instructional devices, programmed learning, closed-circuit television, and other technological systems are being employed to increase productivity and to gain economies through larger classes.

The problem, however, is to increase efficiency without jeopardizing the special character of higher education. Scholars are quick to point out that management techniques and business practices cannot be applied easily to colleges and universities. They observe, for example, that on strict cost-accounting principles, a college could not justify its library. A physics professor, complaining about large classes, remarks: "When you get a hundred kids in a classroom, that's not education; that's show business."

The college and university presidents whom we surveyed in the preparation of this report generally believe their institutions are making every dollar work. There is room for improvement, they acknowledge. But few feel the financial problems of higher education can be significantly reduced through more efficient management.

One thing seems fairly certain: The costs of higher education will continue to rise. To meet their projected expenses, colleges and universities will need to increase their annual operating income by more than $4 billion during the four-year period between 1966 and 1970. They must find another $8 billion or $10 billion for capital outlays.

Consider what this might mean for a typical private
A recent report presented this hypothetical case, based on actual projections of university expenditures and income:

The institution's budget is now in balance. Its educational and general expenditures total $24.5 million a year.

Assume that the university's expenditures per student will continue to grow at the rate of the past ten years—7.5 per cent annually. Assume, too, that the university's enrollment will continue to grow at its rate of the past ten years—3.4 per cent annually. Ten years hence, the institution's educational and general expenses would total $70.7 million.

At best, continues the analysis, tuition payments in the next ten years will grow at a rate of 6 per cent a year; at worst, at a rate of 4 per cent—compared with 9 per cent over the past ten years. Endowment income will grow at a rate of 3.5 to 5 per cent, compared with 7.7 per cent over the past decade. Gifts and grants will grow at a rate of 4.5 to 6 per cent, compared with 6.5 per cent over the past decade.

"If the income from private sources grew at the higher rates projected," says the analysis, "it would increase from $24.5 million to $50.9 million—leaving a deficit of $19.8 million, ten years hence. If its income from private sources grew at the lower rates projected, it would have increased to only $43 million—leaving a shortage of $27.8 million, ten years hence."

In publicly supported colleges and universities, the outlook is no brighter, although the gloom is of a different variety. Says the report of a study by two professors at the University of Wisconsin:

"Public institutions of higher education in the United States are now operating at a quality deficit of more than a billion dollars a year. In addition, despite heavy construction schedules, they have accumulated a major capital lag."

The deficit cited by the Wisconsin professors is a computation of the cost of bringing the public institutions' expenditures per student to a level comparable with that at the private institutions. With the enrollment growth expected by 1975, the professors calculate, the "quality deficit" in public higher education will reach $2.5 billion.

The problem is caused, in large part, by the tremendous enrollment increases in public colleges and universities. The institutions' resources, says the Wisconsin study, "may not prove equal to the task."

Moreover, there are indications that public institutions may be nearing the limit of expansion, unless they receive a massive infusion of new funds. One of every seven public universities rejected qualified applicants from their own states last fall; two of every seven rejected qualified applicants from other states. One of every ten raised admissions standards for in-state students; one in six raised standards for out-of-state students.

WILL THE FUNDS be found to meet the projected cost increases of higher education?

Colleges and universities have traditionally received their operating income from three sources: from the students, in the form of tuition and fees; from the state, in the form of legislative appropriations; and from individuals, foundations, and corporations, in the form of gifts. (Money from the federal government for operating expenses is still more of a hope than a reality.)

Can these traditional sources of funds continue to meet the need? The question is much on the minds of the nation's college and university presidents.

Tuition and fees: They have been rising—and are likely to rise more. A number of private "prestige" institutions have passed the $2,000 mark. Public institutions are under mounting pressure to raise tuition and fees, and their student charges have been rising at a faster rate than those in private institutions.

The problem of student charges is one of the most controversial issues in higher education today. Some feel that the student, as the direct beneficiary of an education, should pay most or all of its real costs. Others disagree emphatically: since society as a whole is the ultimate beneficiary, they argue, every student should have the right to an education, whether he can afford it or not.

The leaders of publicly supported colleges and universities are almost unanimous on this point: that higher tuitions and fees will erode the premise of equal oppor-
Tuition: We are reaching a point of diminishing returns. —A college president

It's like buying a second home. —A parent

tuition on which public higher education is based. They would like to see the present trend reversed—toward free, or at least lower-cost, higher education.

Leaders of private institutions find the rising tuitions equally disturbing. Heavily dependent upon the income they receive from students, many such institutions find that raising their tuition is inescapable, as costs rise. Scores of presidents surveyed for this report, however, said that mounting tuition costs are "pricing us out of the market." Said one: "As our tuition rises beyond the reach of a larger and larger segment of the college-age population, we find it more and more difficult to attract our quota of students. We are reaching a point of diminishing returns."

Parents and students also are worried. Said one father who has been financing a college education for three daughters: "It's like buying a second home."

Stanford Professor Roger A. Freeman says it isn't really that bad. In his book, Crisis in College Finance, he points out that when tuition increases have been adjusted to the shrinking value of the dollar or are related to rising levels of income, the cost to the student actually declined between 1941 and 1961. But this is small consolation to a man with an annual salary of $15,000 and three daughters in college.

Colleges and universities will be under increasing pressure to raise their rates still higher, but if they do, they will run the risk of pricing themselves beyond the means of more and more students. Indeed, the evidence is strong that resistance to high tuition is growing, even in relatively well-to-do families. The College Scholarship Service, an arm of the College Entrance Examination Board, reported recently that some middle- and upper-income parents have been "substituting relatively low-cost institutions" because of the rising prices at some of the nation's colleges and universities.

