Chapter 9

PROVOST, TRUSTEES, AND ALUMNI

1910–1930

THE SECOND PROVOST SMITH

The physician-provost and the business-man-provost having implemented the office between 1881 and 1910 with new and greater powers and achieved great results, it remained for the two scholar-provosts who successively followed them to carry on the tradition of that office till its administrative functions were so largely merged in those of the new presidency. Neither Edgar F. Smith, who was Provost from 1910 to 1920, nor Josiah H. Penniman, whose independent administration came down to June 1929, and in its modified form to June 1939, was merely a scholar. The long administrative experience of each had prepared him to a degree for the office.

Dr. Smith was a man of simple origin. His grandfather was a farmer and his brother a miller in the region of Pennsylvania settled by Germans, and his boyhood was spent in those country surroundings, largely on his grandfather’s farm. There remained always something of the soil about him. His simple, ingenuous, kindly spirit, his unquestioning loyalty to the University, to his friends, to his country, to his religion and to his party, were all so manifest that everyone trusted and almost everyone loved him. He was by nature a conservative but his friendliness made him sympathize with those who held more liberal opinions, and he opposed them only regretfully. He was fortunate in being educated in one of those good rural schools that occasionally exist in unexpected places, York Academy.
founded in 1787. The portrait of its principal, Dr. Ruby, hung on the wall of his office among great chemists and the others to whom he felt he owed most. He graduated A.B. from Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg. In both school and college he was imbued with an appreciation of the classics; and in the latter, under the influence of Samuel P. Sadtler, afterwards his colleague at Pennsylvania, he gained his lifelong interest in chemistry. He went to Göttingen, for his Ph.D. and afterwards taught chemistry in one institution after another, Pennsylvania, Muhlenberg, Wittenberg, till he returned to the University in 1888 as Professor of Chemistry to succeed "Old Genth." Ten years later he became Vice-Provost on the waning of the influence of Fullerton. He was elected Provost November 15, 1910.

In the midst of the administrative work that more and more filled his time, and the writing that more and more filled his leisure—he did not know what recreation was—Dr. Smith never ceased to be a chemist. Textbooks of both inorganic and organic chemistry, the earlier ones translations from the German, some seven volumes, thirty pamphlets, and one hundred and sixty-nine separate papers, all in the field of chemistry, attest this continuing interest. He was at the same time gathering the rare books and mementos that now make up the memorial collection preserved in his name.

While he was Vice-Provost and later Provost of the University, he was president successively of many chemical and other scientific societies, President of the American Philosophical Society from 1902 to 1908, a Trustee of the Carnegie Foundation, and member of many Federal, state, and other commissions; including, characteristically, the chairmanship of the Electoral Commission for the election of President McKinley. He was awarded many distinctions and was an officer of the French Legion of Honor. His early work in chemistry concerned obscure elements and original methods of analysis and measurement, but latterly he turned his attention increasingly to the history of chemistry and the lives of the early chemists.

Provost Harrison relied more and more on his advice as Vice-Provost, and by the time of his retirement Dr. Smith had become the obvious candidate for succession to the provostship,
though many of his friends grieved to see him accept a position apparently so unsuited to his scientific type of mind, to his interests, and to his special temperament. He was elected by a unanimous vote of the Trustees but accepted the position only with hesitation. He was willing to undertake the responsibility of guiding the educational policy of the University, but stood aghast before the task of money raising which had been such a heavy burden even in the competent hands of Provost Harrison. On receiving written assurance from the Board of Trustees that he would be relieved of all financial responsibilities—an undertaking that was never carried out—he accepted the office and entered upon its duties, January 1, 1911.

Notwithstanding some question of his administrative abilities, some unfavorable comment on his political friendships, and some alumni opposition to certain lines of his policy, by sheer sincerity, honesty, singleness of purpose, and devotion to his task Dr. Smith carried through for ten years what must be considered a successful administration. His geniality, affability, and genuine interest in the interests of other men secured him friends everywhere. He entertained distinguished guests of the University with ease at his club and accepted even the formal hospitality of Philadelphia with simplicity. He could go before the state Legislature and receive a kindly and favorable hearing from the men whose votes for an appropriation to the University he was seeking. They all liked him. He was on intimate terms with a certain prominent politician whose influence in Philadelphia was generally considered harmful, but when this man visited him at his office they talked about their families, their travels, their personal interests, not about politics. His scientific eminence, these personal qualities, and his devotion made him an excellent head of the University in a period of particular difficulty. In the summer of 1919 he had a serious carbuncle which his physician assured him was due to overwork. He became weary of the labors of his office and of differences of opinion; he saw, as he said, the expenses and deficits and problems of the University sitting on the footboard as he lay in bed at night, and he wanted to get to his beloved research into the history of chemistry. He wrote and presented his resig-
nation, February 9, 1920, and after four months of expostulation and entreaty by the Trustees that he retain his office he secured their acceptance of his withdrawal, May 10, to take effect June 30, 1920.

Between the provostship of Dr. Smith and that of his successor, Dr. Penniman, occurred the curious interlude of the election of General Leonard Wood; but this can be discussed more satisfactorily later, in connection with other points of alumni policy.

**PROVOST PENNIMAN**

Josiah Harmar Penniman was as near the college don on the Oxford model as is likely to be found in America. Passing with credit through the usual college course at Pennsylvania to his A.B. in 1890, taking such prizes as were offered on the way, Moderator of "Philo," Editor of the *Pennsylvanian*, elected to Phi Beta Kappa, valedictorian of his class, he fulfilled the whole duty of the college student, except perhaps in athletics; but few there be that live well in those two college worlds. Receiving the Ph.D. degree in 1895, teacher for a year in a private school, coming back to the University to be successively Instructor, Assistant Professor, and Professor of English; doing excellent teaching, writing several books, making broad intellectual contacts with the world, he fulfilled also the whole duty of the college professor. But he did more, he lived the troublesome double life of so many academic men, the life of an administrator as well as of a scholar. He acted as Vice-Dean of the College, then for twelve years he was Dean, next, from 1911 to 1920, during the whole administration of Provost Smith, he was Vice-Provost. Now he was to be for nineteen years more, with a variety of titles and duties, the fourteenth Provost of the University.

Under the circumstances of Dr. Penniman's long service as Vice-Provost and as close coadjutor of Provost Smith, it was not to be expected that there would follow any immediate or great change in the University's policy. What was especially characteristic of Provost Penniman's work will appear later. But
on the whole it is not difficult to consider this whole period, from 1910 forward, at least until the administrative changes of 1930, as a unity. Much as the University has grown, greatly even as it has been transformed, in some respects, since 1910, the changes of the thirty years since that date have not been so fundamental as those between 1880 and 1910. The recent period has been not so much an era of initiation and of new directions of development as it has been one of consolidation of gains. The times under Provost Pepper, when a new department was being established every year, and those under Provost Harrison, when two or three buildings were often being erected at the same time and new ideas were coming in in a flood, were past.

Expansion and change and development there have of course been during the last three decades; when these have ceased the University will be dead; and no signs of dissolution are so far visible. There have been new buildings erected, new functions undertaken and even some new departments established, though these prove on examination in most cases to be extensions of old; but in the main the changes of this fruitful period have been internal. The new ground broken had to be worked; expansion has been along lines previously mapped out but not yet followed to their goal; the forces that have carried the University forward have been no less virile but they have been better balanced. If slowing down has recently occurred in some directions, and if the University has not in some of its phases kept up with other institutions, as is undoubtedly true, the cause is not far to seek; it is the old deficiency of endowment. As it enters upon its third century this will no doubt be relieved; it may even go through a process of rejuvenation, of which there are already signs.

THE DIVISION OF SCHOOLS

Ever since the accession of Provost Pepper to office there had been a marked tendency toward centralization in organization of the University. This was most marked in the College. One after another as new departments were established, except for those quite definitely professional, such as Dentistry and the
Veterinary School, they were grafted on to the College. There were still, with a few outlying departments, only the four schools, College, Medicine, Law, and Dentistry. Dr. Horace Jayne, who since 1884 had been engaged in organizing the Biological School, to which he had contributed considerable sums of money and for which he secured the erection of its building, became, at Provost Pepper's desire, Dean of the College. He was a man of means, of leisure, and of energy, and he proceeded to enlarge the duties of that office and to secure for the College under his deanship many forms of advance. It was no light achievement to arrange that the same hour in the middle of the day should be established as the lunch and recess hour through the whole University; he made one of the many successive and none too successful attempts to provide restaurant facilities for the growing horde of hungry students; he interested himself in many proposed new courses and reorganization of old courses.

But the organization of the College was bad. It contained too many departments quite alien to one another—as diverse as the old Department of Arts, the new Department of Science, the Wharton School, the courses in biology. These departments with their various interests and claims to attention were straining at the leash, each with its own problems to be solved and ambitions to be followed. If all its teachers, or even if only those of professorial rank attended, the Faculty became cumbersome. To avoid this, the Academic Council was formed in which the Director or head of each department or group of studies represented his colleagues. Among these there were pressures, jealousies, antagonistic actions. After twenty years the tendency was now reversed and in 1912 Dr. Smith, who believed in greater independence of each of the individual groups, by the exercise of somewhat arbitrary power, brought about partition of the old College into three divisions or schools, the College proper, that is, the old Department of Arts with some additions, the Wharton School, and the Towne Scientific School. Each now had its own Dean and organized Faculty as completely separated from the others as from the Medical or the Law Faculty.
One result of this division was that each Faculty, having its own objectives and its own ambitions, asserted control in its field to a degree undreamt of when educational policy had been controlled by the Board of Trustees, or even by the Academic Council. This devolution of power was demonstrated promptly in the case of the College, which under its new Dean, Arthur H. Quinn, now threw off the lethargy that has been above adverted to, and began a development quite as vigorous as that of any other department. The first important question that arose was of the requirements for the A.B. degree. Greek was still required, as it had been from the beginning. Under the elective system introduced in 1870, however, it had come about that a student in the old College who had elected Greek received the degree A.B.; if he had not included Greek in his elective courses he received the degree B.S. About twenty per cent of the Arts or College students were in the former group, about eighty per cent in the latter. It seemed a small difference on which to base so large a distinction. The Curriculum Committee, therefore, after much discussion, proposed to the College Faculty that this distinction of degrees be abolished and that all students who fulfilled the College requirements, whether their electives included Greek or not, so long as they included one of the classical languages, should receive the degree of A.B. A long contest followed in the Faculty, where after a year and a half of debate the proposal was carried by a vote of thirty-two to eight. In the Board of Trustees, whose consent had to be obtained, the opposition to such a break with the past was strong. After long discussion and repeated conferences, at such a conference with a committee of the Faculty, in 1914, a committee of three of the Board of Trustees voted two to one in favor of the change recommended by the Faculty.¹

The recommendation was thereupon accepted by the Board. It was an important decision. The vote represented not so much

¹ Long afterwards, in 1930, the requirement that a student must take either Latin or Greek was abolished, and any two languages might be chosen to fulfill College foreign language requirements.
the wish or opinion of the Board as their conviction that the
time had come when on educational questions they must ac­
cept the judgment of the Faculties. Just as, since the contro­
versy that led to the resignation of Dr. Stillé, discipline had
rested by common consent in Faculty hands, and as in 1881
they had agreed that the Provost should have a free hand in
administrative concerns, so in 1914 the Trustees yielded to the
Faculties the final decision on questions of purely educational
policy.

