Chapter 10

UNDER A PRESIDENT

1930–1940

As the second century of the University's history drew toward a close it became increasingly evident that its educational progress during the past fifty years of expansion had been more rapid than the development of its administrative structure. The same distant and unorganized Board of Trustees, the same body of incongruous powers and responsibilities incumbent on the Provost, the same absence of centralized and coördinated administrative offices characterized the large and complex institution of 1900 to 1930 that had been true of the smaller and simpler institution of the latter part of the nineteenth century.

The correction of this state of affairs, the process of bringing administration up to the level of education and research, had begun in the midst of the discussions of policy and finance described above. Much of it occurred therefore earlier than the date placed at the head of this chapter; it began indeed as early as 1917 or 1919, but its culmination came later and it can be better discussed now when it has been completed. It began with a strengthening of the executive offices. More careful selection of persons, better salaries, additions to their powers, provision of better offices and equipment made such officers as the Secretary of the University, the Comptroller, the Treasurer, as conspicuous in their domain as educational officers of corresponding rank were in theirs. The statutes say, somewhat later, of the Treasurer, the Secretary, the Comptroller, the General Counsel and the Librarian, in each case, "He shall have the academic rank of Professor." Lesser offices were created, a purchasing
agent, a superintendent of buildings and grounds, an office manager, a publicity manager. The University was growing up, in its own way, along the lines of big business. When Provost Smith for personal reasons declined in 1919 to live in the newly acquired Provost’s House, a group of officials and their clerks established headquarters there until Provost Penniman took up his residence there in 1923.

About the same time a group of additional activities were undertaken by the University. The impressive catalogue of alumni gathered in the Fund campaign in 1925 was handed over to the University and became the permanent Alumni Records Office. The Placement Service was established in 1926 to bring students and graduates and the positions they hoped were waiting for them together. In 1920 a University Press had been incorporated largely for printing official publications. In 1927, when a professional editor and manager, Mr. Phelps Soule, formerly of the Yale University Press, was appointed, it became the regular publishing department of the University under the charge of a committee drawn from the Faculties with the Secretary a member ex officio.

In 1926, as before observed, the title of President was abandoned or rather, in the words of the Trustees’ resolution, “changed to Provost,” so that Dr. Penniman, who had been for three years both President and Provost now resumed the traditional title alone. At the same time a more important administrative change was made. In place of the old single Vice-Provost, who was simply one of the professors, with few or no distinctive duties except in the disability of the Provost, there were created three Vice-Provosts, one responsible for Faculty personnel and relations, one in charge of student government and welfare, and one in charge of public relations. To the last-named post was elected Mr. George A. Brakeley, later unfortunately lost by us to Princeton, his alma mater. Dr. George W. McClelland, already Vice-Provost, was continued in charge of faculty personnel, and for a time the third department, student welfare, also remained in his charge.

By further amendment in 1928 the jurisdictions of the Vice-Provostships were more sharply defined. The title of the first,
that of Dr. McClelland, became Vice-Provost in Charge of Undergraduate Departments, Mr. Brakeley became Vice-Provost in Charge of Administration, and a new jurisdiction, that of Vice-Provost in Charge of Medical Departments, was set up. This post, perhaps the most difficult and certainly the most conspicuous, remained unfilled for three years. It would involve the duty of coördinating and developing what was already a great group of schools, hospitals, and research institutes, destined to become still more extensive and complicated by the endowments and mergers of the next few years. The constructive work of Dr. Alfred Stengel who was placed in this position in 1931 made his sudden death in 1939 a real calamity. The University was most fortunate in having Dr. Alfred Newton Richards to put in his place.

Further development of the vice-provostships, now called vice-presidencies, came in January 1931, when a complete revision of the statutes provided, among other things, that the Provost should remain in charge of the Graduate School, the Libraries, and Research, and that Undergraduate Schools, Medical Affairs, the Law School, and Administration should each be in charge of a Vice-President. In 1939, with the retirement of Dr. Penniman and the election of Dr. McClelland as Provost, the jurisdiction of the latter office was extended over Undergraduate Affairs and that Vice-Presidency disappeared. At the same time a new office was created, that of Vice-President, Assistant to the President. These departmental vice-presidencies were an original and fortunate invention, forming an effective link between administration, teaching, and research.