The presidents of such institutions have nightmares over such trends. One of them, the head of a private college in Minnesota, told us:

"We are so dependent upon tuition for approximately 50 per cent of our operating expenses that if 40 fewer students come in September than we expect, we could have a budgetary deficit this year of $50,000 or more."

> State appropriations: The 50 states have appropriated nearly $4.4 billion for their colleges and universities this year—a figure that includes neither the $1-$2 billion spent by public institutions for capital expansion, nor the appropriations of local governments, which account for about 10 per cent of all public appropriations for the operating expenses of higher education.

The record set by the states is remarkable—one that many observers would have declared impossible, as recently as eight years ago. In those eight years, the states have increased their appropriations for higher education by an incredible 214 per cent.

Can the states sustain this growth in their support of higher education? Will they be willing to do so?

The more pessimistic observers believe that the states can't and won't, without a drastic overhaul in the tax structures on which state financing is based. The most productive tax sources, such observers say, have been preempted by the federal government. They also believe that more and more state funds will be used, in the future, to meet increasing demands for other services.

Optimists, on the other hand, are convinced the states are far from reaching the upper limits of their ability to raise revenue. Tax reforms, they say, will enable states to increase their annual budgets sufficiently to meet higher education's needs.

The debate is theoretical. As a staff report to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations concluded: "The appraisal of a state's fiscal capacity is a political decision [that] it alone can make. It is not a researchable problem."

Ultimately, in short, the decision rests with the taxpayer.

> Voluntary private gifts: Gifts are vital to higher education.

In private colleges and universities, they are part of the lifeblood. Such institutions commonly budget a deficit, and then pray that it will be met by private gifts.

In public institutions, private gifts supplement state appropriations. They provide what is often called "a margin for excellence." Many public institutions use such funds to raise faculty salaries above the levels paid for by the state, and are thus able to compete for top scholars. A number of institutions depend upon private gifts for student facilities that the state does not provide.

Will private giving grow fast enough to meet the growing need? As with state appropriations, opinions vary.

John J. Schwartz, executive director of the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, feels there is a great untapped reservoir. At present, for example, only one out of every four alumni and alumnas contributes to higher education. And, while American business corporations gave an estimated $300 million to education
in 1965–66, this was only about 0.37 per cent of their net income before taxes. On the average, companies contribute only about 1.10 per cent of net income before taxes to all causes—well below the 5 per cent allowed by the Federal government. Certainly there is room for expansion.

(Colleges and universities are working overtime to tap this reservoir. Mr. Schwartz’s association alone lists 117 colleges and universities that are now campaigning to raise a combined total of $4 billion.)

But others are not so certain that expansion in private giving will indeed take place. The 46th annual survey by the John Price Jones Company, a firm of fund-raising counselors, sampled 50 colleges and universities and found a decline in voluntary giving of 8.7 per cent in 12 months. The Council for Financial Aid to Education and the American Alumni Council calculate that voluntary support for higher education in 1965–66 declined by some 1.2 per cent in the same period.

Refining these figures gives them more meaning. The major private universities, for example, received about 36 per cent of the $1.2 billion given to higher education—a decrease from the previous year. Private liberal arts colleges also fell behind: coeducational colleges dropped 10 per cent, men’s colleges dropped 16.2 per cent, and women’s colleges dropped 12.6 per cent. State institutions, on the other hand, increased their private support by 23.8 per cent.

The record of some cohesive groups of colleges and universities is also revealing. Voluntary support of eight Ivy League institutions declined 27.8 per cent, for a total loss of $61 million. The Seven College Conference, a group of women’s colleges, reported a drop of 41 per cent. The Associated Colleges of the Midwest dropped about
ON THE QUESTION OF FEDERAL AID, everybody seems to be running to the same side of the boat.

—A college president

5.5 per cent. The Council of Southern Universities declined 6.2 per cent. Fifty-five major private universities received 7.7 per cent less from gifts.

Four groups gained. The state universities and colleges received 20.5 per cent more in private gifts in 1965-66 than in the previous year. Fourteen technological institutions gained 10.8 per cent. Members of the Great Lakes College Association gained 5.6 per cent. And Western Conference universities, plus the University of Chicago, gained 34.5 per cent. (Within each such group, of course, individual colleges may have gained or lost differently from the group as a whole.)

The biggest drop in voluntary contributions came in foundation grants. Although this may have been due, in part, to the fact that there had been some unusually large grants the previous year, it may also have been a foretaste of things to come. Many of those who observe foundations closely think such grants will be harder and harder for colleges and universities to come by, in years to come.

FEARING that the traditional sources of revenue may not yield the necessary funds, college and university presidents are looking more and more to Washington for the solution to their financial problems.

The president of a large state university in the South, whose views are typical of many, told us: "Increased federal support is essential to the fiscal stability of the colleges and universities of the land. And such aid is a proper federal expenditure."

Most of his colleagues agreed—some reluctantly. Said the president of a college in Iowa: "I don't like it . . . but it may be inevitable." Another remarked: "On the question of federal aid, everybody seems to be running to the same side of the boat."

More federal aid is almost certain to come. The question is, When? And in what form?

Realism compels this answer: In the near future, the federal government is unlikely to provide substantial support for the operating expenses of the country's colleges and universities.

The war in Vietnam is one reason. Painful effects of war-prompted economies have already been felt on the campuses. The effective federal funding of research per faculty member is declining. Construction grants are becoming scarcer. Fellowship programs either have been reduced or have merely held the line.