This had always been the case with the Medical School, and
largely so with the Law, the Dental, and the newly established
departments. Only the Department of Arts had been so directly
under Trustee control. The old days when the Trustees had felt
it incumbent upon them to arrange the curriculum, set the
hours at which professors and students should attend classes,
name the textbooks and attend examinations had quietly passed
away. It was an enlightened recognition of changed conditions
that led now to Trustee withdrawal from any detailed control of
the conditions for degrees.

THE NEARING CASE

A sudden storm led to the ultimate withdrawal of the Trus­
tees from still another field, one especially difficult and subject
to controversy, namely the control of opinions expressed by
members of the Faculty in the classrooms and outside. This was
settled by the reaction from the so-called "Nearing case." The
rising tide of interest in the problems of economic society char­
acteristic of the modern period was necessarily reflected in the
teaching in the Wharton School, and to a somewhat less extent
in the College and the Law School. In some cases there was
criticism by the professors and instructors of what to most of
the Trustees and to many of the alumni seemed settled
point of orthodox economic theory and accepted social standards.
The Trustees thought it incumbent on them to see that only
"sound" principles were taught in the University, and, naturally,
subjecting in the classroom present conditions to free criticism
and on some scores to vigorous condemnation, roused disap-
proval. Discussions gathered around proposed child-labor legis­
lation, the claims and powers of public service corporations, 
many customary practices in civic and political life and educa­
tional theory; sometimes, though not often, they involved 
questions of orthodoxy in religion.

When criticism of generally accepted ideas was expressed out­
side of the classroom, disapproval was still stronger. The Dean 
of the Law School subjected himself to stricture by publicly 
advocating legislation for the recall by vote of judicial deci­
sions. One of the professors in the College was denied publica­
tion in the official University journal of his address before the 
alumni of the Graduate School on “The Agitator in History” 
because of its “radicalism.” He had pointed out the useful serv­
ice agitators had performed in history by breaking up com­
placency, and pleaded for more attention to such criticism in 
our own time. When “radical” views were expressed by pro­
fessors or instructors outside the University, as sometimes 
occurred, in such a form as to violate good taste, official disap­
proval was naturally felt still more strongly. The storm was 
brewing through the years from 1912 to 1914; so much was 
this the subject of the day that in 1914 certain Trustees felt 
called upon to issue, with some acknowledged irony, a declara­
tion in favor of free speech and religious liberty at the Uni­
versity. Huxley’s statement of 1874 was quoted with approval 
that universities should be places in which thought was free 
from all fetters and in which all sources of knowledge and all 
aids should be accessible to all concerned. Nevertheless, some 
of the younger teachers were warned that their dismissal might 
follow unauthorized teaching; others found their promotion 
was being retarded by reports from their students or in the 
newspapers of their unpopular views. A young assistant pro­
fessor was threatened with immediate dismissal because of the 
report by one of his students of a remark he had made in 
the classroom—a proposal that brought about the threat of the 
head of his department that he would resign if such summary 
action was taken on an unverified and private statement. The 
report was thereupon explained by the teacher concerned and 
the matter dropped.
In this heated condition of feeling the blow fell rather unexpectedly on Dr. Scott Nearing, a popular and active young teacher of economics who had been, after some delay and with some hesitation, promoted in 1914 to an assistant professorship for a single year. On June 15, 1915, the day of the last meeting of the Board of Trustees before the expiration of his appointment, a note from the Provost informed him in rather curt terms that by order of the Trustees his appointment would not be renewed. Although the Trustees were obviously within their legal rights in terminating an appointment which had been made for only a year, the tardiness of their decision, the suddenness of their action, and their disregard of the favorable recommendation for his reappointment of the Dean and Faculty of the Wharton School, stirred up a hornet's nest.

The unfavorable public reaction was more intense when the members of the Board refused to give any reason for their action and insisted that it was purely a matter for their own decision and one in which the public was in no way concerned. As the University was at the very time appealing for a grant from the state Legislature on the ground that it was a quasi-public institution performing public services, to declare that the public had no right to an explanation of their action was an obviously illogical claim, which aroused popular and newspaper antagonism that would not have been provoked by a more open policy. Moreover, there was no doubt on the part of anybody concerned that the failure to reappoint was mainly a case of the old conflict between the conservative and the radical.

The majority of the Trustees considered Dr. Nearing, as one of them expressed it, "a liability that the University should not carry." This may be questioned. As a result of the Trustees' precipitate action and refusal to explain it, the University carried for many years, unjustly no doubt, a widespread reputation for denying that degree of academic freedom of teaching which had long since been accepted in other large universities.

At the time, notwithstanding the defensible position of the Trustees when legalistically interpreted, and their well-kept silence, the alumni and the interested part of the community
divided sharply into two camps, so that its representative and impartial position, its greatest social asset, was endangered. A number of local members of the General Alumni Society gave out a statement of approval of the action of the Trustees, and took occasion to express their condemnation of the “fallacious conclusions” of certain members of the teaching staff which when stated publicly were “likely to arouse class prejudice.” On the other hand other alumni in Philadelphia and elsewhere made strong protests against the propriety of this statement and against what they called a “vigorous campaign against several progressive teachers of the University.” The local newspapers, only too ready to condemn the University, entered into the controversy and almost without exception commented adversely on the action of the Trustees. The Faculty were practically a unit in disapproving it, since, however little sympathy many of them may have had for Nearing’s views, they all resented the crude precipitancy of his dismissal, and found in it indication of a disparaging attitude of the Administration toward the Faculty of which there were thought to be other instances at the time.

The relation of the administration of universities and colleges to their faculties was a rising question, and but six months before the Nearing case broke out the American Association of University Professors had been formed to introduce some common agreement as to these relationships. It was particularly irritating to members of the University Faculty to have their institution used in these discussions, even if quite unfairly, as an example of antiquated and narrow practice. The Nearing case was at best a tissue of mistakes and misjudgments, of confusion between what was legal and what was just or wise, of hasty action for which there might well have been justification if it had not been so hasty. It is not at all certain that Dr. Nearing should have been reappointed to a position in the University; but neither he nor any other teacher should be abruptly separated from it without notice or discussion. Teachers are appointees, not employees of the Board.

Provost Smith, who had acted during the controversy purely as an agent for the Board of Trustees, now that it was over
persuaded them to take steps that would prevent its recurrence. A series of changes in the by-laws provided for a more orderly procedure in short appointments and placed the responsibility for removals in the case of full professors, except for the very last step, on the Faculties, where it belonged. It had become obvious that it was no longer defensible in a large and free university for the administrators to take action that laid them and their institution open to the charge of interference in the teaching given by its faculty. The faculty alone could be trusted to judge of the competency of their colleagues. Proof of the subsequent willingness of the Trustees to accept criticism without demur is shown by the publication by a member of the Faculty before the year 1915 was over of a narrative of these events certainly not unduly favorable to those who had taken the initiative in them.¹ There has been since 1915 no instance of removal without the approving judgment of the Faculty. The sequel of the Nearing case marks the abandonment by the Trustees of one more of their ancient activities. It also marks the end of a period of somewhat strained relations between the Trustees and the Faculty.

THE PROBLEM OF FINANCE

When Dr. Smith became Provost January 1, 1911, the problem of finance stared him in the face. Mr. Harrison had left the University out of debt, but he had left no provision for its running expenses. Dr. Smith had declined to accept the provostship unless he should be relieved of the burden which had lain so heavily on the shoulders of the last two Provosts. This relief was promised to him, but no effective steps were taken by the Trustees to carry out their agreement. As a matter of fact, Dr. Smith himself was probably the only man then able, although reluctant, to draw on what seemed under the circumstances the only available source of sufficient funds for the maintenance of the University, the state treasury. Many friends of the University looked with disfavor on this form of support, but they did not supply or suggest any practicable alternative,

and money must be found immediately. Moreover, appeals for
state aid and arguments for its propriety had already under the
administrations of Provost Pepper and Provost Harrison been
so frequent and so successful that another application would
be no novelty.

This matter of state grants to the University has played so
large a part in discussion and policy during recent years that
a résumé of their history may be apposite. The University of
the State of Pennsylvania was supported almost entirely by state
funds. After 1791 the Trustees of the University had applied with
full expectation of success to the state government for the sup­
port which the act of union of 1791 had seemed to promise
them, an understanding which was supported by the use of the
name of the state, by the fact that the Governor was ex officio
President of the Board, and by the requirement that they
should every year lay a statement of their financial condition
before the Legislature. This last requirement has been fulfilled
through good report and ill report almost without intermission
since that date. But the Legislature was by no means so regu­
larly willing to make appropriations. The applications of 1792
and 1793 brought no favorable response.

In 1807 the state granted, on conditions, as has already been
told, a nominal sum of $3,000, in the form of relief from pay­
ment of the last instalment of the amount owed to the state by
the University on the purchase price of the “President’s House.”
In 1838 the Legislature approved an annual sum of $1,000 for
ten years to each university in the state maintaining five pro­
fessors and instructing one hundred students. It was understood
that this was the only such institution, and the University re­
ceived the benefit of this grant for five years. In 1843 the state
was in such financial difficulties that it reduced the amount to
$500, and afterwards ceased to pay altogether. In 1868 the Uni­
versity applied to the state government for the product of the
sale of the land scrip recently given by the Federal government,
agreeing to fulfill the requirements of that grant. The money
was, however, as already stated, given elsewhere. The Trustees
gradually and reluctantly gave up the hope of state support;
and the belief that the University was or should be in any sense
or to any degree a state-supported institution gradually died away.

The move to West Philadelphia marked a new era of state grants to the University. Appropriations were made from time to time for specific objects which might be considered of a public nature. In 1872, by the efforts of Dr. William Pepper, grants of $200,000 were obtained for the University Hospital on condition that the same amount should be obtained from private donors, and that fifty-five beds be kept up for citizens of the Commonwealth; repeatedly since that time state money has been given for building or other needs of the Hospital. In 1889 $12,500 was granted to the Veterinary Hospital for research on the diseases of animals, and grants have since been made at various times to the Department of Veterinary Medicine for building and other objects. The state made grants, as has been told, to the Museum, and during a decade it gave successive sums for the purchase of books for the Library.

