

BROWN ALUMNI MONTHLY

★ 1915 - 1916 ★

VOL. XVI

OCTOBER, 1915

NO. 3

BROWN ALUMNI MONTHLY



TWO REPORTS ON THE QUESTION OF CHARTER
AMENDMENT — COLLEGE YEAR OPENS WITH THE
LARGEST FRESHMAN CLASS ON RECORD — TOTAL
REGISTRATION WILL EXCEED ONE THOUSAND —
NEWS AND NOTES OF BRUNONIANS FAR AND NEAR

BROWN ALUMNI MAGAZINE COMPANY

BROWN UNIVERSITY, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

TEN CENTS A COPY

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR

Industrial Trust Company

Largest Bank in Rhode Island

49 Westminster Street,

Providence, R. I.

CAPITAL

\$3,000,000

SURPLUS

\$3,000,000

Branches in Pawtucket, Newport, Woonsocket, Bristol, Wickford, Pascoag, Westerly and Warren

BANKING DEPARTMENT—Interest paid on deposits. Issues Certificates of Deposit at attractive rates. Loans and discounts. Collections made on all points on favorable terms.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE DEPARTMENT—Foreign Drafts and Letters of Credit available in all parts of the World. Cable Transfers

TRUST DEPARTMENT—Authorized to accept Trusts. Is a legal depository for trust funds. Acts as Trustee, Executor, Administrator, Guardian and as Registrar and Transfer Agent of Corporations.



Fifty Horse Power

SEVEN PASSENGER SIX \$1050

Where in the world
is its equal?

Four-Cylinder Models and Prices

Touring Car, 7-passenger	\$885
Roadster, 3-passenger	850
Landau-Roadster, 3-passenger	1185

Six-Cylinder Models and Prices

Touring Car, 7-passenger	\$1050
Roadster, 3-passenger	1000
Landau-Roadster, 3-passenger	1350
Coupe, 4-passenger	1550
Limoisine, 7-passenger	2250

F. O. B. Detroit

The price of this new Studebaker SIX has been reduced from \$1450 to \$1050—a reduction of \$400. Yet it has been INCREASED in power, size and quality.

It is the ONLY 7-passenger, 6-cylinder car with a FIFTY horse power, 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch bore x 5-inch stroke motor that has ever been offered in America or Europe for less than \$1450.

Write at once for 1916 catalog—and see the car at your local Dealer's.

STUDEBAKER

South Bend, Ind.

Walkerville, Ont.

Detroit, Mich.

Address all correspondence to Detroit

ESTABLISHED 1825

Mechanics National Bank

Cor. Dorrance St. and Exchange Place

Interest paid on deposits subject to check

Certificates of Deposit issued

Our Savings Department is convenient

New accounts respectfully solicited

CHARLES C. HARRINGTON, President

ROWLAND G. HAZARD, Vice-President

H. EDWARD THURSTON, Cashier

EDWARD A. HAVENS, Assistant Cashier

Blackstone Canal National Bank

20 Market Square

Capital Stock \$500,000

Surplus and
Undivided Profits \$480,000

FRANK W. MATTESON, President

HERBERT F. HINCKLEY, Vice-President

ALBERT R. PLANT, Cashier

CHARLES P. BROWN, Assistant Cashier

Directors

Herbert F. Hinckley

Frank W. Matteson

Daniel Beckwith

Edwin M. Dodd

C. Moulton Stone

Charles H. Merriman, Jr.

Frank O. Field

William L. Hodgman

John B. Branch

The Merchants National Bank

Providence, R. I.
20 Westminster Street

o

Capital, - - - \$1,000,000

Surplus and Undivided
Profits, - - - \$1,000,000

o

ROBERT W. TAFT, President

MOSES J. BARBER, Cashier

FRANK A. GREENE, Asst. Cashier.