Indeed, the changes in the flow of federal money to the campuses may be the major event that has brought higher education's financial problems to their present head.

Would things be different in a peacetime economy? Many college and university administrators think so. They already are planning for the day when the Vietnam war ends and when, the thinking goes, huge sums of federal money will be available for higher education. It is no secret that some government officials are operating on the same assumption and are designing new programs of support for higher education, to be put into effect when the war ends.

Others are not so certain the postwar money flow is that inevitable. One of the doubters is Clark Kerr, former president of the University of California and a man with considerable first-hand knowledge of the relationship between higher education and the federal government. Mr. Kerr is inclined to believe that the colleges and universities will have to fight for their place on a national priority list that will be crammed with a number of other pressing
Colleges and universities are tough. They have survived countless cataclysms and crises, and one way or another they will endure.
—A college president

problems: air and water pollution, civil rights, and the plight of the nation's cities, to name but a few.

One thing seems clear: The pattern of federal aid must change dramatically, if it is to help solve the financial problems of U.S. higher education. Directly or indirectly, more federal dollars must be applied to meeting the increasing costs of operating the colleges and universities, even as the government continues its support of students, of building programs, and of research.

In searching for a way out of their financial difficulties, colleges and universities face the hazard that their individual interests may conflict. Some form of competition (since the institutions are many and the sources of dollars few) is inevitable and healthy. But one form of competition is potentially dangerous and destructive and, in the view of impartial supporters of all institutions of higher education, must be avoided at all costs.

This is a conflict between private and public colleges and universities.

In simpler times, there was little cause for friction. Public institutions received their funds from the states. Private institutions received their funds from private sources.

No longer. All along the line, and with increasing frequency, both types of institution are seeking both public and private support—often from the same sources:

- **The state treasuries**: More and more private institutions are suggesting that some form of state aid is not only necessary but appropriate. A number of states have already enacted programs of aid to students attending private institutions. Some 40 per cent of the state appropriation for higher education in Pennsylvania now goes to private institutions.

- **The private philanthropists**: More and more public institutions are seeking gifts from individuals, foundations, and corporations, to supplement the funds they receive from the state. As noted earlier in this report, their efforts are meeting with growing success.

- **The federal government**: Both public and private colleges and universities receive funds from Washington. But the different types of institution sometimes disagree on the fundamentals of distributing it.

Should the government help pay the operating costs of colleges and universities by making grants directly to the institutions—perhaps through a formula based on enrollments? The heads of many public institutions are inclined to think so. The heads of many low-enrollment, high-tuition private institutions, by contrast, tend to favor programs that operate indirectly—perhaps by giving enough money to the students themselves, to enable them to pay for an education at whatever institutions they might choose.

Similarly, the strongest opposition to long-term, federally underwritten student-loan plans—some envisioning a payback period extending over most of one's lifetime—comes from public institutions, while some private-college and university leaders find, in such plans, a hope that their institutions might be able to charge “full-cost” tuition rates without barring students whose families can’t afford to pay.

In such frictional situations, involving not only billions of dollars but also some very deep-seated convictions about the country’s educational philosophy, the chances that destructive conflicts might develop are obviously great. If such conflicts were to grow, they could only sap the energies of all who engage in them.

If there is indeed a crisis building in American higher education, it is not solely a problem of meeting the minimum needs of our colleges and universities in the years ahead. Nor, for most, is it a question of survive or perish; “colleges and universities are tough,” as one president put it; “they have survived countless cataclysms and crises, and one way or another they will endure.”

The real crisis will be finding the means of providing the quality, the innovation, the pioneering that the nation needs, if its system of higher education is to meet the demands of the morrow.

Not only must America’s colleges and universities serve millions more students in the years ahead; they must also equip these young people to live in a world that is changing with incredible swiftness and complexity. At the same time, they must carry on the basic research on which the nation’s scientific and technological advancement rests. And they must be ever-ready to help meet the immediate and long-range needs of society; ever-responsive to society's demands.

At present, the questions outnumber the answers.

- How can the United States make sure that its colleges and universities not only will accomplish the minimum task but will, in the words of one corporate leader,
Nothing is more important than the critical and knowledgeable interest of our alumni. It cannot possibly be measured in merely financial terms.

—A university president

provide “an educational system adequate to enable us to live in the complex environment of this century?”

- Do we really want to preserve the diversity of an educational system that has brought the country a strength unknown in any other time or any other place? And, if so, can we?
- How can we provide every youth with as much education as he is qualified for?
- Can a balance be achieved in the sources of higher education’s support, so that public and private institutions can flourish side by side?
- How can federal money best be channeled into our colleges and universities without jeopardizing their independence and without discouraging support either from the state legislatures or from private philanthropy?

The answers will come painfully; there is no panacea. Quick solutions, fashioned in an atmosphere of crisis, are likely to compound the problem. The right answers will emerge only from greater understanding on the part of the country’s citizens, from honest and candid discussion of the problems, and from the cooperation and support of all elements of society.

The president of a state university in the Southwest told us: “Among state universities, nothing is more important than the growing critical and knowledgeable interest of our alumni. That interest leads to general support. It cannot possibly be measured in merely financial terms.”

A private college president said: “The greatest single source of improvement can come from a realization on the part of a broad segment of our population that higher education must have support. Not only will people have to give more, but more will have to give.”

But do people understand? A special study by the Council for Financial Aid to Education found that:
- 82 per cent of persons in managerial positions or the professions do not consider American business to be an important source of gift support for colleges and universities.
- 59 per cent of persons with incomes of $10,000 or over do not think higher education has financial problems.
- 52 per cent of college graduates apparently are not aware that their alma mater has financial problems.