The need for greater efficiency in carrying on the administration of the University and the wish to respond favorably to the repeated requests of the alumni for larger representation on the Board of Trustees combined to make some reorganization of the Board itself desirable. Notwithstanding its more active membership in recent times, it was cumbersome and unresponsive to the needs of the time. It was either too large or too small; too large for unity and for combined responsibility, too small to furnish informed committees on all the many fields of interest now covered by the University's activities. It was also
widely felt that the Board should be made more representative of all classes in the community. To reach these ends the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia in December 1927, upon application, modified the charter of the University by increasing the number of the Trustees from twenty-four to forty-one, including the Governor, ex-officio, and permitting the Trustees by statute to establish a new class of Trustees, serving for a term of ten years, instead of for life. The new statutes, adopted in 1928, provided for ten Life Trustees, twenty Term Trustees, and ten to be elected for terms of ten years by the alumni and known as Alumni Trustees, thus conceding their old demand.

In the statutes of 1928 the reinforced Board of Trustees introduced a still more significant change, the system of constituent boards. It was largely that this might be done that the board had been increased in numbers and flexibility. Each of the eight principal fields of University interest was placed under the administration of a group of these Trustees. These boards, each in its own field, had much the power of the whole Board of Trustees, including appointments, the awarding of degrees, the approval of curricula; with new powers and duties, to be drawn, it was hoped, from their increased interest in and knowledge of the conditions in the particular department which was under their control. Thus there was formed a Constituent Board for Graduate Education and Research, having jurisdiction over the Graduate School, the Libraries, and research work wherever it was being done in the University; a Board of Liberal Arts, having jurisdiction over the College of Arts and Sciences, the College Courses for Teachers, the Towne School, and the general extension courses; and so with the Fine Arts, Medical Affairs, Business Education, Law, Teacher Training, and Engineering boards.

The Provost and respective Vice-Presidents are members ex officio of their appropriate constituent boards. Heads of teaching departments and other professors are regularly called into consultation. Each board has the right to elect yearly Associate Trustees, heads of neighboring colleges and other interested outsiders, and in many cases these have attended the monthly meetings of the boards, taken part in their discussions and
added much that was of value and interest. These constituent boards have proved to be as effective and helpful as they were original. A small group of four or five Trustees acting with all or almost all the power of the whole Board, with a Provost or Vice-President and in many cases Associate Trustees familiar with and interested in some phase of the University’s work, have given guidance and encouragement to members of the Faculty and in turn have been themselves brought into contact with its problems to a degree unknown before in the University’s history. An element of cooperation with other institutions has already emerged, almost involuntarily, from these board meetings that is of the greatest interest and promise. But the stage is even yet scarcely set for the drama of institutional cooperation that may yet some day be played.

The first stages of these administrative changes were made between 1925 and 1929 while the highest officer of the University was still the Provost. One might speculate whether this reorganization should not include a change of the system at the top. The powers and responsibilities of the Provost had been growing in number and complexity ever since the accession of Provost Pepper to office—or at least until the Fund had recently taken part of the financial burden from him. Few people realize the problems, external and internal, financial and personal, arising in the work of an educational institution with some fifteen hundred instructors and more than as many thousand students, distributed in some forty semi-independent schools, departments, institutes, and foundations, and expending an annual budget (in 1939–40) of well over eight millions; an institution full of life, constantly growing, demanding financial support, keeping up old standards and at the same time adapting itself to the mold of its time. These requirements for the old office of Provost had become more than any one man could be expected to fulfill. They were also more heterogeneous in character, as the University touched the community at more points.

The University was fortunate in being able, without too great a wrench with the past, and without disparagement of its long line of Provosts, to satisfy this demand for new qualifica-
tions for headship. Provost Penniman, who was in office during this period of reorganization, was a man of long experience in University administration, had solved many problems and placated many conflicts. He had presided over its affairs with dignity and charm for many years. His was the pen of a ready writer, and he had spoken judiciously on a great variety of occasions to thousands of University men and women and to other thousands of outsiders concerning the University. As host at the Provost's House and as presiding officer at the Board of Trustees and at Faculty meetings and in intercourse with the outside world, he was a Provost whom all could respect and admire. But he was primarily a scholar, by preference a man of contemplation rather than of action, with no bent toward finance and no more experience in solving its problems than his share in seeking the day-by-day support the University demanded.