Directors

Frank E. Richmond

Samuel R. Dorrance

Edward D. Pearce

George M. Smith

Lucian Sharpe

Robert W. Taft

Herbert J. Wells

Charles H. Newell

William B. McBee

Rowland Hazard

Horatio N. Campbell

Interest allowed on Current Accounts

The National Bank of Commerce

Of Providence

Turks Head Building

Strictly a Commercial Bank

Foreign Exchange

Certificates of Deposit

Capital and Surplus, - \$1,500,000

C. PRESCOTT KNIGHT, President

DUTEE WILCOX, Vice-President

HENRY L. WILCOX, Cashier

EDW. B. FESSENDEN, Asst. Cashier

Established 1851

Westminster Bank

73 Westminster Street
Providence

ARNOLD B. CHACE, President
GEO. A. JEPHERSON, Vice-President
WILLIAM C. ANGELL, Cashier
BENJAMIN B. MANCHESTER, Ass't Cashier

Accounts Solicited

We offer to depositors every
facility which their balances,
business and responsibility war-
rant

Providence Banking Company

Turks Head Building
Providence, R. I.

Local
Stocks, Bonds and High Grade
Investment Securities

Orders executed on the New York and
Boston Stock Exchange. Foreign Ex-
change bought and sold. Letters of
Credit furnished for travelers.

National Exchange Bank

63 Westminster Street
Providence, R. I.

INCORPORATED 1801

Capital	-	-	-	\$500,000
Surplus	-	-	-	\$750,000

Interest paid on deposits
Certificates of deposit issued
Travelers' Cheques for sale
New business invited

Sole Providence Agents

For these Unique Exclusive Goods

"MARK CROSS" English Gloves and Leather Goods.

"GOTHAM" Gold Stripe Silk Hose with patent no run feature.

"LIBERTY" of London Art, Silk and Furnishing Novelties.

"CAMBRIDGE" Hand Woven Decorative Rugs made by the blind.

"EASTWOOD" Play Shoes for Children.

"HOME-MADE" Undermuslins made in clean, sanitary shops.

"PAGE & SHAW" Chocolates and Bon Bons.

"GOSSARD" Lace Front, "USONA" Custom-finished and "LOUISE" Economy Corset.

"GROUND GRIPPER" Foot Strengthening Shoes for Men and Women.

"LADIES' HOME JOURNAL" Patterns, Style Book and Embroidery Book. "GOOD DRESSING" Free.

Gladding's

Dartmouth College Summer Session

Six Weeks, July 6--August 15

Exceptional opportunities this year for the study of *English Literature and Recent Continental Drama, Economics, Chemistry and Mathematics.*

Special features include Folk and Aesthetic Dancing, Fine Arts, Music and the Festival.

Dartmouth is located near the White Mountain region, and offers unmatched opportunities for outdoor recreation.

For copies of the Bulletin, address

DR. H. W. LAWRENCE, JR.,

Associate Director,

7 Dartmouth Hall, Hanover, N. H.

What Cheer Printing Company

Printers and Publishers

*The Only POSTER PRINTING
Plant in Providence*

98 Pine Street, corner Eddy

Telephone 1663 Union

French Laundry Soap

Has Been the Standard for
Forty Years

Soapine

washes everything neat and clean. It washes clothes without injury to the fabric. For house cleaning and washing dishes it is unsurpassed. For Jewelers' use it has no equal.

Providence

Kendall Mfg. Co.

Rhode Island

Why you should take the Brown Alumni Monthly

The price to alumni is only one dollar per annum—less than the cost.

It keeps you informed of what is happening at Brown and also what is going to happen.

It tells you what your classmates and friends are doing ; and chronicles the births, deaths and marriages among them.

It gives you full reports on current sports and statistics of past athletic events.

It publishes many interesting articles by alumni and wants one from you.

It reaches about 2400 of the alumni, a larger proportion probably than any other college magazine.

It helps the University and the President in many ways—if you don't believe it, ask the President.

A dollar is not much ; put it into a copy of the Monthly; it will make you happy for a year.