To America’s colleges and universities, these are the most discouraging revelations of all. Unless the American people—especially the college and university alumni—can come alive to the reality of higher education’s impending crisis, then the problems of today will be the disasters of tomorrow.
thick of urban problems. Proposals for projects may be submitted by any accredited District college or university, and those selected are financed by the federal government (75 percent) and local funds such as those of the District government, participating universities, and the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies. Projects approved so far have included the following:

American University has two Title I projects. The Washington Executives Conference allows top District, suburban, and regional officials and citizen leaders to study the District's needs in government organization and manpower development; in public finance; in urban development, including relationships between low-income housing, model neighborhood, new town and antipoverty programs; and in community relations, including class and race relations, and citizen participation. American also sponsors the Urban Careers Project, whose aim is to increase the supply of talented manpower for urban, suburban, and metropolitan public service. It recruits college students in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia, presents orientation seminars, and supervises the students' work as summer interns in local government and private agencies. This is a cooperative project with Maryland and Virginia and as such is the only interstate Title I project in the nation.

Catholic University's Educational Technology Project conducts workshops for teachers, parents, and administrative staff of schools in the vicinity of the university. Teachers are instructed in the operation of audiovisual equipment and in the selection and use of programmed learning materials and in other innovations, such as computer-assisted instruction and educational television. The project is also preparing a training guide in educational technology for use throughout the District school system.

D.C. Teachers College, although it is not a member of the Consortium, has a Group Relations Project which the Consortium, as Title I agent, administers. This provides one-week summer workshops for department supervisors of District government agencies. Its purpose is to increase public officials' understanding of low-income citizens. Relations between public officials and low-income people are examined in terms of the problems of law enforcement, housing, welfare, and employment.

George Washington University sponsors the Volunteer Tutor Project, which conducts individual one-day training institutes for 25 tutoring groups. It has led to the establishment of new tutoring groups and expects to prepare an evaluation of volunteer tutoring groups and their problems.

Georgetown University has sponsored three Title I projects. The Institute for Urban Service Aides provides a one-year course of study of urban society from the perspectives of history, sociology, government, and psychology. Its aim is to improve the job effectiveness of the aides and prepare them for advancement in their careers and as leaders in the community. Georgetown's Conference on the Report of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia, held in March 1967, brought together 150 public officials and community leaders to examine and appraise those recommendations of the Report that deal with the police, juvenile delinquency, the courts, and correction. The Conference led to the third Georgetown project, a television series on Crime in the District of Columbia. This series, produced in cooperation with WMAL-TV through its public-service program Close-Up, focuses on social dimensions of crime. Monthly half-hour programs present the views of officials, attorneys, professors, members of the Crime Commission, and people with criminal records.

Howard University's Conference on the University and the Community, held in cooperation with Georgetown University in December 1966, brought together 200 government, community, and university representatives to explore ways of increasing university participation in the public affairs of the District of Columbia. Sixteen colleges and universities were represented. Some of the recommendations of the Conference have already been implemented by Consortium universities. One suggestion was that student internships be established to broaden education and help meet the mounting need for urban public servants. American University's Urban Careers Project is one such program. Another recommendation was that universities appoint representatives for community affairs who would coordinate university activities in the area of public and social action. This has been done in several of the universities.

In another area entirely, the Consortium and the federal government have teamed up in service to the community. This is through the State Technical Services Act of 1965, which was designed to help universities communicate technological advances in science and engineering to business, commerce, and industry. Each state under this act has an agent, and the Consortium is the agent for the District of Columbia. Projects accepted for 1968 that will be carried out at Consortium universities are structural analyses by computer methods (at Catholic University), application of the critical-path method to the light construction industry, and an institute for construction technology (both at American University).

The five Consortium universities have been formally cooperating now for four years. In enriching their academic offerings, in saving scarce funds and utilizing scarce talents, and in acting together as a community-oriented agency, they have come to agree, in Dr. West's succinct phrase, that "five universities are better than one." ~Robin Friedheim

Mrs. Friedheim is Assistant University Editor at Georgetown.
On Blackbeard’s Island
Georgetown doctors serve a children’s clinic

The Agnes Hardecker Laboratory and Children’s Clinic—a haven of health for poor children in Nassau—had its origin during the honeymoon of two pediatricians.

Its conception goes back to April 15, 1946. On that date, Dr. Frederic Girard Burke, M’42, a professor of pediatrics at Georgetown University, married Dr. Ruth Derouin, also a pediatrician.

Two days after arriving in Nassau for their honeymoon, the newlyweds noticed a young Catholic priest coming in off the quay. Oddly enough, he carried both a missal and the trademark of physicians everywhere, a little black bag. Curious, Dr. Burke walked over to the priest and struck up a conversation.

"Noticed your black bag, Father, and just wanted to stop by to say hello. Do you practice medicine?"

"Yes, but I’m not a doctor," the priest replied. "I've had only limited training in medicine, as a Benedictine missionary. Learned mainly how to extract teeth, suture wounds, and treat minor ailments."

A serious shortage of physicians, however, made it necessary for the missionary to perform most all types of diagnosis and therapy. Only last week, he had delivered a baby in a remote village on one of the out-islands.

Later, the priest introduced Dr. Burke to the Rev. Paul Leonard Hagarty, O.S.B., curate for the Bahamas. At dinner, Father Hagarty talked compassionately about the poor health of island inhabitants, particularly the children.

"The church feels a great need to administer to the sick, as well as to the souls," he stated. "It is hard to preach the word of God to a man starving to death or dying of disease."