There was available for higher University service at this time a man with a different group of qualifications. Thomas S. Gates was a graduate of the Wharton School of the class of '93, and of the Law School of '96: he had also carried on postgraduate work. He had practised law for some years; then, in business and banking connections, he had achieved a notable success. He was a director of the Pennsylvania Railroad and member of many other boards. He had been an interested and prominent alumnus almost from his graduation. He had been a member of the Committee of One Hundred and had taken part, though not a prominent part, in the discussions of the alumni concerning University policy in 1920. He was a member of the various committees on Valley Forge. He had been elected a Trustee in 1921 and was chairman of the Board of Managers of the Fund in 1925 and subsequently. He was made chairman of the Executive Board of the Trustees in 1929. He was already something of a civic leader, being one of the supporters of the Philadelphia Orchestra and of the Academy of Fine Arts. His choice for the Philadelphia Award, with universal acclaim, was still to come. He was a man of literary interests and culture, and sympathetic with all intellectual interests. Above all he was ready and willing to retire from business and
to give himself with devotion to the service of the University.

In the clamorous need of the University administration for executive ability and business training, the fortunate chance to obtain these, combined with understanding of and sympathy with its intellectual needs and ambitions, offered an opportunity that could not be wasted. The Trustees therefore, October 6, 1930, passed an amendment to the statutes providing that "the Trustees discharge all their executive duties through an officer who shall be styled President of the University." Mr. Gates was thereupon elected President October 8, 1930. It was a great change in few words; it was followed by a complete revision of the statutes made in January 1931 embodying this new office and all the administrative changes that have now been described. The arrangement for ten Life Trustees and twenty Term Trustees, with ten Trustees to be elected by the alumni, was made permanent. The President became the head of the University. All officers, instructors, and employees were made responsible to him, and he became presiding officer of the Board of Trustees, except for the nominal ex officio presidency of the Governor of the state, reserved by charter. He was given all other powers usually belonging to the head of a university or other corporate body, defined by a carefully formulated body of statutes. The University was at last under a President.

There was an obvious attempt to preserve to the provostship as much of its old prominence as possible under a more highly centralized régime than had ever before existed. The Provost was described in the statutes as "the senior educational officer of the University," and, since the University is an educational institution, this left him a wide sphere of honors and duties; membership in all Faculties, the right of attendance at meetings of the Trustees, of the Executive Council, of all constituent boards and of the Administrative Council, and the chairmanship of the Educational Council. In other respects the position of Provost was similar to that of one, though the highest one, of the Vice-Presidents, as the former Vice-Provosts were now called. He had special oversight of the Graduate School of Arts and Science and of the Library. In the words of the statute, he
was also "responsible for the coördination of the research work in all schools and departments," one of the activities of the University in which, as already mentioned, Provost Penniman was especially interested, and which was rapidly becoming one of its chief functions. He must also advise the President on his educational policies and on the general development of the University.

During the remaining eight years of Provost Penniman's service, until his retirement in June 1939, he found no lack of occupation, responsibility, and recognition. Many of his predecessors in office, if they could have looked forward to these halcyon days of relief of the provostship from so many of its financial and administrative burdens, would have anticipated his position with profound envy. Few who were present will forget the distinguished occasion in June 1939 on which his retirement was celebrated. His successor as Provost, Dr. George W. McClelland, elected in 1939, had been so long Vice-President in charge of Undergraduate Schools that this Department, as has been seen, was added to the fields of which the Provost had special oversight and to his more general duties. Provost McClelland's administration is not yet a matter of history, and it remains to be seen just what development the provostship will go through under the presidency; but, whatever shape it may take, around the title will always cling some of its old traditions.