We want your interest and your money—we can't get along without it.

Please enclose a one-dollar bill with your full address to the

BROWN ALUMNI MONTHLY

BROWN UNIVERSITY

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

BROWN ALUMNI MONTHLY

VOL. XVI

PROVIDENCE, R. I., OCTOBER, 1915

No. 3

ARNOLD BIOLOGICAL LABORATORY



New College Building Opened for Work at Corner of Waterman and Thayer streets

SONS OF BROWN MEN ENTER BROWN

Three sons of members of the Brown University Corporation have entered Brown this autumn. Of the forty-five living members of the present Corporation, eighteen have had sons in Brown, one student coming from St. Louis and one from Colorado.

Among the Faculty Professor Appleton is at the head, having educated three sons and three daughters at Brown. Since the Faculty is a younger group than the Corporation, most of the children in the Faculty circle are under college age. Yet eight of the present members of the Faculty have had children who entered Brown. The son of President Faunce and the son of Dean Randall are members of the class of 1919.

The class of 1880 is represented in the second generation by four members of the present Freshman class.

As the Monthly goes to press 260 men and 60 women are registered in the Freshman class. The total University registration will be well over 1000, and probably the largest on record.

THIRD REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE CORPORATION OF BROWN UNIVERSITY TO CONSIDER CHANGES IN THE CHAR- TER OF THE UNIVERSITY

(Adopted by the Corporation, June, 1915)

To the Trustees and Fellows of Brown University:

In obedience to your instructions, the Committee appointed to consider the subject of changes in the University Charter begs leave to present its final recommendations on the advisability of attempting to amend the Charter at this time.

Your Committee presented to the Corporation a preliminary report in 1909. This report was made before the Committee had completed its investigations and consideration of the subject and was confined to the inquiry as to whether change in the Charter is in itself desirable. The Committee unanimously affirmed its belief that "the purpose of the founders in the light of present conditions would be best fulfilled by the removal of specific denominational requirements from the Charter." The report did not unqualifiedly declare in favor of amendment. It made "harmonious action to this end, with due consideration of all interests affected," the conditions of such action. The report states that the Committee is "not as yet prepared to recommend that action be taken to this end by the Corporation," and concludes with these words:—"The change involves so many considerations of justice and courtesy, of moral and legal obligations, of regard for our Baptist constituency and for the general public as to demand an unusual degree of deliberation in procedure and careful consultation of all interests, educational and religious, which are immediately or remotely involved. . . . It is highly desirable that all interests work in harmony to the same end. Hasty and

ill-considered action and disregard of the opinions and feelings of alumni and friends can only work disaster."

The Committee presented a second report, called its "Final Report," in 1910. With this report the Committee presented to the Corporation an opinion of its sub-committee appointed to examine and report upon the legal questions involved including the power of the General Assembly to amend the Charter with the consent of the Corporation. This law committee was composed of Messrs. Hughes, Colby and Edwards. After long and thorough examination of the judicial precedents, the law committee unanimously rendered a carefully reasoned opinion which was submitted to this Corporation and sent to the alumni.

The conclusion of the law committee on this question runs as follows:—"It was the declared purpose of the incorporators to found an institution for the education of youth, and they provided that the qualifications of Trustees and Fellows should be such as to insure the continued administration of the charity under Christian auspices. If the founders endowed the College, there was an implied contract between them and the Corporation that the endowment should so long as possible be devoted to the purposes for which the Corporation was created, and that it should be administered by a trustee constituted as provided by the Charter. The benefactors of the College since its foundation are to be presumed to have made their donations for the same purposes and upon the same implied contract. As said by Chief Justice Marshall in the Dartmouth College case,—

"The founders of the College contracted, not merely for the perpetual application of the funds which they gave to the objects for which those funds were given; they contracted also, to secure that application by the constitution of the Corporation. They contracted for a system, which should, as far as human foresight can provide, retain forever the government of the literary institution they had formed, in the hands of persons approved by themselves."