THE ERA OF PRIVATE SUPPORT

But none of these appropriations were for the regular maintenance of the University. They belonged rather to the class of special gifts, some public, some private, some for specific purposes, some for general expenses, that were being so successfully obtained during their two administrations by Dr. Pepper and Mr. Harrison, those princely beggars for noble causes. Themselves men of wealth and liberality who set an example of generous giving, having contacts with men and women of wealth of all groups in the labyrinth of Philadelphia society, they were in a position to teach Philadelphians a lesson they had long neglected to learn, that is, to give to their own University. Under the devoted and ingenious efforts of these two Provosts, for many years gifts to the University rose to more than half a million dollars a year, in some years to nearly a million.

These gifts corresponded mainly to the respective interests of the donors in the various phases of University life, and it was largely the increasing variety of these activities that drew new givers of the funds necessary for their support. They gave
where they were interested. But part of the flood of individual
contributions was due to the greater interest and kindlier feel­
ing in the community toward the University as a whole. For
the first time since its earliest days the local community began
to feel that it was their University, and to take pride in its
usefulness and greatness. Dr. Stillé believed that this change
of attitude had already begun in his time and that an inde­
pendent Provost, able to speak for the University, could exploit
the change; but this power was denied him. Now that the Prov­
ost was the actual head of the University, and able to speak
for it as fully as any college president could represent his
institution, such powers of explanation, of persuasion, and of
appeal to college and local loyalty as he possessed had full op­
portunity for use.

Both Dr. Pepper and Mr. Harrison were, as has been in­
timated, past masters in this art. The number of individual
givers of considerable sums rose in some years to three hundred
and even four hundred persons. Lists of these donors, when
Mr. Harrison was chairman of the Committee on Property,
when he was Provost, and after his resignation, when his inter­
est was turned largely to the Museum, were, with his meticulous
attention to detail, carefully kept, and still lie with their signed
promises of the donors among Mr. Harrison’s papers. On the
lists are of course confirmed repeaters, such as Mr. J. G. Rosen
garten, LaBarre Jayne, Dr. and Mrs. Pepper, Mr. and Mrs
Harrison, the Houston family, the Misses Blanchard, and many
other generous givers whose names are encountered, giving
for all sorts of purposes. There appear, cheek by jowl, subscrip­
tions of a hundred thousand dollars, or fifty or ten or five thou­sand, with modest contributions of ten or twenty dollars, for
purposes that appealed especially to the givers or which the
had been convinced were for the benefit of the University. In
this way, the new departmental buildings, successive addi­tion
to the Dormitories, the Museum, and other buildings were
erected and the campus beautified. By other funds similarly col­lected, special salaries were paid and in certain departmen
t and at certain times increased, publications were provided for
fees for lectures furnished, funds for needy students collecte
and ever recurring "maintenance funds" and "deficiency funds" contributed to. Mr. Harrison claimed, correctly, that no calendar year in his administration closed with a deficit, and that the budget was always balanced at the end of the fiscal year; but this was accomplished only by a constant and vigorous campaign of seeking private contributions.

Mr. Harrison was in the habit of carrying printed forms of subscription for various University objects, laid in black covers, in his pocket to be brought out and submitted to prospective donors. Semi-mythical and semi-humorous stories went the rounds of the panic of well-to-do persons on seeing Mr. Harrison approach, realizing that before their interview was over their names would be duly signed in his famous "little black book" promising a contribution to some University purpose. Many records of such salutary experiences of Philadelphia citizens still lie in the University archives, almost invariably annotated "pd." A variation is the story of a good Philadelphia Quaker, a Trustee, who was asked to contribute $10,000 to a certain object. He took the matter under advisement, then sent $5,000, with the explanation that he knew he would grudge giving the larger sum but could give $5,000 cheerfully, and "the Lord loveth a cheerful giver."

THE ERA OF STATE GRANTS

Devoted as were the labors of the successive Provosts and others engaged in these collections, and generous as was the spirit in which these gifts were made, certain doubt could hardly fail to arise whether it was a practicable or defensible way of meeting the regular long-range expenses of a great and growing institution. Such doubts were assailing the minds of the Provost and Trustees, the Faculty and alumni, at the very time the tide of contributions asked for and received was still running high and providing the facilities that have been described. Mr. Harrison frequently asked, though seldom receiving a favorable reply, for pledges to pay so much a year for three or five or even ten years.

It was doubtless in response to the feeling of need for some-
thing more permanent that, scattered among the appropria-
tions for specific objects asked for and obtained from the state
government, occasionally appears an item simply for mainte-
nance of the University. This was a return to ancient practice.
The applications read in some cases almost verbally the same as
those of 1792 and the immediately succeeding years. The first
such general grant in later times seems to have been in the first
year of Mr. Harrison's administration. The members of the
Legislature were invited to visit the University, and a large
number accepted and were entertained there April 19, 1895.
An appropriation of $200,000 was made the next July, and the
pen with which the Governor signed the bill was placed in the
University Library. In 1897, $150,000 was given for general
maintenance. In 1899 and 1901 the grants were for the Hospital
only, not for maintenance. State appropriations in Pennsylvania
are made every other year for a two-year period.
The ties that bound the University to the state government
were drawn closer in 1903 by the election to the governorship
of Judge Pennypacker, long a Trustee, and always an advocate
of closer relations of the University with the state. In his in-
augural address at Harrisburg he promised to restore the old
close relations and "to regain and retain for the state the credit
for this early and unprecedented recognition of the cause of
learning." In March of that year the members of the Legis-
lature again visited the University, and in the fall a small
appropriation for general maintenance was made; a larger one
was for the specific object of aid in the building of the new
Medical Laboratory. In every session since 1903 in the biennial
appropriations voted by the Legislature has been included an
item for the maintenance of the University. In the passage of
these appropriation bills the services of Dr. Smith while he was
Vice-Provost were invaluable. His genial relations with the
legislators at Harrisburg, many of them plain men with whom
he loved to talk about country matters, brought them to him,
rather than finding it necessary that he should seek them, and
made them ready to do what he asked as a personal favor even
when they had little enthusiasm for a distant institution of
higher learning.
This was the practice in state appropriations when Dr. Smith became Provost. Finding no financial support from Trustees or alumni, and feeling little capacity or inclination for the personal appeals that had been so fruitful under his predecessors, he turned perforce to the Legislature for that large part of the income of the University not provided by the fees of its students, or by solicitation, or produced by its few endowment funds. The appropriation signed by Governor Tener in the first year of Dr. Smith's administration, 1911, was something over twice as large as any previous appropriation, being but slightly less than a million dollars for the next two legislative years. The appropriation of 1913 was more than a million, three-quarters of it for general maintenance. The grant for 1915 was somewhat smaller, but in 1917 and 1919 and to the end of Dr. Smith's provostship and afterward appropriations by the state were made, as has been said, at every legislative session and for a time in constantly increasing amounts. The practice has become a well-established one and, although a special application has to be made at each session of the Legislature, the principal question in recent years has been the strength of the relative claims of the University and the other educational institutions that receive state aid.

Although these biennial appropriations had become indispensable, and in productiveness were the next item to students' fees, the stream of private giving had by no means dried up. Alumni and other friends of the University still responded to specific appeals; funds were voluntarily given on the Provost's gentle reminder of old promises being due, for continuing objects or for general expenses; and there were some welcome bequests and endowments. The Duhring bequest of more than $900,000, received in 1913, was the largest that had ever come to the University. The generosity of alumni continued to be counted on, or rather, the University and the alumni, as will be seen, went into partnership in this field in 1924 for all funds except endowments and students' fees.

A private memorandum on a slip of paper in his own handwriting lies among Dr. Smith's papers with the characteristic heading, "To the Heavenly Father—thanks for these," on
which he lists some forty recent gifts to the University, including state appropriations, various sums from five hundred to fifty thousand dollars, for purposes varying from contributions to the “deficit fund” and the “fund for needy students” to a gift of $500 from Mr. Rosengarten to pay for printing the Schoolmen’s Week program, $1,500 from H. R. Hatfield to pay expenses of the Saturday lecture course, or from Mrs. Syms $25,000 and from Mrs. Prevost $200,000 for medical research, or $25,000 from “Bauer’s Boys” and $1,000 from “Will Bauer,” or $350 from “Billy Hulme,” or one of the many $5,000 gifts for unrestricted use. These and other generous gifts from generous people evidently warmed the heart of the Provost. It is a list corresponding to Mr. Harrison’s “black book,” characteristic of the two men and of the times. This constant flow of gifts was an occasion for genuine gratitude on the part of all connected with the University; but, as remarked at an earlier time, a régime of gifts as a systematic source of supply of funds had evident weaknesses. There was to come a time when the alumni would appear on the scene in a serious effort to introduce an element of greater regularity as well as of adequacy, but other occurrences intervened which must first be recounted.

THE WORLD WAR

It is impossible to proceed far in the chronicle of this period without finding the University for the third time in its history enmeshed in the complications of war. At no time in its life probably was the University floating on a more even keel or sailing more prosperously forward than in the years just preceding the entrance of the United States into the World War. Old Penn, the semi-official university weekly of the time, gives perhaps a fairer impression of the real University than more formal records furnish. An examination of its files for the years from 1912 to 1917 shows a steady and wholesome growth in numbers, and additions of new and valuable members to the staff, as death or retirement created vacancies or the growth of one department or another demanded more instructors. The various departments were at work at their normal tasks, learned so-
cieties were meeting here, and our own professors were taking their fair share, perhaps more than their fair share, considering their teaching duties, in the general activities of the academic world. The alumni were becoming more interested and, as already stated, were drawing closer among themselves and their alma mater.

Of course the finances were in an unsatisfactory state. It would not have been Pennsylvania if this had not been so. Its history has been a continual conflict with poverty. Mr. Harrison’s boast that no year in his administration closed with a deficit could, it is true, no longer be made, but the biennial grants from the Legislature and other sources of income were doing much to fill the gaps. Moreover a Provost of the University, not Mr. Harrison, had once said that a university ought to be ashamed not to be spending more than its income. Its possibilities of usefulness were so great that it should undertake its tasks first and seek the funds for them afterwards. This bold policy was again being followed, though without Provost Pepper’s sang-froid.