On church grounds in downtown Nassau, he said, the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent, N.Y., were waging a valiant struggle against diseases and disorders in children. The nursing nuns treated minor ailments at a day nursery for prekindergarten children. Their efforts, though commendable, could not succeed in conquering disease without help from more physicians.

Dr. Burke decided to do something about it. "Why not spend the rest of our honeymoon helping these children?" he asked his wife. She agreed, and, for the next three weeks, the Burkes examined and treated more than 100 youngsters.

"It was a sad—and eye-opening—experience," recalls Dr. Burke, still on the faculty of the Georgetown University School of Medicine. "We observed children dying nearly every day of whooping cough, lockjaw, and other diseases that were being prevented by immunizations in the United States and other countries."

Before leaving for home, Dr. Burke arranged for students and faculty of the School of Medicine to staff a pediatrics clinic at the nursery. The first to serve was John Ralph, M’46, during the summer of 1946. More volunteers followed year after year, but a lack of facilities hamstrung their efforts. A new modern clinic was needed.

Providentially, in March 1961, Dr. Burke met Aaron Frosch, a famous New York attorney, at a Nassau hotel. With his help, Dr. Burke obtained construction funds from the Angelus Foundation of New York. According to foundation officers, the clinic would be a living memorial to Miss Agnes F. Hardecker, former personal secretary to the mother of Huntington Hartford and an official in the Hartford Enterprises. The officers had come to admire Miss Hardecker as "a very warm human being—one who loved her fellow man."

The clinic would be built in Nassau, on New Providence Island, in the heart of the green Bahamas. Here at one time was the headquarters of Blackbeard and other swashbuckling pirates who staged raids on rich Spanish galleons. More sedate now, the Bahamas are a tourist attraction, one of the most popular in the world.
With tourism have come many improvements in living conditions. Still, pockets of poverty persist. The largest of these pockets, known as the "Over-the-Hill" section, is a patchwork of tin-roofed huts and wooden shanties. In these one- and two-room structures live entire families, sometimes as many as 18 persons. There is no running water, and outhouses are in almost every yard.

Ironically, it is water that helps create many health hazards. When it rains, the water picks up sewage, and scatters it throughout the village, more efficiently than a manure spreader. Polluted with filth, the yards—and eventually the homes—become breeding grounds for disease.

Amid this squalor, the Hardecker Clinic—a one-story, white cottage—was dedicated June 15, 1963. To the ceremony came most all of the clinic's supporters. In his address, Father Hagarty—who became the Bahamas' first bishop in 1960—told the gathering that the strength of a nation lies in the health of her children.

"When the health is poor," he said, "the country is weak and the moral fibre of her people is bound to be fragile.

"Clearly, then," he went on, "it is our mission, derived not only from the command of God, but also from the highest ideals in the heart of man, to provide the best for the health of those we love the most—our children." Emphasis, he said, should be on preventive medicine, adding: "It is far better to prevent disease than to have to treat it."

Among those listening were the Burkes, Miss Hardecker, Mr. Frosch, and three persons who were to figure prominently in the success of the clinic: Dr. Julie Wershing, Frank Clarke, and Sister Celeste Marie.

Only a month before, Dr. Julie—as she is affectionately called by friends and patients alike—was skiing on mountain slopes near Denver, where she was employed as a pediatrics instructor in the Colorado University School of Medicine. She had gone there from Georgetown University, after graduating from the School of Medicine, class of '58, and completing postgraduate training in pediatrics under Dr. Burke.

On a visit to Washington, she ran across Dr. Burke, and he promptly asked whether she would serve as pediatrician at the Nassau Clinic.

"Nothing doing," replied Dr. Julie, and flew back to Denver. Dr. Burke, however, is a man who, like a Sicilian suitor, won't take no for an answer.

A week later, Dr. Julie received a letter from him, instructing her to pack up! She would become a clinical associate professor of pediatrics, assigned to the Hardecker Clinic. Conveniently enough, flight instructions, housing arrangements, and other important details were included in the letter.

On arrival in Nassau, Dr. Julie soon met Sister Celeste of the Sisters of the Sick Poor in Brooklyn, N.Y. As a nursing nun, Sister Celeste was named administrator of the clinic. Needed now was a laboratory worker.

The position was offered to Frank Clarke, a native Bahamian who did odd jobs at The Priory—central mission for the Bahamas. Frank knew more about mandarins than microbes, but he was willing to learn. Under the instructions of Dr. Julie, he caught on quickly and today, according to his tutor, "knows more about urinalysis, blood analysis, and stool examinations than most medical technologists."

With this staff of three, the clinic opened its doors September 20, 1963. Its services were for children through age 12, regardless of race, color, or creed. But the first day was a disappointment, with only five patients visiting the clinic. An explanation for this cool response comes from Dr. Julie.

"About six of every ten children in this poor section died before reaching maturity," she explained. "The inhabitants blamed many of these deaths on bad experiences with doctors.

"One mother even went so far as to have neighbors buy her a black dress and mantle for the funeral before bringing her child to me. Then, after bringing the child in, the mother said she hoped she didn't have to wear them."

Other early experiences were recalled by Dr. Julie in a Christmas letter home, three months after the clinic opened. "Although many are scared stiff at first," she wrote, "quite a few now come to visit us almost daily—just to say 'hello' shyly and dash out again. Many of the patients are undernourished and quite ill with dysentry, asthma, and skin diseases. They have swollen stomachs, stick-like legs, and thin, bony bodies covered with sores and scars."