"It would be difficult to use words which would impose a perpetual injunction against any but inevitable change if the words of the Charter are not to be so construed. This language is so positive, and the denominational qualifications of the Trustees and Fellows are so essential a part of the constitution of the corporate trustee, that it is probable that the proposed amendments would be held by a court of equity to be substantial."

"It is, however, manifestly impossible to forecast with certainty the decision of the court, and it may be that the court, applying a less rigid test, might find that the changes would better carry out the purposes of the founders in providing a liberal education for youth under modern conditions, and would be of such great benefit to the University, and of such minor importance in the donors' scheme of beneficence, that they should be sustained by its decree."

We have stated the conclusion of the law committee in order that the Corporation may have full knowledge of the serious and probably insurmountable legal obstacles which may be incurred in an attempt to amend. Further reflection has only confirmed and strengthened the conviction of the members of the law committee whose names are signed to this report that amendment, if opposed by a proper party in interest, is beyond the power of the General Assembly and the Corporation.

Your Committee was not able to agree unanimously on its report of 1910. Six

of the nine members of the Committee united in a report reaffirming their belief expressed in the earlier report that amendment is "desirable," but at the same time declared that "none of the Committee would advise immediate action." Three members of the Committee presented separate statements setting forth the reasons why they were unable to concur in the report.

To remove all misunderstanding by showing that the change was thought desirable on educational grounds and not principally for financial reasons, seven of the Committee joined in a recommendation, to which there was no dissent, that the Corporation consider the advisability of securing an addition to the common fund sufficient to provide adequate pensions for members of the Faculty.

Through the generous gifts of alumni and friends this provision for pensions has now been made, and the University has its own independent pension system, and one reason for immediate change is thus removed.

Five years have passed since the last report of your Committee was presented. During that time an arrangement has been effected between the Corporation and the alumni whereby the alumni may nominate a certain proportion of all candidates for election to the Trustees. This settles to the satisfaction of all parties a long standing controversy and gives the Corporation the benefit of the counsel of the alumni in this matter. This arrangement makes unnecessary the second amendment proposed in 1910, for securing from the General Assembly a grant of power to the Corporation to delegate to the alumni body the election of a certain number of the Trustees.

At the time of making its report in 1910 your Committee had completed its examination of the question involved in amendment. Nevertheless, the information before the Committee at that time necessary to an intelligent decision as to the advisability of amendment was less

complete than it is to-day. There has been time for the opinion of all interested parties to crystallize and for that opinion to some extent to find expression. The lapse of time has also enabled your Committee to weigh more carefully the probable effect of the proposed amendment, if made now, upon the welfare and progress of the University—to measure more accurately the probable losses and gains likely to result from the change.

The opinion expressed in the reports of 1909 and 1910 respecting the removal of denominational requirements from the Charter as desirable was predicated upon the express condition that the necessary amendment could be secured with the harmonious action of all interests concerned. It was apparent in 1910 that there was not substantial unanimity as to the wisdom of the proposed amendment. The members of your Committee were not in accord and some of them presented to the Corporation their reasons for dissent. Many members of the corporate boards have expressed their opinion on the subject and it is apparent that there are wide differences of opinion among them. Many alumni, non-Baptist as well as Baptist, loyal and devoted in their support of the University, protest against any action to surrender any part of our ancient franchises now firmly secured to us by constitutional guarantees. Several influential bodies whose relation to the Baptist denomination and to the University entitles them to speak have passed resolutions of strong condemnation against the proposition to seek amendment. One representative body has gone so far as to appoint a committee of Brown alumni to contest in the courts the validity of any amendment which may be enacted. This may be assumed as a forerunner of a general and far reaching opposition in the Baptist denomination in case a movement for amendment should be inaugurated by the Corporation.

Those who oppose amendment urge

weighty reasons for their position. Their objection is well stated in the legal opinion and in the opinion in the Dartmouth College case as follows:— "The Corporation is a trustee, whose duty it is to administer the funds of the Corporation for the uses indicated by the Charter. .