It was into this peaceful progress that came, as twice before, the intrusion of war. Notwithstanding its short duration the World War cut deeper into University life than had either the Revolution or the Civil War. Participation of students and professors in the earlier wars was left largely to their own discretion; now the government took control of the situation. Before the United States entered the war in 1917 many students and some professors had volunteered in the service of one or another country with which they sympathized, or had returned, in response to summons, to serve those countries of which they were still citizens. A course in military science and tactics had been established, with requirements prescribed by the War Department, under the Federal Law passed in June 1916. The students who took this course, as an elective with physical training, in the undergraduate schools were known as the Reserve Officers Training Corps; they received certain pecuniary and other advantages and, on its completion with recommendation from the authorities, became second lieutenants in the Officers Reserve Corps.
Between the declaration of war in the spring of 1917 and the opening of college in the fall of the year, the government established here as elsewhere a Students' Army Training Corps and entered into a contract with the Trustees for the support and instruction of the students in training. The Corps at the University contained 2,440 men, and was supplemented by a naval unit containing 450 men. These students were enlisted, under direct control of the United States authorities and given free tuition, clothing, board, and lodging, besides their regular pay as soldiers or sailors. The costs to be paid by the government were estimated at $231,000, but payment of about $200,000 was finally accepted by the University.

Under orders from the War Department, a number of classes were organized in different departments suited to the various arms of the service in which the men were enrolled. Out of the 480 students in the Medical School 250 were already in 1917 enlisted in the Medical Enlisted Reserve Corps and twelve were already in the Naval Reserve Force, and of the graduating class in medicine all but twenty were already in the Medical Reserve Corps. So many men had enlisted from the Law School, which had no regular military training course, that at one time there were but eleven students and teachers together in the department. Dormitories and fraternity houses were largely turned over to members of the Students' Army Training Corps. Various concessions as to absence from college were made for those who enlisted in the service of the United States. "War Aims" courses were drawn up under approval of the government and delivered by the professors to the students. Drilling was constant; khaki was the order of the day. Those who from extreme youth, infirmity, or other causes were not subject to the draft, and therefore did not wear uniform, became conspicuous. It was in contemplation by the government, if the war had lasted a few weeks or months longer, for reasons of morale to put into uniform members of the Faculty, at least those who took part in the instruction of the Students' Army Training Corps, which included almost all professors and instructors. There were scattered cases of objectors to the war, but in the case of professors, who mostly remained silent, their
known opinions were respected and they were not molested; and students were treated individually by the government.

All these arrangements were temporary, and shortly after the Armistice the Students' Army Training Corps was demobilized and the regular college order of exercises resumed. In 1922 the Adjutant General of the United States Army issued a certificate in recognition of the services of the University in establishing the Students' Army Training Corps. The Reserve Officers Training Corps, known familiarly as the R.O.T.C., which had disappeared when the S.A.T.C. came in, was reconstituted in 1918 and has remained permanently in existence but, as it has not been compulsory, has not played a conspicuous part. The services and personal experiences of men connected with the University either as students, professors, or graduates, corresponding to the many-sided interests which now bound the University to the community in war time as in peace time, are too varied, numerous, and recent to follow up here. The participation of the University in the late war, like so many other aspects of our history, still awaits its special annalist.

There was one unexpected and far-reaching result of the war. Whatever the explanation, Pennsylvania, like all other universities and colleges in the United States, experienced immediately after the war a sudden and striking increase of applications for admission. Instead of making as formerly a reserved but no less real effort to obtain students, now it seemed necessary to protect the University against an inundation of students. The University kept up, indeed in some directions increased its requirements for admission, but its total enrollment still continued to increase. This growth of numbers had begun before the war. At the beginning of Provost Harrison's administration the total enrollment in the University was slightly over two thousand; at its close sixteen years later, it was above five thousand; the year the United States entered the war it was just below nine thousand; in the year of its close, the numbers rose to more than eleven thousand. This increase therefore was obviously the result not only of war influences but of the many new lines of contact the University had established during the last quarter-century, as well as of the growing repute of the older departments. The Whar-
ton School, the Summer School, the Evening School, the Extension Courses, the College Courses for Teachers, the increased numbers in the College, now that it had one degree for all its students and had set up the premedical, predental, and prelaw courses, the widespread appeal of the Graduate School, the current setting of the flow of students from so many directions toward the School of Architecture, the graduate courses in the Medical and Law schools, all combined to swell the number of the student body, even before the war. To this increase was now added the new demand for education caused by the war, springing from the determination of young men and of their parents that in the next war they or their sons should be officers, not privates. This brought them flocking to the colleges and universities. Others consider the post-war depression that drove men out of all occupations except university study to have been the principal cause of increase. Whatever its cause, after the two years of war the University had two thousand additional students.

THE DISSATISFACTION OF THE ALUMNI

It was this great increase of numbers and its democratic sources that drew the unfavorable attention and ultimately the active interposition in the administration of the University of a large and influential body of the alumni. Alumni opinion is an elusive spirit. No one has ever yet found the average alumnus, and no institution has ever been able to round up a body of alumni that corresponds at all closely in judgment with the mass of graduates. The devoted group of those who join the alumni societies, pay their dues, attend meetings, serve in office and on committees, take and read the college and alumni journals, and occasionally visit their old surroundings are an interesting body that can never be disregarded or undervalued by any body of administrators and teachers; but no careful observer believes that they reflect the considered opinions of the great body of graduates. They are generally more conservative than the graduates in general, than the students, and, strange as it may seem, than the faculty. Yet they are the only ascertainable bond that binds the University to its past, and they ar-
its natural recourse for loyalty, encouragement, and material support. It is nevertheless wise to think of them as the organized society of the alumni, not as identical with the graduates, many of whom hold quite different views.

As has been noted above, the alumni organizations and the administration and Faculties of the University had been drawing closer and closer. It was a reciprocal movement. Provost, deans and prominent professors frequently attended and spoke at alumni gatherings. Dr. Penniman especially, as Dean, as Vice-Provost, and after he became Provost, made it a constant practice to report on University affairs to bodies of the alumni and spent a great deal of time in travel for this purpose. Correspondingly the Central Committee of the Alumni and the General Alumni Society, in addition to their other activities exercised a certain amount of advisory influence on the Board of Trustees by nominating and securing the election of one member after another to the Board. Between 1885 and 1913 they placed ten members on the Board, and in their reports they made many suggestions on University affairs. In 1913 the Central Committee and the General Alumni Society were merged, and the latter thereby became the active representative body of the organized alumni with an office and permanent secretary in Philadelphia. In 1911 William A. Redding, a New York lawyer, elected in that year President of the General Alumni Society, had set himself the task of bringing the scattered local alumni bodies together. The basis of unity was found largely in the encouragement and support of Pennsylvania athletic teams especially when away from home. Mr. Redding remarked, “There is nothing which gives to a university a wider reputation than intercollegiate athletics, and there is nothing which arouses so much enthusiasm among the graduates and undergraduates as intercollegiate sports.” But there was also the object of working for the University generally, not without the idea of exercising an influence over its policy. “Alumni unity is absolutely essential to make our claim a powerful force for the good of our university.”

By 1913 unity, or at least alliance, was by the efforts of Mr. Redding and Mr. William McClellan successfully accomplished.
The local alumni societies were brought together into a general federation, the Associated Pennsylvania Clubs. In contrast with the General Alumni Society, the Federation had no continuous existence. It met as an annual conference, in a different city each year, and was expected to discuss general matters of interest brought up by representatives of the sixty or eighty local and other separate organizations of alumni, and to appoint committees which should report to the next conference. It was in these conferences that the dissatisfaction with the condition and tendencies of the University to which reference has been made became evident. Along with much that was appreciative and constructive there was much that was critical. The rapid increase in numbers of the University, its growing dependence on state appropriations, its development, since the beginning of the century, into a great many-sided, democratic institution, in which the College was only one of many departments, drawing its students largely from distant regions yet subject to the influences of its location in a large industrial city, were all displeasing to many members of the alumni societies. The University, even the College, was drawing into its student body the more ambitious boys of the city masses and in its other departments ever more and more yielding to the pleas for admission of women, however rigorously they were excluded from the College proper. Through the Extension and Evening Schools and Saturday classes it was serving and including classes of the community that had before had no access to its opportunities, and it necessarily came to reflect to a certain extent these interests.

Training for Leadership

On account of the war there were no conferences of the Associated Clubs in 1917, 1918, and 1919, but at the fifth conference, held in Wilmington, Delaware, in February 1920, the report of the Committee on the Welfare of the University called attention to many points of criticism, proposed a drastic alteration in the direction of the University's progress, and recommended the formation of a committee of one hundred alumni
to confer with the Board of Trustees regarding the policies of the University.

The chief proposals of the Welfare Committee were that the number of students and variety of courses should be reduced, that women should be more completely excluded, that extension and evening courses and all courses that did not lead to degrees should be abandoned, and that an endowment fund should be raised so that the dependence of the University on state appropriations should be unnecessary and the danger of Pennsylvania becoming a state university be avoided. Each of these proposals was supported by a statement of reasons and of the ideals it was proposed to substitute for what they considered the lowering existing tendencies. These statements were of course permeated with much inadequate information and unnecessary dread of possibilities. Those who had taken the old-fashioned Arts course might have remembered Tacitus' observation that *omne ignotum pro magnifico*; and that greater numbers did not necessarily mean less scholarship. The University was not really, as they came afterward to learn, in the parlous condition they feared. Those who attended these conferences, took part in these discussions, and favored these recommendations were for the most part able and thoughtful men and represented a genuine interest in the University and devotion to what they considered her higher welfare. But they were insufficiently informed as to the facts, and many of them were dominated by a desire that the University should be, like some country college, what she had never been and could never be, an oasis of quietude, dignity, culture, and withdrawal from the throbbing life of the community that surrounded her and the modern time in which she lived.

In an Alumni Day address, February 21, 1919, Provost Smith had quite unintentionally provided a slogan for those who felt these fears and held these views. Speaking of the problems of education after the war he declared, "I firmly believe that the thing the University should do is to educate for leadership." He went on to explain that by this he meant that students in all departments of the University should be required to take
the College course first. Students in chemistry, in engineering, in medicine, in dentistry, in the Wharton School, should have a college degree before they entered any of those departments. "By having a college degree and then going into another department and getting a technical degree . . . we will send out a superior lot of men." He acknowledged that for a few years it would greatly reduce the number of students, but soon "parents will begin to see the work that we are doing and they will say, 'I want my son educated for leadership, and I will send him to the University of Pennsylvania.'"

He had no idea of choosing a special type of men for admission to the University. He would not have limited the number or sought to test the quality beyond the ordinary entrance examinations, of those entering the College; rather the contrary. He would have admitted students rather freely and tested them afterwards. His prescription for leadership was long training, first in the College, then in the professional or technical school. His whole philosophy of life was opposed to any limitation of opportunity.