These paragraphs may seem a somewhat technical description of formal changes in the administrative framework of the University. Justification for them is to be found in the fact that this reorganization is in a certain sense the culmination of the administrative history of the past and a well-devised foundation for the future. The Administration, the Faculties, the alumni, even the students, each have now a position in the whole organization with which they feel satisfied and in which they can act efficiently. In regard to the students there is a curious fact to be noted—that the old problem of discipline has almost vanished. Misbehavior in the classroom or about the buildings is nearly unknown. The reason is a matter of speculation: the presence of women, the greater interest of studies, the outlet of athletics, the interest in outside social questions, the multi-
licity of extra-curricular interests, better teaching—all have been suggested as explanations of the fact that the childishness and trouble-making that played so large a part in college life in earlier days no longer exists in these. At the same time the touch-me-not attitude of the members of the Faculty of former generations in their relations with students, the old-fashioned insistence on the outward shows of respect, and the demand for unbroken attention and implicit obedience—demanded but seldom or never obtained—seem somewhat absurd to their successors. Perhaps it is because there are so many teachers and students that formality is less and behavior better.

Few administrators with a difficult financial problem to solve have entered office in more unpromising times than those in which Mr. Gates took up his duties as President in October 1930. It was in the early days of the depression. The University was subject to the same storms as were breaking on other institutions. It suffered many harsh effects: reduced appropriations for books and research, restriction on what seemed necessary purchases and expenditures, painfully rigid economies, a slowing down of the normal course of appointments and promotions. But the University had reason to be grateful for the leadership of its new President in weathering the storm. Salaries were cut down only moderately and for the most part soon restored. There was no catastrophic loss or failure anywhere in the institution. It was no light matter that scholarship was still safe though suffering under the chastening hand of extreme frugality; that while the budget was being balanced the Faculties and lecture courses and publications of the University remained so nearly intact. Mr. Gates was himself a financier and doubtless took the best financial advice; but he was also an educator and took counsel of those who were interested in keeping learning and teaching alive for a better day at any price.

Rifts in the clouds began to appear, apprehension for the future to pass away and progress along normal lines to be resumed. Some financial reforms were of a general and permanent character. Mortgages that burdened many departments were brought into one with a considerable saving of interest; trusts
were consolidated and made more productive; investments were improved and made more secure. It was claimed that few if any such institutions had on the whole a better percentage of income from their investments. It is only a pity there were not more of them. In these improvements the late F. Corlies Morgan, Treasurer of the University from 1919 to his sudden death in 1939, played an important part, and his vision and sound judgment were also felt in many other fields of University administration.

Some financial advantages arose as the result of reforms entered upon primarily for other reasons. This was true of the so-called "Gates Plan." The Gates Plan was approved by the Trustees February 2, 1931, following a report which had been prepared after a four-month study by Gordon Hardwick and Michael Dorizas, interested alumni, and was presented to the Board by President Gates with a recommendation for its adoption. This resolution set up the Department of Physical Education, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Student Health. It was to have a Dean and group of professors, assistant professors, and instructors making up a faculty. Rules and requirements were assimilated to those of other departments of the University. This combination of formerly independent activities presented several new provisions. In the first place, physical education and competitive athletics were placed under one head. The unity of these two objectives, physical training and athletic competition, long claimed and occasionally even striven for but never realized, was now measurably attained. The first incumbent of the responsible position of Dean was Dr. E. Leroy Mercer, who introduced into the Department a régime of efficiency and strict control.

Secondly, intercollegiate athletics, heretofore practically under alumni management, became a budgeted department of the University, under the financial supervision of the Treasurer and Comptroller. Coaches became members of the University Faculty. The more careful supervision of finances in this field has saved hundreds of thousands of dollars in the years the plan has been in operation. More important than the finances, however, was the larger share of the students in the control of
athletics and greater participation in them. Not only were professionalism and doubtful practices in football and some other sports eliminated or much diminished, but the number of students taking active part in competitive games and in ordinary outdoor exercises was much increased. It was part of the Gates Plan to encourage a much greater variety and number of athletic contests, to introduce much more intramural competition, and above all to root out and make impossible all dishonesty in athletics. Whether these changes have been favorable or unfavorable to success in intercollegiate contests is a moot point; several factors enter into that problem, but criticism has been disarmed and scandal put an end to. The new Sydney E. Hutchinson Gymnasium and the Palestra, the home of basket ball and other indoor contests, were opened in 1927, and the group of tennis courts, soccer fields and the new field house, with their facilities for women, made the River Fields an additional center for athletic activities. This equipment, along with the spirit of the reformed system, has brought many score more students to share in athletic activities.