On a typical day now, the clinic is busier than a church bazaar. Visiting there several months ago, I found the waiting room filled to capacity early in the morning. One of the patients was a small girl, dressed in Sunday clothes with a big red bow atop her head. From between chubby cheeks, she smiled shyly at Dr. Julie.

Nodding toward the patient, Dr. Julie said she looks as healthy as an American farm girl. "Looks, however, are deceptive," she added. "This girl is from a very poor home, but, like many others, is well-dressed every time she comes here." Cuddling the child against her side, she noted that Bahamians "take great pride in their appearance." Inwardly, though, the patient, according to Dr. Julie, was very sick with anemia and a bad case of worms.

Typically, this patient suffered from two ailments categorized in what doctors call the four A's: ascariasis, amebiasis, asthma, and anemia. When the clinic first opened, Dr. Julie found that from 80 to 90 percent of the children were infected by worms, amebae, or both. Only recently, three children each passed 120 round worms within a 24-hour period. One worm was 14 inches long and as thick as a pencil.
In the islands, roundworms cause an infection known as ascariasis. Found frequently in the small intestine, these worms cause colicky pains and diarrhea. Amebiasis, too, is an infection, caused by amebae, or minute one-cell animals. Besides roundworms, the whip or threadworm—known medically as trichuris—is also commonly found in the children. This two-inch-long worm curls itself into the shape of a bullwhip, and settles in the lower rectal areas. Often it causes the rectum to protrude from the anus, leading Bahamians to refer to the disorder as “body coming out.” Also, it produces diarrhea, vomiting, and nervous disorders. Once absorbed into the bloodstream, worms do even worse damage to the body.

Organs chiefly affected are the liver, heart, kidneys and lungs. To deal effectively with the parasitic diseases, the clinic staff immediately instituted a program in preventive medicine. Complete medical examinations were given to infants, preschool children, and youngsters from the neighboring Church of Our Lady school, which has 900 pupils. Most important, each child was immunized against diphtheria, poliomyelitis, tetanus, smallpox, and whooping cough.

As a supplement to the program, public health measures were taken. Mothers were taught to purify water by boiling, and to use disinfectants against bacteria. School children were taught health hygiene, and in turn passed on their new knowledge to parents.

The Nursing Sisters of the Sick Poor also did their part. Through daily visits into the home, they provided follow-up treatment to patients and gave instructions in good health habits to all in the family.
In the clinic itself, posters went up, offering patients tips on how to cope with worms and malnutrition.

One poster, designed by a volunteer nurse, is an obituary for Miss Wiggly Worm—Died April 5, 1967—"from lonesomeness after Stacy stopped sucking her thumb." Another memorializes The Ascaris Family, "murdered with boiling water and dettol."

Other signs encourage the youngsters to make bread, milk, and eggs part of their daily diet.

Slowly but steadily, more and more Bahamians were attracted to the clinic. Today it has 5,000 individual patients. During the fiscal year ended May 31, 1967, patient visits numbered 6,119. Now, thanks to the efforts of Dr. Julie and staff, less than half of the patients have worms.

Along with education and treatment, research too has become a part of the regular routine at the Hardecker Clinic. Sponsored by American pharmaceutical firms, particularly Parke-Davis Co., studies are being done in nutrition, worm infestations, childhood diseases, and the effectiveness of new drugs against amebiasis.

More effective drugs resulting from this research have rendered dysentery a less serious health problem in Nassau. In 1963, children afflicted with the disease occupied an average of 30 beds daily at Princess Margaret Hospital, the only inpatient facility in the Bahamas. Now many days go by without admission of a single patient with a serious case of dysentery.

"Dysentery has by no means been eradicated," says Dr. Julie. "Indications are, however, that we have at least cut down the severity of cases, to a point where hospital admission is not required in many cases."

The clinic, too, is growing physically. Construction of a new wing doubled its size in August 1966. In this wing are a reception room, two examining rooms, a staff room, pharmacy, admitting room, and library.

On its full-time staff now, Hardecker Clinic has a receptionist, a Bahamian nurse, an American nurse, and two medical technologists, who are volunteers working as lay apostles. Assisting them, as practitioners and consultants, are students and faculty from the Department of Pediatrics, Georgetown University School of Medicine. Chairman of the department is Dr. Philip L. Caleagno.

Each year from six to eight medical students spend from four to six weeks at the clinic, participating in all aspects of medical care. According to Dr. Burke, students go there on an elective basis to learn more about tropical diseases.

"All of these students," he said, "diagnose and treat tropical diseases that are relatively uncommon in the United States, except in some poverty-stricken areas. Also, the students can study the cross-cultural, social, and certain medical problems that characterize all developing countries."

Georgetown faculty members visit the clinic primarily as consultants. For example, Dr. Marshall Parks, a leading eye surgeon, spends two weeks at the clinic each year, advising the Hardecker staff and other health personnel on the islands on how to detect and treat eye disorders.

All who serve at the clinic develop a common interest—the advancement of world health. To perpetuate this objective, the volunteers have organized the Hardecker Clinic Alumni Association. Its secretary is Dr. Barbara Schulte, M '66, a pediatrics resident at Jackson Memorial Hospital in Miami.

The desire and dedication of all volunteers have helped make the Hardecker Clinic a model for bringing the resources of teaching institutions to bear on the health problems of underdeveloped areas. Other medical schools have followed Georgetown's format in other parts of the world. Most of them, however, concentrate on either research or treatment, usually not both.

Increasingly, more and more Bahamians are being trained at the clinic to provide medical care for their own people. In the words of Dr. Julie, "We hope to stay here only as long as it takes to help the Bahamians to take over the clinic and operate it themselves."