On the other hand, by many of the alumni "training for leadership" was immediately seized upon and pitted against "mass education," as though it meant training only of those destined by ability or opportunity to be leaders in society. That may have been a defensible ideal but it had nothing to do with Dr. Smith's "training for leadership," and should not be attributed to him. The question had come up long before. In 1894 the witty and wise Horace Howard Furness, the Shakespearean scholar, a Trustee, speaking of the University, said:

Its first endeavour is not to turn out leaders in politics or in the arts, any more than it is the object of a cook to make fat men. Leadership will come in the fullness of time to those of its graduates who are leaders by the grace of God. . . . It should be a training school for every faculty with which nature has endowed us. Every pathway should be made a thoroughfare. After the University's work is done and its students have been led forth (in its true derivative sense educated) from the darkness of ignorance, all future careers, whether as

1 His address is published in the Alumni Register, March 1919, pp. 428 ff.
leaders, as followers or as mere nonentities, must be left to circum­stances and to that formula on which every man's temperament is based.

Or, as a certain college administrator remarked, "There can be no school for generals." Nature picks out her own leaders; and usually much later in life than the date of entering or even leaving college. Essentially "mass education" and "education for leadership" should be synonymous: the University should educate as many as she can properly accommodate. If she shall be fortunate enough to have trained some who are destined to genuine leadership, they will be the wiser leaders because of her training. A later Provost testified sadly that he had found no way of knowing beforehand who would become leaders.

Yet those of the alumni and Trustees who advocated "education for leadership" in a sense opposed to "education for the masses" as an ideal for the University, even if the expression was not what Dr. Smith meant, might well believe that young men with a superior inheritance or promise, either of money, of vigor, of health, of mental equipment, or of family, social, or political influence, would as a matter of fact be more apt to be given or to secure positions of executive responsibility in later life than those without these advantages. The idea that the University would do better to educate this special class whose social or economic position or superior gifts enabled them to look forward to careers of prominence seemed to receive support from the example of Oxford, whose graduates, under the aristocratic organization of English society, have been traditionally given appointments to positions of responsibility and power, and whose performance has a record of greater excellence in bulk, though hardly in distinction, than that of Englishmen of native genius unaided by university influence. It was an attractive analogy, so two professors, Crawford and McClelland, were sent by the University in 1930 to visit the two older English universities in search of suggestions that might be of value in reconstructing the educational work of the College. They did not, however, visit those new and vigorous provincial British universities, situated usually in large cities,
more representative of modern democracy, whose problems and characteristics are much more like our own.

THE COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED

The Committee of One Hundred, provided for at the Wilmington conference in February 1920, was appointed, organized itself and held three successive meetings in that year. More than ninety per cent of the members had graduated from the College, more than sixty per cent were from Philadelphia, and most of them had already taken a definite position in alumni affairs. It was not well organized therefore to take a wide University or national point of view, or to suggest much that was new. It was almost sure to look backward rather than forward, to look on problems from a College rather than a University point of view. It is particularly hard, as this writer can testify, for a College man to realize that his department is only one of several that make up the University, and for a native Philadelphian to throw off local inhibitions. The Committee went promptly to work and appointed two important sub-committees, one on the choice of a Provost, Dr. Smith having resigned in the spring, the other on University policy.

The first took high ground. General Leonard Wood, a well-known officer and an attractive personality, after a career of distinction in the army and in administration, was now retired and available for some civil appointment. It occurred to this committee, anxious that the University should receive more recognition, that General Wood might be elected to the vacant provostship and thus give it new distinction. They wrote to the Trustees that if they would accept this suggestion it would, as they said, “establish and maintain harmonious relations between the Trustees and the body of the Alumni” and “would open a new era of constructive progress in the history of the University.” It would also guarantee freedom of the University from control by the state, of which there was then some dread.

A committee of the General Alumni Society secured General Wood’s tentative consent to accept the position if it were offered him and arranged an informal meeting with some of the
Trustees, at which the conditions at the University were explained to him. A special meeting of the Board of Trustees was thereupon held February 28, 1921, at which some of the interested alumni were present. Mr. Wickersham, a member of the committee, presented the name of General Wood as "a man who would command universal respect, a national figure whose selection would be a financial strength, and a great administrator who can bring the University safely through its present crisis." At the same meeting Mr. George Wharton Pepper, chairman of the committee of the Board of Trustees appointed to make nominations for the vacant provostship, presented eight names, among them that of Dr. Penniman, who had been elected Acting Provost immediately after Dr. Smith's resignation and had continued to act in that capacity through this whole series of events.

The Trustees present agreed to the election of General Wood. He was offered a salary much higher than had ever been paid a Provost before, a liberal contingent fund and the use of the house which had been lately bought as a residence for the Provost. There was some question about his title, but it was arranged that it should make clear his position as head of the University, and that Dr. Penniman should be asked to remain as Acting Provost or with some other title indicating that he was in charge of the University's educational interests. This action of the Trustees was confirmed at a full meeting April 18, 1921. Some months later it was arranged that General Wood's title should be President, and Dr. Penniman was thereupon elected Provost. There was no clear differentiation of powers, except that the President was to be head and the Provost to be in charge of more purely educational affairs.

Immediately after his election in April 1921 began a correspondence lasting for two years between the Trustees, anxious to have the new appointee come to Philadelphia to take up his duties, and General Wood, seeking successive leaves of absence while he accepted and continued to serve in the high office of Governor-General of the Philippines. Interested and sharing in the correspondence were Secretary of War Weeks, speaking for President Harding, who desired General Wood's retention
for a time of his post in the Philippines, and the General Alumni Society, pressing for the grant of the leaves of absence asked for by General Wood. There were also the University Faculties, who were filled with consternation at the prospect of a chief executive necessarily ignorant of the educational problems of the University, and fearful of greater emphasis on military training. The Faculty petitioned the Trustees to accept the anticipated resignation of General Wood; they declared that the head of the institution should be a man versed in education, familiar with the problems of the University, of broad views and vigorous initiative, a description which clearly enough indicated a preference for Dr. Penniman. Successive dates for the arrival at the University of the new head were set and then postponed; the Trustees became more and more impatient until, upon their insistence that General Wood must come to take up his duties by January 1, 1923, he resigned, December 18, 1922.

The resignation of General Wood left the University with the vacant office of President which had no defined duties different from those of the Provost, on its hands, and with Provost Penniman actually fulfilling the duties traditionally attached to the old title. The simplest way out was chosen by electing Dr. Penniman, October 15, 1923, President as well as Provost. Three years later, in 1926, the title of President was abolished, to be re-created four years later for President Gates.

THE FINEGAN PLAN

A serious question was precipitated upon the sub-committee on policy. A rising difficulty had faced the University in recent years from the competition of the University, State College, and the University of Pittsburgh for state aid. They all received grants from the Legislature, but at each session there was doubt, rivalry, and sometimes contention as to how much each should have. Dr. Thomas E. Finegan, State Superintendent of Instruction, suggested as a means of overcoming this difficulty that a State Board of Education should be appointed clothed with the power to distribute the state appropriations for higher
education, and with some concomitant powers of restriction on its uses. This proposal when announced in the newspapers roused expressions of intense disapproval among the alumni and seemed to justify their fear that accepting appropriations would ultimately lead to control of the University by the state. The sub-committee on policy took this as an occasion not only to expostulate with the Trustees against putting Pennsylvania in the position of a state university but to reverse the whole process of carrying on the process of "mass education" in which the University was engaged, believing this to have resulted from the state connection.

They proceeded to make a formal report, with eight specific recommendations, which would have made many changes. They may be summed up in Point Four, "The revision of all courses of undergraduate study with a view to education for leadership." This report was repeated in its main terms at the New York conference in 1921 and corresponding resolutions were adopted, presented by Mr. Wickersham, of the Law class of 1880, and supported by former Provost Harrison and others.

The Trustees, among whom there was much the same division of opinion as among the alumni, appointed, February 9, 1920, a committee on University policy of which George Wharton Pepper was chairman. As the differences of opinion developed, the Faculties, troubled by the danger of losing state appropriations and thus cutting off many of the most useful parts of the University's work, somewhat nettled at the patronizing tone used by some of the alumni critics, and dreading what seemed the uninformed and reactionary policy being advocated also, met and appointed a committee on University policy. The possibility of becoming a state university, though not advocated or desired, had no special terrors for the Faculty. Several members were graduates or had taught in or had taken their advanced degrees at Michigan or Wisconsin or California or Kansas or Illinois or some other state university of quite equal standing with our own, while those who were Pennsylvania graduates had taught in summer schools or had given special lecture courses at state universities. All met on common ground in scientific organizations, and their superior oppor-
unities for research were often objects of envy. Nor did ex­perience or observation require considering state support as involving state control. Faculties in state institutions seemed generally quite as free from interference as in privately sup­ported universities and colleges. In the University's own history there had been a period when it was a state university, and its very name of University was an inheritance from its state con­nection. Its Trustees had frequently tried in early times to make that connection closer.

Among these three committees and within the Board of Trustees a year of controversy ensued. Tense meetings were held and close votes in the Board taken. In March 1920 an informal conference was held with a group of presidents of Pennsylvania colleges and universities, with enlightening results. An incidental result of this conference was the acknowledgment of the University as the head of advanced educational activity in the state. Protests were sent in in shoals by business men, bankers, railroad officials, former students, and other citizens of inland Pennsylvania cities, as well as from Philadelphia, against the alumni proposal to abandon the Extension Courses and the Evening School. On the other hand there were appeals by wire and letters from organized branches of the alumni to the Trustees urging them to accept the recommendations of the Committee of One Hundred.

Mr. Pepper in his key position as chairman of the Trustees' committee was able by his moderation, his clarity of exposition and his fairness and, by no means least, by his suavity, to do much to bring order out of confused impressions and opinions. He warned the alumni that it would require an endowment fund of an amount estimated at from ten to fifty millions to enable the University to dispense with state aid. The University could not suspend its operations while this vast sum was being collected, and the courses the alumni proposed dropping were just those which were nearly self-supporting and whose sus­pension would do little to make smaller the deficit. The only reductions that would make the cost of carrying on the Uni­versity very much less were just such changes as the alumni would
be the last to advocate and the Trustees could not seriously contemplate.