Thirdly, in the field of student health, an advisory board was set up to coördinate this department with medical and hospital facilities. A health fee of $10 a year was charged to all regular students; in return for which an infirmary was established in which, in case of indisposition, students were kept if necessary for three days without special charge; further hospitalization being in the students' ward of the University Hospital at a moderate cost, or elsewhere at the option of the student's physician. There was an annual physical examination, special examinations as required, and expert advice. A staff of physicians and nurses were made available for this student health service. The results of this supervision asserted themselves immediately; thousands of physical, x-ray, and laboratory examinations, and literally tens of thousands of visits by students to dispensaries within a year brought about a remarkable régime of health and physical well-being.

To list the most recent occurrences at the University, those which belong especially to the period of the administration of Mr. Gates, as has been done for other administrations, is very
difficult. It is much like counting chips as they drift by on a running stream; they appear so suddenly and give so little time for observation. To measure the special influence on the course of events exercised by the present head of the University, as has been done for other administrations, presents still greater difficulties. The last ten years of time should belong not to the historian but to the commentator.

However, the interest of some recent movements forbids their neglect. There is scarcely one of those lines of development that have been traced in the past that has not continued down through recent years. Most of them must be abandoned here; only a few can be mentioned before the past is left entirely to itself. New schools have continued to be established. The School of Liberal Arts for Women has already been described. The School of Fine Arts arose in 1920 from the old Department of Architecture which since 1912 had been part of the Towne School and was then celebrating the thirtieth anniversary of its actual foundation. It had been remarkably successful, and under the influence of the reorganization and combination characteristic of the period proceeded to absorb the old Department of Music, to add courses in the congenial field of landscape architecture, and to draw together the cultural courses on the history and appreciation of art. It included with them professional work in interior decoration. As has been remarked, women were admitted to the fine arts courses after 1923 and to a limited number of the architectural courses after 1935.

The Moore School of Electrical Engineering arose, like the School of Fine Arts, from an older department; this too was an offshoot from the Towne Scientific School. It owed its separateness and distinction to a bequest of approximately a million and a half dollars from Alfred Fitler Moore, a Philadelphia manufacturer, given in memory of his parents and accepted by the University in 1923. The school was able in 1926 to secure "ready made" a building whose location on what thus became one corner of the campus, whose similarity of design to the nearest University buildings, and whose adaptability to its new uses were so remarkable as to suggest either a favoring provi-
dence or anticipation by those who had originally erected it that it would some time fall to the University, which was so steadily taking possession of that part of the city. The Moore School, under the guiding hand of Dean Pender, soon developed graduate as well as undergraduate work in all branches of that rapidly extending field, and since 1928 has given graduate courses in the evening to working and professional engineers.

A characteristic combination of the needs of the time and the readiness of the University to respond to them was the foundation in 1937, on the basis of a six-year trial endowment of $240,000, the gift of an anonymous donor, of the Institute of Local and State Government. Schools of diplomacy and of national service of various kinds have been established at various places, but it was realized by the donor and his advisers that the problems of state and city, county and township, borough and commission for public service, were none the less pressing and difficult. Democracy begins at home. To fulfill the functions of training career men in this field of public employment, of giving such assistance in the performance of local governmental tasks as its technical equipment might enable it to contribute, and the endless task of research in one more phase of human activity, the Institute was organized, a Director and staff appointed and it set out on its career of experiment and development. It was attached to the Wharton School, provided with an executive board, and, like all other divisions of the University since 1928, placed under an appropriate constituent board of the Trustees, in this case the Board of Business Education. Its short three years of life have done little more than point out its possible fields of activity, but there has been time enough to show that this is a wide one and that it is quite time its cultivation was begun. The fact that President Gates was drafted to act as chairman of the Philadelphia Advisory Finance Commission seems to justify the undertaking by the University of instruction and research in the vast and growing field of which this is a type. A chance activity of the Institute is its coöperation in some of its work with the Pennsylvania State College, reminiscent of the old days of 1864 when it was un-
certain which institution would receive the endowment on which the latter has since been built up, and of 1920 when the Finegan Plan would have drawn the two institutions closer together.