Meantime, modern medicine continues to flow from Georgetown to Nassau, 1,100 miles away. As a result, children who once had only a 50 percent chance of reaching adulthood are being given new hope for longer lives. ~ Arthur Ciervo

Medical student Lawrence Kelly (r.), upon his return to Georgetown from six weeks' service at the clinic, reports on his experience to Dr. Frederic Burke, professor of pediatrics.

Mr. Ciervo, who also took most of the photographs accompanying his story, covers science and medical news for the Georgetown University News Service.
BOOK REVIEW

The United States in Puerto Rico 1898-1900
Edward J. Berbusse, S.J.
University of North Carolina Press, 1966
274 pages, $7.50

On May 12, 1898, the commander of the U.S. Caribbean Squadron gave the order to commence firing on San Juan, Puerto Rico. The Spanish fleet departed, and a rather easy episode of the Spanish-American War ended Spanish rule of the island. The resulting U.S. military occupation was the beginning of a long, tortuous road to dominion status. This book by Rev. Edward Berbusse, S.J., Ph.D. '52, is an account of the early years of U.S. occupation, a period that has not up till now, been well investigated by historians.

Father Berbusse describes at great length the conditions and events in early nineteenth-century Spain that prompted the wars for independence in her New World colonies. After the restoration of the Bourbons in 1815, most of Spanish America severed ties with the mother country, but Spain was determined to keep Cuba and Puerto Rico—and succeeded throughout most of the nineteenth century. The author states that Bourbon Ferdinand VII granted Puerto Rico token economic reforms in order to keep liberals “pacifistic” at a crucial time when the island could conceivably have joined her sisters in independence. Occasionally voices were raised in the Spanish Cortes (parliament) urging autonomy for Puerto Rico. Expectations for autonomy were raised again when the Spanish Bill of Rights was extended to the island in 1873—but dashed the next year when Alfonso XII was returned to his throne to restore a bitter absolutism. In January 1898—just months before the U.S. takeover—the island was proclaimed autonomous, and the principal Puerto Rican leaders seemed to be reconciled to Spain. But the U.S. occupation ended forever the question of autonomy under Spain.

The author neglects two important factors in the retention and the end of Spanish rule of Puerto Rico. First, the fact that Cuba and Puerto Rico remained Spanish for so long was due in good part to the wishes of the major European powers—especially England—who feared that an independent Cuba and Puerto Rico might fall into the lap of a possibly expansionist U.S. Second, the author does not make it completely clear that Spain’s failure to keep the islands was due to her inability to adopt a realistic and consistent policy toward them, while the U.S. was becoming increasingly expansionist, both economically and politically.

The book has some other serious shortcomings. There are several long and detailed chapters on the military government in this early period. The activities of the first governor, the able General John Brooke, are fully described. Brooke and his colleagues didn’t believe that the Islanders were ready for self-government, but it was not the military governors who hampered dominion status (this role was left to the U.S. Congress, who bickered and delayed; and the sugar industry, which demanded tariff protection). But these chapters are marred by excessive, boring, and somewhat repetitive detail. The reader, among the trees, loses sight of the forest of overall policies and directives of U.S. military government.

In his description of the civil government set up by the Foraker Act of 1900, the author regretfully neglects the activities of Luis Munoz Rivera, an autonomist leader under Spanish rule and an early supporter of the Foraker Act. Interestingly he became the Act’s principal critic—but this is not explained. Munoz’s maneuvers in this crucial era will warrant more study, as will his emergence as a prominent Puerto Rican nationalist.

Although one wishes further explanations had been forthcoming on certain points, and the discussions of other matters had been shorter and livelier, Father Berbusse’s book is still a helpful, worthwhile contribution to the historiography of U.S. Administration in Puerto Rico.

Thomas Dodd, Jr.
Assistant Professor of History
Georgetown University

From Atlantic to Pacific
Immanuel J. Klette
Harper and Row for the Council on Foreign Relations, 143 pp., $4.50

This is “must” reading for all those who are aware that the present Panama and future inter-ocean canals are under study and that a major decision on east-west water travel will be made in the near future.

Col. Klette, G’62, has his preferences both among the four possible routes for a new sea-level canal (the Sasardi-Morti route in Panama) and for a means of constructing a new canal (nuclear excavation); but this has not prevented him from presenting all the pros and cons involved in all the options. Each possibility is examined in terms of its history, the future needs of international trade, engineering problems both conventional and nuclear, security considerations, and finally the general con-
text of international politics in which the problem must be viewed.

One regrets only that the author has omitted any discussion of ecological and oceanographic considerations. Scientists are worried that a sea-level canal can potentially change the ecology of the region, and the Interoceanic Canal Commission is currently studying this aspect of the problem.

Nevertheless, this is a good book, and a glance at Col. Klette's background shows how he was able to produce it. Among his many military assignments was a tour in the Canal Zone, between 1962 and 1965, which provided him a vast store of information and a sensitivity to some of the emotionally laden problems involved. His academic training and the time spent as Air Force Fellow with the Council on Foreign Relations have provided him with the tools to write an evenhanded report on a complex subject.

—Robert L. Friedheim
Strategic Analyst
Center for Naval Analyses

The Church in the World
ed. Charles P. O'Donnell
Bruce, 1967, 173 pp., $5.95

The fruits of a colloquium held at Georgetown University in July 1966, this book is dedicated "to those who wish to see the Church work with the world and the world work with the Church." It will have no appeal for those who think that the majesty of the Catholic Church lies primarily in its past. The essays make clear that the program of renewal undertaken at the Second Vatican Council is "programmatic for the future."