Genuine devotion to the University on the part of all made conflict less bitter and acceptance of defeat, postponement, or compromise easier. Mr. Pepper made a notable address at the conference in New York in 1921, which with its optimism, its appeal to loyalty, and its eloquence exerted a deep impression. An equally significant address was made by Provost Penniman before the Committee of One Hundred at its meeting in Philadelphia in February 1923. At the request of the chairman of the Committee he appeared before them to answer a series of criticisms of the policy of the Trustees who did not seem to be following the recommendations of the Committee as they had hoped. He answered also a barrage of questions submitted to him after his address. The information and explanations given in Dr. Penniman's speech, the inside view of the University's proceedings in those respects which especially interested the College alumni, and his ready and judicious answers to the questions of members of the Committee did much to make the discussion a practical and realistic one.

The net effect of the discussions was that there was a change in emphasis rather than in conditions. The "Finegan Plan" was disclaimed and there has been no change in the relation of the University to the state. The desire of the alumni that they should be better represented on the Board of Trustees, and its membership drawn from a wider area than was indicated by the presence of twenty-one Philadelphians among its twenty-four members, was acceded to. In the next two years four nominees of the alumni were elected, two of them from other regions, and in 1928 changes were introduced by which one-quarter of the Board regularly represented the alumni. The suggestion that a general survey of the University covering finances, administration, education, and social life, to be made by outside investigators, which had emerged during the discussion, was carried out in 1924 and an interesting report presented which has, unfortunately, had less influence than might have been hoped.
On the other hand the more specific changes advocated by the Committee of One Hundred were not adopted—it is hard to reverse the processes of evolution. There was no deliberate limitation of the total number of students, though they were limited in some departments. In 1919–20 the net enrollment, excluding duplications, for the first time passed 10,000; in 1920–21 it was 11,182; two years later it was 13,577. The peak was in 1927–28, when the net registration rose to 16,382. The depression years showed a gradual decline, but by 1938–39 the net total had increased to 16,137. No departments or established lines of teaching or research were abandoned. It was impossible to disregard the protests and arguments of business men, who insisted on the value of the extension and extramural courses, and appealed to the principles of Franklin in opposition to the recommendation of the Committee of One Hundred for their elimination. Other activities which had come under criticism showed similar powers of survival. The informal address of Mr. Wickersham at the Boston conference of Associated Clubs of 1928 indicated a much more appreciative attitude toward recent University tendencies than he had held in 1920.

There was no one considerable phase of the University's work that could be abandoned unless a deliberate reversal of its development through half a century were undertaken. Any serious diminution of the numbers of the teaching force proved equally impracticable, even though closer inspection was made of the need of each proposed appointment or promotion. As to reliance on more rigorous economy as a means of avoiding dependence on state support, no one who has had negotiations with the Budget Committee on any question of expenditure is apt to have illusions on that possibility.

VALLEY FORGE

But the ideal of the University as a smaller and more select institution, less subject to restless, progressive influences, reflecting more the country than the city, would not down. It appealed to many minds among the Trustees and in the Faculty, among the alumni and even among the students. It has
been mentioned before as part of the original plan of Franklin
described in the Proposals, and in a letter written in 1750 to his
friend Colden: "It was long doubtful whether the Academy
would be fixed in the town or country, but a majority of those
from whose generous subscriptions we expected to be able to
carry the scheme into execution being strongly for the town it
was at last fixed to be there." The question had come up re-
peatedly since. Now it was to be discussed once more.

The ideal of a relatively small college, located in the country,
well away from the interruptions, confusions, and social admix-
tures of city life, making possible a closer intercourse among
the students and with the Faculty, providing more healthy and
attractive surroundings and allowing more leisure for reading
and conversation, hovered before the eyes of many of the most
thoughtful of the alumni as a refined and attractive contrast
to the numbers, the mixture, the democratic tone which the
University was more and more taking. The smaller colleges of
New England, or even those in the vicinity of Philadelphia, or
a detached university, like Princeton, seemed to them a better
ideal of college life, and they regretted the fact that their own
University was not like these. The fact that the Trustees and
graduates frequently sent their sons to other universities and
colleges, although noted and deplored for a century, was said
to be becoming still more customary and to be largely the re-
sult of the changes that have been described, so that while the
number of students was becoming larger, fewer of them were
sons of Pennsylvania of the second or third or fourth gener-
ation. This was a source of general discussion and Valley Forge was
the answer.

This plan was largely due to the influence of the late William
Otto Miller, Comptroller of the University. He found as he was
campaigning for funds that many of the College alumni de-
clared themselves dissatisfied with the city location of the Uni-
versity, and gave that as a reason for sending their sons else-
where and for feeling such a languid interest in its affairs. Mr.
Henry N. Woolman, a graduate of the College of the class of
1896, influenced by Miller's statements, proceeded to buy a
tract of land, Cressbrook Farm, of 178 acres near Valley Forge,
some twenty miles from the city, and June 21, 1926, offered it as a new site for the University, if the Trustees would agree to transfer to it some considerable part of the institution. The Trustees referred the offer to a committee, but action was slow. The difficulties were obvious. Money must be found for buildings, endowment, and current expenses. Six millions were named by its critics; one million by its friends; lesser sums were declared to be adequate for a beginning. It was realized that the roots of the University ran deep into the soil of its present location and would be hard to draw out. It was evident the whole University could not be transplanted, nor indeed all its undergraduate schools, so the project gradually narrowed till it was conceived of as applying only to the College, then to a branch of the College, then to a select group of students. One committee after another was appointed, reports of progress were made, and in 1930 a Valley Forge Board was created with membership representing the Trustees, Faculty and alumni. But nothing was actually done by the Trustees.

Among the alumni and even on the part of some members of the Faculty there was considerable interest, even enthusiasm for the plan. It was discussed with approval at each conference of the Associated Clubs after 1926. The General Alumni Society appointed a committee and resolutions of urgency were sent to the Board of Trustees, which was felt to be lukewarm. Those who were hopeful of the plan looked forward to the rise of buildings and the usual college dependencies that might make up a small town. This led Mr. Woolman to purchase an adjoining farm, and the joint committee of Trustees, Faculty and alumni even spoke of needing a tract of 1,600 acres to keep the college free from intrusion. Plans were worked out by which it was thought teaching could be done with a minimum of difficulty by the same Faculty as should be teaching in West Philadelphia, or by some of its members.

It was, however, all a dream; every approach to the actual problems of such a transfer disclosed financial and other difficulties beyond practicable settlement. Students and professors of a certain medieval university are said to have migrated in one day and established themselves in a body in another city.
But their problem was an easy one in comparison with Pennsylvania's. They had no libraries to be replaced, no laboratories, no dormitories, no playing field, no heating or lighting—only two or three empty rooms in which the teachers might lecture to students who slept in the slums and attended lectures when they felt like it.

The project of a college at Valley Forge is not abandoned; it may yet materialize. The Bicentennial campaign seeks a fund of something more than half a million dollars which, if subscribed, will provide facilities for the education, under favorable conditions, of a small group of selected students, who may thus be pioneers of a different type of education from that to which the University as a whole is devoted, and toward which its evolution has so far tended. Meanwhile the Trustees have taken the two farms off the hands of the original donor, to whom they had become a burden, and hold them, for the present, awaiting the necessary funds. If those are not forthcoming the property will presumably be devoted to the general uses of the University.

THE PROVOST’S HOUSE

The plan of securing a house in which the Provost should live, entertain official guests of the University and his own, and which might serve as a sort of social center for the University, was another chapter in the story of the desire of many of the alumni that Pennsylvania should do those things that other colleges and universities of her class were doing. The plan was initiated at a “Founders Night” meeting of the Mask and Wig Club, February 14, 1914, and was financed chiefly by a gift from the Club of $25,000, and by funds raised by the General Alumni Society and the Associated Clubs to the amount of $104,000. These combined efforts made possible the acquisition of the interesting old house near Forty-first and Pine streets, the remote successor of the first Provost’s House at Fourth and Arch streets. The plain tastes of Provost and Mrs. Smith and their disinclination to the régime of entertaining its occupation would have required, reduced it for a few years to
the level of an administrative building. The frequent and hospitable attentions shown to visiting scholars and officials of other universities which marked the administration of Dr. Smith were provided at his own expense in one or another of the city clubs. Ultimately the house was occupied and put to its intended uses by the exercise of a kindly hospitality there by Provost and Mrs. Penniman in the later years of his administration.

THE FUND

It was a frequent criticism of the University during this period, as indeed it was of other institutions of equal intellectual rank, that it was “drifting.” This was an inappropriate figure of speech, except as it applied to its financial support. The University was not a captainless ship drifting on the waves; it was rather a tree, unpruned it may be (but who was wise enough to prune it?), growing at the end of every branch, constantly putting out new twigs and shoots from the very exuberance of its life and its freedom from restriction. It was well that this should be so. “To teach the young idea how to shoot” may be the proper task of a schoolmaster, but it is doubtful whether the intellectual life of a university can or should be guided in an established and prearranged groove. Its freedom to grow in any direction, its adaptation to changing conditions, its ability to experiment, are the very best of its characteristics. There are countries where the universities are regulated, but they do not thrive.

The remark of Mr. George W. Wickersham, a prominent alumnus, at the conference of Pennsylvania Clubs held at Boston in 1928 that “the purpose of the University is to try experiments. . . . The progress which has been made by those institutions which rank highest in the educational world . . . by reason of their ready receptivity of new ideas and willingness to put into operation new ideas,” might be taken as expressing the highest of the University’s educational ideals.

With regard to finances it was different; greater system in providing for the University’s support had become absolutely necessary. Gifts, lotteries, income from endowment, state ap-
propriations, students' fees, had been successively relied on as its principal source of income, but they were all inadequate and irregular. The adoption of a better plan was an outcome of the new alumni interest. October 27, 1924, the Board of Trustees authorized the formation of the University of Pennsylvania Fund, an association, principally of alumni, whose object was the concentration under systematic direction of alumni gifts for the support of the University. A general committee was formed and set to work to such good effect that in the first two years of their effort, from the date of the establishment of the Fund to the end of the year 1926, they were able to report subscriptions from more than ten thousand alumni and to turn over to the University treasury more than $3,000,000. This was the subject of discussion and of expressions of satisfaction at each conference of the Associated Clubs.

The Fund was thereupon made a permanent organization under the authority of the Trustees, consisting of members representing the Trustees, the Faculties, the Administration, and the General Alumni Association. They adopted a plan which had been lately coming to general attention. The "Yale System" of regular contributions from the alumni to the University, founded in 1890, its collections applied partly to current expenses, partly to building up a permanent endowment, had been followed in principle by one institution after another until by 1926 eleven of the larger universities in the country had worked out a more or less consistent plan of regular contributions from their alumni. That year a committee of the University Fund made a careful study of these plans and drew up, on the basis of these, and of their own experience and the peculiar position of Pennsylvania a body of rules and regulations to provide for a system of annual giving. They were reduced to a definite plan, adopted and published September 1930. They provided for a system of annual contributions from alumni as the principal means of securing funds for the University's support. All money-raising efforts on behalf of the University in future were to be carried on by the consent and advice of the General Committee of the Fund. Although its origin and history have connected it especially
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with the alumni, and with provision for current needs, it has interested itself also in appealing for outside interest in the University and obtaining aid in the support and growth of the multifarious endowments for special objects. Obtaining subscriptions involved other activities. "To keep in the minds of the public the literary and scientific work, the public service and the financial needs of the University," was to be as much a part of its work as "to secure the interest and support of its graduates and former students, wherever situated, and to endeavor to have their interest and support manifest itself in the form of gifts and contributions to the approved needs of the University."