The most recent of the departments to take its place as a separate school is the School of Animal Pathology, so separated in distance and in its field of interest and so recent a recruit that its situation in the University organization still remains something of a question, though it will soon doubtless become much more significant. It was established in May 1937 on Bolton Farm, a well-stocked farm of four hundred acres in Bucks County. It was the gift of the heirs of the Trustee, Effingham B. Morris, who had some years before presented to the Wistar Institute, in which he was much interested, another farm on which the Institute had established laboratories for raising and studying white rats, opossums, frogs, and other forms of life which are regular subjects of biological study. The two farms are adjacent; the more recent acquisition will be devoted to the study of diseases of wild and domestic animals, rather than of their normal condition. For this purpose the state has recently made somewhat liberal appropriations. It was the joint appeal of these new facilities to the three departments, Medicine, Biology, and Veterinary Medicine, that led to the formation of a new school.

Thus old departments have put forth new branches and some entirely new schools have been established; but the most characteristic form of extension in recent times has been combination between the University and other institutions already existing. These combinations have ranged all the way from mere agreed-upon coöperation to affiliation or actual amalgamation. Coöperation has never been a strong point in Philadelphia. Repeated approaches have been made toward the attainment of unity among her cultural institutions, only to be blocked by her ingrained individualism. There are still in Philadelphia almost a dozen public or endowed libraries, with no unifying bond among them, unless the Community Library planned by the University and housing the Union Catalogue already in existence, should provide that bond. It is the same
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with other literary, scientific, and artistic institutions. Even Provost Pepper with all his persuasiveness had failed in his dream of making West Philadelphia a university city by inducing the scientific institutions for which Philadelphia is famous to settle themselves there and pool their libraries, collections, and activities. After the University had obtained its third extensive grant of land from the city, he said he hoped that such a "liberal and wise policy on the part of the University will make it more and more clearly recognized as the intellectual center of this great community, around which will naturally group themselves the various scientific and literary institutions whose work is an essential part of the comprehensive University scheme." In March 1889 he extended an invitation to the Academy of Natural Sciences, to settle on this University land, but after some consideration the Academy rather brusquely declined, and the plan of concentration was dropped.

Mr. Gates was more successful, though by a different kind of coöperation. By his influence the Academy now offered to University students in the Earth Sciences both elementary and advanced courses in palaeontology and advanced courses in geology and mineralogy. In 1935 an affiliation was established in quite another field. This was with the Pennsylvania School of Social Work. That organization, although remaining a separate corporation with its own location and its own means of support, becomes, so far as its teaching is concerned, a graduate professional school, and certain members of its faculty become members of the Faculty of the University.

The most striking form of coöperation, extending in these cases to actual merger, lies in the medical field. The merger of the Medico-Chirurgical College with the University in 1916, which led, as already mentioned, to the formation of the Graduate School of Medicine in 1919, was followed by the similar unions of the Polyclinic, the Diagnostic, and the Howard hospitals. They became under various conditions parts of the University and are grouped in the great establishment, located in an older part of the city, making up the Graduate Hospital of the University, or, more exactly, the Hospital of the Graduate School of Medicine of the University. The campus long ago
transcended the limits of the old Blockley Farm which our supposititious prophet looking across the river in 1870 might well have imagined would give perpetual limits to even its widest growth. The latest of these mergers has been that of the Orthopaedic Hospital and Infirmary for Nervous Diseases, finally consummated in 1939.

Independent additions to the Medical Department were the series of foundations for research which, following the Pepper Clinical Laboratory, have been distributed through recent years: the Eldridge Reeves Johnson Foundation for Research in Medical Physics, the Edward B. Robinette Foundation for Study and Treatment of Circulatory Diseases, the John Herr Musser Department of Research Medicine.

Since Mr. Gates has become President to these have been added the George S. Fox Endowment for Medical Research, established in 1932, and the George L. and Emily McMichael Harrison Foundation, in 1936. The interesting and impressive record of all this extensive endowment and its work in the field of medicine must be left, as has been remarked in connection with medical research and frequently elsewhere, to that history of the Medical Department of the University still to be written by some competent and devoted hand, and, it is to be hoped, at some early period.