Just as important, The Church in the World confirms the modest yet crucial judgment of Robert McAfee Brown that although the Council has not uttered the final word on the place and task of the Church in the modern world, it has issued "an immeasurably important first word on a subject to which Catholicism has given far too little attention in the past."

Bishop John J. Wright's essay assesses the thrust of the Council, which is "now fully focused on the future and on dialogue with the present and coming world of unbelief, dogmatic or practical." The Church's tactic in countering this "severe winter of unbelief" was the planting of many "seed-ideas," winter wheat with the strength and resolve to weather the "scientism, atheist humanism, and moral scepticism" of our age. The "seed-ideas" are engendered by the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, the primary focus of the essays in the book.

Three essays by Monsignor George G. Higgins, Reverend Francis X. Murphy, and the late Reverend John Courtney Murray examine the purpose, scope, and significance of the Pastoral Constitution. Of prime importance is the fact that the Council addresses itself to the entire human family as a community which is inseparably linked with and dedicated to mankind and the course of human history. But the Constitution does not presume upon the gravity of the world's problems by offering pat answers to particular problems.

The program of aggiornamento at Vatican II, especially as it is manifest in the Constitution, is interpreted in the book in its full positive thrust. Its validity is confirmed by several essayists. In matters of marriage and family, Father John L. Thomas thinks it a decided step forward that the Council did not prematurely define on issues of great urgency and complexity. Even in its socioeconomic statements, where "nothing truly new" was said, the Constitution offers "something truly new in emphasis." The new emphasis, John Murphy and George Shuster agree, lies in Vatican II's acceptance of cultural changes "as forming the framework within which the mission of the Church must henceforth be carried on."

The Church in the World, however, also contains some reservations. There is strong feeling that while the experts assess the value of Vatican II, the secular world moves on and the "winter of unbelief" settles in. Father Murphy expresses his fear "that the time-scale of history is set at a much faster pace than the Vatican realizes." Georgetown Professor Victor C. Ferkiss fears that "while a great event has occurred in the Church in the process of renewal, it has not gone far enough." Nevertheless, one point stands out in all the essays: the Church has overcome the old static relationship between itself and the world.

As a Protestant with a healthy concern for ecumenicity, I was particularly impressed by two things. First, the incisive discussion of Church-state relations by John Courtney Murray itself makes the book a worthwhile contribution. Second, I object to Father Murphy's insistence that change in the present should not be taken as an indication of past error. Perhaps it is crucial today, as the Church addresses itself to the whole of humanity, to remember that to err is only human.

—James W. Thomasson
Instructor in Theology
Georgetown University
Alumni Ballot

To All Georgetown Alumni:

The purpose of this letter is to announce that this year the Official Ballot for the election of officers and members of the Board of Governors of the Alumni Association is contained in this magazine on the following page.

Please complete it, tear out the page, and mail to:
Election Committee,
Georgetown University Alumni Association,
3604 O Street, N.W.,
Washington, D. C. 20007.

Ballots must be returned by June 30.

The duly constituted Nominating Committee of the Board of Governors, under the chairmanship of Dr. Adrian J. Levesque, D’33, received nominations to fill three officer vacancies and 22 vacancies on the Board of Governors. The slate of nominees was duly published and circulated in the last issue of Georgetown, together with information regarding the process of the addition of nominees through petition; no petitions were received. Each nominee was carefully considered by the Committee before making the final selection contained on the following page.

Cordially,

Louis B. Fine, L’25
All Georgetown Alumni are entitled to vote for the election of the president, secretary, treasurer, and 22 members of the Board of Governors of the Georgetown University Alumni Association. Officers will serve until June 30, 1970. Board members will serve until June 30, 1971.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOARD OF GOVERNORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region IV*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State except the five boroughs of New York City and the Counties of Westchester, Nassau, Rockland, and Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Norman Kleisley, C'55, Rochester, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. William Michael Slavin, C'29, Troy, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Herman F. Bernstein, D'26, Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Regis Dean, L'46, Falls Church, Va.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dennis Lane, FS'43, LLB'48, Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charles B. Murto, D'32, Silver Spring, Md.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Christopher Rolle, Jr., C'56, Chevy Chase, Md.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joseph Salcetti, D'53, Fairway Hills, Md.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Regions not listed have no vacancies this year.

Region VII
Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia (except the Counties of Arlington and Fairfax); Richard Harlan Frank, C'50, LLB'53, Tampa, Fla. |
Paul Alexander Nalty, C'58, L'61, New Orleans, La.

Region VIII
Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico |
Rev. Charles Bernard King, Jr., C'53, Dallas, Tex. |
Laurence Francis Rooney, Jr., C'49, Muskogee, Okla.

Region IX
Colorado, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming;
Francis Maurice Cavanaugh, LLB'38, LLM'39, Arvada, Colo. |
Robert Delphine Marcotte, C'48, Omaha, Neb. |

Region X
Arizona, California, and Nevada |
James A. Broderick, Jr., C'37, Los Angeles, Calif. |
Henry A. Mackey, C'43, Phoenix, Ariz. |

Region XI
Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington |
Dr. Malcolm Oliphant, C'47, Honolulu, Hawaii |
George L. Rodgers, L'40, Portland, Ore. |
Morris Zipper, FS'34, Portland, Ore. |

Region XII
Insular possessions of the United States and foreign countries |
Thomas Ryan Byrne, G'51, London, England |
Dr. Marcelo Nubla, GL'23, Quezon City, Philippines |
Peter J. Tanous, Jr., C'60, Neuilly sur Seine, France