To achieve this publicity and these financial ends the Fund constructed an administration with a general manager, a managing committee, officers, headquarters, and a staff, paying its expenses from the receipts from its efforts, and carrying on extensive operations almost paralleling the policy-making and educational activities of the University. The annual reports of the Fund have given striking testimony to the excellence of this plan for providing an approach to an adequate support for the University.

THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

One of the branches of the University tree that continued to grow, even in an unfriendly atmosphere, was the education of women. The Graduate School for Women of 1892, it is true, had not flourished. It had at best been rather an excuse for inaction than fulfillment of the demand that undoubtedly existed. But either as holders of its scholarships or as ordinary students, women studied in the Department of Philosophy without opposition. Women were admitted to the Law School in 1881, and in 1914 the Medical and Dental schools quietly opened their doors to them.

But there were not many who wanted these professional or graduate courses. The great demand for admission was on the undergraduate level. Many young women, as has been pointed out, sought admission to College to prepare for teaching. It
was mainly for their sake, the Saturday teachers' courses, the College Courses for Teachers, and the Summer School had been established. In 1893 a way had been found for furnishing specialized training for both graduates and undergraduates preparing for the profession of teaching. In that year a chair of pedagogy was established the incumbent of which, for a moderate salary, gave on Friday evenings a graduate lecture and on Saturdays taught an undergraduate class. The first to hold the chair was Dr. Martin G. Brumbaugh, appointed in 1895, a man of great energy and competence. He held many interim positions, from Superintendent of Schools of Puerto Rico and of Philadelphia to Governor of Pennsylvania, but managed to carry on at intervals for ten years pedagogical courses of much influence. He was succeeded by A. D. Yocum. Women and men alike came trooping to these educational classes, to the graduate classes if they had been to college, to the Saturday classes if they were still undergraduates or working school teachers.

It was in these classes that Professor Witmer gave the earliest courses in child psychology given in this country and laid the bases of his Psychological Clinic, and from them sociology made its way into the College, the Wharton School, and the Graduate School. It is evident that someone—the Provost or the Trustees, recognized the applicability of the educational courses to existing conditions, for in 1913 two new and strong men were added to the Faculty in this field, each giving both graduate and undergraduate work and each receiving a larger salary than the average paid in Pennsylvania at that time. Even this provision of graduate courses and courses for teachers in service was not sufficient to meet the demand. The courses of lectures in pedagogy in the Department of Philosophy were open only to college graduates and were largely historical and philosophical, not providing that professional and technical training that students preparing for teaching were supposed to require. There were on the other hand many young men and women willing to give all their time for four years to prepare for higher positions in teaching to fulfill the new and more rigorous requirements being made by school authorities.

The organization of a separate School of Education seemed
the best way to meet the problem, though it would almost cer-
tainly increase the number of women in the University. Such
a development was evidently anticipated, for the state appro-
priation of 1913, the second under Dr. Smith's provostship,
included a substantial sum for teacher training. The School of
Education, separate from the Graduate School and the College
Courses for Teachers, was thereupon organized, and opened its
courses in the fall of 1914. It had a separate Dean and Faculty;
provided a four-year course and after some hesitation whether
to claim the A.B. or not, decided to give the new degree Bache-
lor of Science in Education.

Professor Frank Pierrepont Graves, the Dean, had had a
varied experience as Instructor in Greek at Columbia, Presi-
dent of the University of the State of Washington, and Professor
of Pedagogy at Ohio State University. He exerted much in-
fluence till, after eight years here, he resigned to become Com-
missioner of Education of the State of New York. The new
school started with a hundred students and increased rapidly
in numbers. On the other hand the obvious desirability of a
careful selection of students whose personality would be likely
to lead to success as teachers induced an early habit of testing
each applicant for entrance by a personnel committee or officer.

Although there was no exclusion of men from any of these
courses, it was obvious that the School of Education with its
great preponderance of women was adding a large number to
the feminine contingent in the University. The old barriers
were rapidly breaking down. Women had always been mem-
bers of the Evening and Extension courses. When in 1920 the
old Architectural School was extended into a School of Fine
Arts, women were admitted to all its courses except that which
led directly to professional work in architecture, and in 1934
even this barrier was to a certain extent removed. The School
of Veterinary Medicine held out till 1933, though it would
seem that the field of the care of small animals was notably
one of promise for women. They can be seen busy in their
daily attentions to them along the Seine and in thousands of
American households.

Constant extension of the dormitories for men, with no
special provision for women, began to seem so anomalous that in 1924 the Trustees bought the apartment house at Thirty-fourth and Chestnut streets as a dormitory for women, already fairly well adapted as it was to the purpose, and renamed it Sergeant Hall. In 1921 the women, with the consent of the Trustees, formed the Bennett Club which soon obtained the use of a house at Thirty-fourth and Walnut streets for recreational purposes.

In the meantime the Bennett funds were piling up, though they were drawn on for expenses of "coeducation as at present carried on," in the words of the bequest, to pay part of the salaries of such professors as taught both men and women. In 1925 the new Bennett Hall was erected chiefly for women's classes and for the administrative offices of the three departments in which women were most largely represented.

The Faculty of the School of Education were not satisfied with its organization. Four years were not enough for its students to follow the cultural courses they wished them to have and in addition to give them their general professional training and the special equipment they needed for their future work. Another difficulty was that, notwithstanding the vocational intimations of its name, many girls entered the School of Education who wanted college life and a college degree but had no expectation of becoming teachers. This made it difficult to arrange a curriculum suited to both cultural and professional needs. Therefore in 1933 the School of Education boldly dropped its two lower classes, added a third year to its upper two and became distinctly a professional school, with technical requirements for graduation that would discourage any student who wished only a cultural college education. This was the long-awaited opportunity to establish a separate college for women. Before describing its foundation, however, some offshoots of the older school must be noted.

The School of Education has been prolific of dependencies, or it may be that it has only served as a magnet to draw them. "Schoolmen's Week" has been, once a year, for a week, usually in April, ever since 1914 an astonishing assembly. It floods, with a horde of mature men and women, Bennett Hall and
any adjacent buildings where rooms for meetings can be found. The first of these annual conferences was held in April 1914, preceding indeed by a few weeks the actual opening of the School of Education itself. The attendants came in response to an invitation issued by the University to superintendents and principals of Pennsylvania public schools, teachers of education in high schools, normal schools, and colleges, and representatives of school boards to meet at the University and confer on such educational topics as might interest them.

The plan was a great success from the beginning; this group of men and women evidently had much to confer upon and were only awaiting the opportunity and the leadership the professors in the Department of Education thus gave them. More than two hundred registered at the first conference and several hundred more attended the meetings. At the second conference almost a thousand registered and more than two thousand attended and so numbers increased at each successive conference until in 1939 there was an attendance of more than five thousand. The invitation itself became inclusive of larger categories. The University, with its traditional hospitality, provided free buffet lunches and suppers to visiting delegates until 1931, when this custom became such a burden and expense that it was suspended. The annual conference has been under the charge of a joint committee of the School of Education and the cooperating schools, but the University has provided, often by a special gift from some sympathizer, for the main expenses of the meeting. The Proceedings has been printed as a University document. According to good testimony the discussions, although on questions vital to the school superintendents and teachers, have remained free, open and unbiased,—a good instance of the kind of help the University from its nonpartisan position is able to offer the community.

The latest and one of the most pleasing of the divagations of the School of Education into non-University life, and withal an excellent illustration of the spirit of Mr. Gates's administration is the Cultural Olympics. They were begun in 1936, and as they do not follow the four-year cycle of the great contests from which they are named they have already had a
history of four years. A department of the University which
gives no instruction, charges no fees, awards no degrees, and
offers only the services of a Director and the occasional use of
some of its rooms, reminds one of those early loans of its fa-
cilities to artistic and literary organizations, when the Univer-
sity in its second home still had at its disposal the rooms of its
first, but in the proportions of the twentieth century. Whatever
may have been the size of “Mr. Adgate’s music classes” or of
the “Humane Society” or of Noah Webster’s lecture audiences
in the eighteenth century, the Cultural Olympics in 1939 drew
to the campus something over eighty thousand visitors, brought
together eight thousand participants in its contests in music,
dance, speech, and the drama, and in its exhibitions of graphic
and plastic arts, from 214 neighboring schools and similar in-
stitutions.

Everybody is interested, more or less, in athletic contests,
but only a few can participate in them. Why should not
young people, very young people, below college age, whose
gifts, interests, or ambitions lie in other than athletic directions
not enjoy the thrill of competition and obtain the advantages
of developing high standards in their own lines? This analogy
is at the basis of the Cultural Olympics. The original idea of
a Philadelphia philanthropist, the generosity of a Philadel-
phia retail business organization, the quick favorable response
by President Gates to the suggestion of their connection with
the University, and the work as Director of a professor in the
School of Education, brought into existence this annual series
of intellectual and artistic contests among teams from schools
in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, with
“adjudications” by competent volunteer judges on the excel-
lence of performance in the schools and the finals. If, as sug-
gested in another connection, any one doubts the influence of
this modest contribution to the artistic and cultural life of the
community, or the reality of its connection with the University,
let him attend one of its “shows” — there will be no charge for
admission.

One more department was attached to the School of Educa-
tion. At a certain period in the history of the University there
was much complaint of the extreme youthfulness of the students. In this attachment to the University there can be no question of the proper age limit, for its name establishes its position in the educational scale: the Illman-Carter Unit for Kindergarten and Primary Teachers. However the analogy is spoiled by the fact that it is the teachers, not the children, who are taught in this branch of the School of Education; though as a matter of fact it keeps up a kindergarten and primary school a few blocks from the University as a demonstration or practice school, practically a laboratory.

The absorption by the University of this old and successful school for kindergartners, under the name the department now bears, took place by a vote of the Trustees July 1, 1936. Miss Illman is still Director of the School. Students are enrolled for a four-year course, obtaining their technical training and observation in special courses, and take general culture courses in such other departments as are open to women. Graduates receive the degree of Bachelor of Science in Education.