It is a curious coincidence that the latest and in some ways the most attractive gift to the University, the lovely Morris Arboretum, should be the fulfillment of so old, so often undertaken and as often abandoned a plan. The possession of laid-out gardens has been an ambition and a delight of men since Theophrastus inherited that of his master Aristotle, or Kublai walled in his in Xanadu, or still earlier, as Bacon says in his essay on Gardens, "When God first made man he put him in a garden." It was just such a garden that the brother and sister, John D. and Lydia T. Morris, had planted for themselves on their estate "Compton," in Chestnut Hill, through almost half a century, between 1888 and 1932. Its avenues and thickets and groups and single specimens of rare trees and bushes contrasted well with the stretches of our own native Pennsylvania trees in their undisturbed settings and the open stretches of the
160-acre estate. It came to the University in 1932, in a bequest which had resulted from the personal suggestion of President Gates. Implicit in the possession of a garden by an educational institution, and in this case required in the endowment with which the bequest was accompanied (though that proved less than had been hoped) were research, experimentation, publication, the giving of public lectures, and distribution of plants.

The old attempt to establish a "botanic garden" in 1807 and the purchase of a tract intended for that use in Montgomery County, not far from the Arboretum, will be remembered, also its abandonment for lack of support. A second more modest attempt was wrecked by the erection of the new buildings on the Ninth Street site in 1829. Later Dr. George B. Wood, as he founded and endowed the Auxiliary School of Medicine, laid out a garden for rare plants on which scientific studies should be carried on, but this was never turned over to the University. Scarcely had the modern Department of Biology been established and its building erected when in 1888 a quarter of an acre, then a whole acre nearby were set apart and by the efforts of Professor Rothrock redeemed for scientific uses from the wilderness which covered that part of the University's West Philadelphia tract. The plan dragged until Professor Macfarlane, whose name still clings to the botanical hall, obtained the interest of Provost Harrison and was made Director of the Botanic Garden. A few acres around the biology building were systematically planted and a variety of trees and shrubs of interest set out. Plants and seeds were exchanged with public gardens in Edinburgh, St. Petersburg, Dublin, Cambridge, and other European cities.

Professor Macfarlane was fortunate in obtaining for some years the services of a skilled English gardener, Charles Pettiford, who later attracted attention by his planting of the Pilling garden in Germantown. But the University garden led a struggling existence. Botanic gardens are expensive to maintain. Kew and the Arnold Arboretum and a few other famous gardens are the survivors of long lists that have been at one time or another established but are now recorded as "discontinued." So when the Morris Arboretum was bequeathed to the
University and with impressive ceremonies, in the midst of beautiful summer weather, with distinguished speakers from Canada and New England, and general festivity handed over on June 2, 1933, to the oversight of the professors of botany in the University, they were given not only an attractive academic home and an interesting task but the fulfillment of an old academic dream.

The writer of history has to select his materials. If what he writes is to be a story, as the etymology of the word seems to indicate, he must include only those things he can work into his narrative. This chronicle, as it is being now brought to its close, has omitted many things that have bulked large in the interest of University men and, in these latter days, women. Athletics have of course asserted themselves in the narrative momentarily now and again. But nothing has been said about the dramatic societies existing at the University, temporarily or for longer periods, from the Thespians of 1867 or the Garrick Club of the nineties or the Mask and Wig Club, which has enlivened the University and the community by its annual plays since its foundation in 1888, or those who have given the French and German plays, or the creators of the shows given by the Architects and the Engineers—down to the highly organized and semi-official Pennsylvania Players of the last five years. Their history has been a long and obscure series of events, difficult to trace and incapable of being worked into this general narrative.

It is the same with another phase of college life, undergraduate journalism. Some forty periodical publications have been started on their more or less extended career: some humorous, like Chaff and the Punch Bowl; others informative and professional, like the Medical and Dental and Law reviews, or the Wharton News, or the Lantern; others literary, like the Junto and the Red and Blue; still others mixed of news and literature, like Philo's University Magazine (the mention of whose name still brings editorial worries to the mind of this writer) which in order to provide more news was duly handed over to its successor, the Pennsylvanian, in 1885. The history of these ventures would be the record of an interesting part of Uni-
versity life, but it would be only in a very disjointed narrative that it could be combined with the history of dramatics.

The history of music at Pennsylvania has been neglected, at least since colonial times. The many years in which it was represented solely by the Glee Club, the formation in the eighties of the first University orchestra, the union of all the existing musical societies in 1898 into the Combined Musical Clubs, the recent extension and transformation of the students' musical interests and achievements under the guidance of the Faculty of the School of Fine Arts, would make an interesting chronicle if it could be combined with these other forms of University life. Nor will any mention be found here of the introduction of the honor societies that base their membership on scholarship alone, though the earliest and best known of them, Phi Beta Kappa, the Delta chapter of which was established at Pennsylvania in 1892, and Sigma Xi, the corresponding scientific society established in 1899, might well have been included, just as were "Philo" and "Zelo" as literary societies. But after these came, in a long line, some twenty such open societies, representing special departments or special intellectual interests, or, like Sphinx, Friars, and Phi Kappa Beta, choosing their members at large from those about to graduate or to pass on to the next year.

The secret Greek-letter societies have been omitted with regret. Certainly they have played a large part in the lives and interests of a great number of students. They appeared early, one in 1849, two in 1850, and one in 1854, and were looked upon with jealousy by the old literary societies. Then, after twenty-five years, four more appeared, soon after the University moved to West Philadelphia. From 1890 onward during the next thirty years, a new fraternity appeared almost every year; in 1908 and again in 1912, there were three established in each of those years. The dates of these foundations, the relationships of the fraternities to one another, the satisfaction they have been to their members and advantage to the University, the appearance of the first fraternity house, Psi Upsilon, on the campus, and the gradual capture of eligible sites in the vicinity of the University by a score of fraternities since, their use for
housing the Students' Army Training Corps during the World War, the growth and then the elimination of abuses by an Interfraternity Agreement in 1926; all these facts and considerations have been carefully collected by Dr. A. H. Quinn for this book, but an attempt to weave them into the general story, each in its proper place, has proved hopeless and has been abandoned.

The religious interests of students at Pennsylvania have been the object of more experiment than at most institutions, because of its traditional freedom from denominational bias. An interesting record might be made of the "varieties of religious experience," to use Mr. James's expression, of its students during two hundred years. Has there ever been in the colonial College or the later University a group of devotees corresponding to the "Holy Club" of Oxford in the eighteenth century, or the Anglo-Catholics of the nineteenth, or the Oxford group of the twentieth? The Christian Association has in its possession the minute book of a group calling themselves The Christian Society of the University of Pennsylvania, giving a record of their proceedings in the years 1857, 1858, and 1859, with a list of their fifty-six members. The Young Men's Christian Association was introduced at the University in 1892 and along with its other activities began the collection of funds that led eventually to the erection of the noble building that was completed and dedicated in 1922. Observers of the progress of events at the University during recent decades will have noticed the appointment of representatives of the various denominations to work with their own students, the religious work of the Young Men's Christian Association and, under the present administration and with the special interest of Mr. and Mrs. Gates, the admirable work being done by the official Chaplain of the University, Rev. W. Brooke Stabler.

This list of neglected subjects is given to indicate some of the matter which should have been included in the foregoing account if it were to be a picture of the life of the University during its two hundred years. But this is a history, not a picture; an attempt to trace the development of an organism—to watch the unfolding of a plot—to follow the course of a stream.
As one observes the course of events it becomes abundantly evident that the most marked characteristic of recent times has been the constantly increasing service of the University to the community. So one comes to think of the history of the University as not so much a drama, but rather a "theme with variations." The variations have been numerous, the theme was long ago announced by Franklin in the Proposals: that the students would by their studies attain "Benignity of Mind . . . consisting in an Inclination joined with an Ability to serve Mankind, one's Country, Friends and Family; which Ability is (with the blessing of God) to be acquired or greatly increased by true Learning, and should indeed be the great Aim and End of all Learning."

THE END