The adaptation of divisions of the School of Education to useful service in the higher ranges of public education has during this expansive period led to the extension of the Department into many new corners of that field of American life. Some of these extensions have come in by the offer of financial aid from the outside, such as the courses in Vocational Education, some from professional urgency, such as the Department of Nursing Education. Almost the only unity among them and the only limitation on indefinite subdivision is the requirement that all students shall take courses appropriate to receiving the degree of Bachelor of Science in Education and shall be given the opportunity by prolonged study to receive the degree of Master of Science in Education. The decision of Dean Graves when the school was organized in 1914 not to ask for the purely cultural degree of A.B. but to award the technical scientific degree instead was a pregnant one. It held in it not only the avoidance of the jealousy of those who wished to preserve the purely cultural significance of the older degree, but it offered the extension of the degree of B.S. in Ed. to all
the numerous ramifications of the profession of education in these later years. There are few departments of the University more clearly adapted to the growing needs of the community.

In the same general field of the training of young people, though not along the usual educational lines, was the William T. Carter Foundation of Child Helping, established in the University in 1924. It was an effort to spread, through academic means, the experiences of the donor and her husband in carrying on for many years a school for training troublesome boys; to discover by research the principles on which children could be most effectively helped; and to disseminate through lectures and other means such devices for that purpose as were already known. The Foundation is attached not to the School of Education but to the Department of Sociology; one of the professors in that Department being Director of the Foundation.

THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS FOR WOMEN

The idea of a college for women exactly paralleling the old College had slept peacefully for half a century, except for an occasional disturbing dream of official mention, such as successive Provosts had introduced from time to time into their annual reports on the needs of the University, or as the alumni had grasped at it as an alternative to coeducation, or as it was announced as one of the objects of the University Fund in 1925. In the meantime the pressure of women students desiring to obtain a general college education and able to do so only by the tortuous process of selecting courses not intended for that purpose—the College Courses for Teachers, the School of Education, the School of Fine Arts, or the Biological Department—was becoming greater and greater. The final push came from the adoption by the School of Education of a professional policy of admitting students only to its junior, senior, and post-senior years.

To fill this void of a general course in the earlier years preparatory to the School of Education and to satisfy the wishes of students wanting a general college course, in 1933, just fifty-
one years after the offer of 1882, the College of Liberal Arts for Women was established, with its own Dean and Faculty, although, it must be confessed, without the endowment that had so long been sought, and with a Faculty and courses drawn largely from those already in one or another department. More than five hundred women students attending in its fifth year, however, attest its fulfillment of the need that had long been asserted; and the old hope of an endowment that may enable these young women to enjoy the academic life that normally belongs to one-half the youthful race may still be fulfilled.

To an alumnus returning to the University or examining its statistics there are few more surprising discoveries than the present position of women in the University. There are more women students at Pennsylvania than in any one of the principal women's colleges in the United States. About one-quarter of the students on its rolls are women. This is true whether the total number, something over seventeen thousand enrolled as students of the University in any sense in 1939–40 be taken, of whom five thousand are women; or whether students in the stricter sense of those regularly in residence and candidates for a degree be counted. These number some eight thousand four hundred, of whom nearly two thousand are women. Women are admitted to fifteen departments in the University; and there is more than one course to which women alone are admitted. They have their own dormitories, their own fraternities, their own athletic, scholastic, and other organizations, and their own social life, in addition to the dramatic, musical, and other interests in which men and women share.

And yet Pennsylvania does not impress one as a coeducational institution, nor is it such. Women are still in the University as it were on sufferance. The College, the oldest and most characteristic part of the University, that which is best known to the public and which largely gives tone to the whole institution, is still strictly masculine. Nor does the Wharton School or either of the engineering courses as yet admit women. The infiltration of the feminine element has been gradual; it is not yet complete.
At his first meeting as Provost with the Board of Trustees, in 1923, Dr. Penniman called their attention to the double position of the University, as a teaching institution and as an institution engaged in the increase of knowledge—to its two functions, teaching and research—to the importance of the latter and to the desirability that it should deliberately acknowledge this as its principal function. It was a significant observation, furnishing a clue to a change of emphasis in the University's interests that has become continually more pronounced.

Research at the University was of course not new. There had always been professors interested in the discovery of new knowledge in their respective fields, and occasionally a student. Research had in some departments been acknowledged and encouraged. Postgraduate study almost necessarily consists largely of investigation, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences became, after its foundation in 1884, so far at least as the work of its teachers and of its candidates for the degree of Ph.D. were concerned, more and more a school of research.

The Pepper Laboratory of Clinical Research, opened in 1895, was the first of a long series of foundations devoted to medical research. Ten years later were established the John Herr Musser Department of Research Medicine and the Department of Surgical Research. The new men who came in with the reorganization of the Medical School Faculty in 1910 were all research men, as were their successors. The Henry Phipps Institute for the Study of Tuberculosis, established in 1903 and handed over to the University in 1910, was to a very large degree a research institution. The last year of work in the Graduate School of Medicine, organized under Dr. George H. Meeker in 1919, was regularly devoted to some piece of research. Later endowments and foundations in the field of medicine have been almost invariably for research in one field or another.

In the meantime, while research was spreading through the whole field of medical study, in other fields it was invading
the domain of teaching, as for instance in the Law School, in which a Graduate Department granting the degree of Master of Laws was established in 1907, "for the purpose of encouraging original legal work"; followed two years later by the endowment by Esther Gowen Hood of the three Franklin B. Gowen Memorial Fellowships. Although these were defined as intended to fit their holders for the better practice of their profession, in the light of modern practice this could hardly help but include some research in the legal field.

Curiously enough, one of the first formal recognitions of research as a form of university work came with the introduction in 1899 of the honor society of Sigma Xi, which had been founded at Cornell in 1886 especially to give due recognition to original investigation in either pure or applied science by professors, graduate or undergraduate students. Its very name translates into "Companions in Research." The natural sciences have always been a challenge to investigators. There is so much just beyond the borders of present familiar knowledge yet so accessible to independent study that observation soon becomes a search for that which is still unknown. It has already been remarked that the founders of the Biological School as early as 1884 were not only themselves all men engaged in research but made a habit of giving even their undergraduate students new subjects to investigate. In the same way research was apt to be carried on by the professors and by capable students in chemistry, physics, astronomy, and allied scientific fields.

In 1921 Industrial Research was established as a recognized department of the University, at the suggestion of Joseph Willits, former Dean of the Wharton School, with the object of carrying on by trained investigators unbiased study of some of the local problems of labor and employment. A number of representative Philadelphia firms stood back of this experiment in research and it was subsidized for some years by the Laura Spelman, the Rockefeller, and the Rosenwald foundations. This interest in research by business concerns and endowed foundations was characteristic of the period immediately following the World
War. The necessity of a search for raw materials, food supplies, chemical, and all other requirements in war time was stimulated by the events of 1917 and 1918 and led to the creation by the government of the National Research Council and the revival of the National Academy of Sciences for the study of our national resources. There was also a proposal, emanating from Mr. Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, for a vast national research endowment for continued investigations. At the same time industrial concerns were setting up at their own expense those research laboratories which have played such a brilliant part in modern scientific invention and production.

In this movement the universities had as yet no recognized part, although the laboratories and the endowed projects of research were necessarily manned almost entirely by men trained in the universities. This was a matter of remark among many university men. Impressed with the importance of this function of the University, as already indicated, Provost Penniman in the spring of 1926 issued an invitation to a large number of men connected with endowments for research, government departments, industrial establishments, and the universities to attend at the University a conference on the part which universities should take in this growing activity. The conference met May 3, 1926. It included seven representatives of the large foundations, the heads of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company and the General Electric Company, and twelve university men and engineers. They held a morning and an afternoon session and adopted resolutions approving the national endowment for research being advocated under Mr. Hoover, and a "self-analysis" by each of the larger universities to consider what should be its relation to research. These inquiries, made along lines suggested by Dr. Merriam, head of the Carnegie Institution, were supposed to bring out the need and opportunity for a research policy at each institution, its means of support, and its probable success in coördinating its work with that of other research bodies.

The results were only moderately satisfactory. The national endowment fund ran on the rocks of the economic catastrophe
that so soon followed; the foundations gave grants for research freely, but took little interest in the university problem. Several universities, especially the state universities, had such large amounts available for research, like California with its $80,000 a year, and so completely under their own control, that they were tempted to neglect any attempt at a general policy.

At Pennsylvania the matter was taken up more seriously. The Provost appointed a committee which held many meetings in 1929 and 1930 under Dr. McClung as chairman and presented a carefully drawn-up report to the Provost which he transmitted to the Trustees May 23, 1930. Of the recommendations of this committee only two were put into effect at the time, though the others have remained under consideration and some, not directly connected with research, have since been accepted. The two recommendations adopted in 1930 were, first, that the Graduate School and all systematic research being done at the University should be placed under the charge of a special group of the Trustees, and, second, that a standing Faculty Research Committee be appointed provided with a substantial sum yearly for giving assistance to members of the Faculty desirous of carrying out research projects. It was to be their duty also to encourage all forms of research at the University. A Faculty Research Committee was thereupon appointed and a grant of $80,000 obtained from the Rockefeller Foundation, December 1930, to be spread over six years, for assistance to research projects.

The new Board of Graduate Education and Research of the Trustees in January 1931 gave its instructions to the Faculty Committee, which held its first meeting March 20, 1931. Since that time it has functioned, meeting with regularity, reporting monthly to the Trustee Board and showing much activity. After a year and a half it was able to report that it had made something over a hundred grants to approximately the same number of applicants, in thirty-two departments. The objects were naturally of great variety; the grants were mostly small, averaging $135 apiece. There was universal testimony to their great helpfulness.

The work of the Research Committee and the interest of
the Board of Graduate Education and Research have continued since along nearly the same lines, though much restricted by lack of means. The Trustees have recognized the importance of this work by making appropriations, not of course as large as could be expended to advantage, but generous in view of the difficult period. Apart from actual assistance given to members of the Faculty in carrying out projects which they could not have completed otherwise, this official recognition and aid have quite transformed the general attitude toward research. Every member of the Faculty is not a productive scholar, nor is it necessary or perhaps desirable that he should be, though generally speaking, a teacher in a college or a university is not apt to continue useful unless he has some individual creative interest. But research is universally respected if not actually performed. One result of this appreciation is that in all new appointments or promotions the Dean of the Graduate School is consulted to make sure the interests of research are considered. There will in future be less dead wood. The University now stands reasonably well, notwithstanding its lack of endowments in all other fields than medicine, in comparison with other institutions in the amount and quality of research being carried on by its men.