. . . Not only the contributions made upon the organization of the Corporation, but all subsequent donations, must be conceived to be made in trust for the purposes expressed in the Charter. In other words, the provisions of the Charter are impliedly incorporated into each instrument of gift as the terms of the trust upon which the property is to be held." In the words of Chief Justice Marshall in the Dartmouth College case,— "They (the founders of the College) contracted for a system which should, as far as human foresight can provide, retain forever the government of the literary institution they had formed, in the hands of persons approved by themselves." And again,— "These changes (in the Dartmouth College Charter) may be important for the advantage of this College in particular, and may be for the advantage of literature in general, but they are not according to the will of the donors and are subversive of that contract on the faith of which their property was given."

The opponents of amendment press the objection that change cannot be assented to by the Corporation without violation of the trust committed to the Corporation by the founders of the University. If the question of fidelity to a trust is raised, it must be expected that a legal contest will be attended with bitter feeling, and, whatever the decision of the courts, is likely to result in serious loss of support for the University.

This want of agreement on the part of the friends and alumni of the University and the opinion of the law committee that a court of equity will hold that change is not made necessary because of change of circumstances, and that an amendment removing the present denom-

inational qualifications of Trustees and Fellows would be unconstitutional and void are in the opinion of your Committee controlling reasons against change at the present time.

This conclusion of your Committee is not in conflict with the opinion expressed in the former reports, as these presupposed harmonious action by all interests concerned. Your Committee is satisfied that such action cannot be secured at the present time. It does not follow that because a change in itself is desirable, a present effort to effect that change should be made. It may be admitted that a University founded in Rhode Island today, with the present Trustees and Fellows as incorporators, would seek another form of Charter,—a charter free from denominational requirements in its governing boards and Faculty. This, however, does not help us in determining what is the present duty of this Corporation. The initial question before us is, can this Corporation in good faith carry out under the conditions existing to-day the purpose and intent of the Charter? Notwithstanding difficulties set forth in the former reports, we are compelled to the conclusion that it is possible to give practical effect to the spirit and intent of the Charter in the selection of members of the Corporation and Faculty.

It is for the Corporation to decide under these conditions what course is wisest and best and most likely to safeguard the welfare of our University. The question is not whether the members of this Corporation can devise a better scheme of corporate organization, or whether they can establish a more liberal and catholic institution, or whether they can by amendment promote the cause of learning. It may be that under a reformed Charter, the University would be freed from public misunderstanding, or might enlarge the circle of benefactors and enjoy greater prosperity, or might call to its administration men of more commanding ability and influence.

The question to be decided is this:— Shall the Corporation under existing circumstances apply to the General Assembly for an amendment to its Charter removing all denominational restrictions as qualifications for members of the Corporation and the Faculty? The problem is what course of action will really best conserve and promote the interests of the University.

The University is now in as prosperous a condition as at any time in its history. Its future is full of promise. Its friends and alumni are working harmoniously to promote its welfare. Pensions have been provided for the Faculty, and the contributions to the Loyalty Fund give promise that means may in the near future be available for providing much needed increase of salaries for our teachers. The number of students, greater than ever before, bears witness to the efficient and active interest of the friends of the University in its behalf.

Under these conditions is it wise to seek amendment of our ancient Charter? This course will launch the University upon a heated controversy. The friends and alumni of the University to-day working together for its welfare will inevitably be divided into hostile camps. Until the issue is finally decided, contributions to the University funds may fall off and the University suffer thereby. The work of the institution cannot be prosecuted successfully under such conditions. So far as we can foresee we are sure to enter upon a long period of litigation with its uncertainty and expense. If the opinion of the law committee is well grounded in law, defeat would await the institution at the end of the legal contest. Whatever the result, however, there is danger that an important part of the University's constituency may be alienated and the resources of the University impaired. Whether such losses may be counter-balanced by compensating gains is wholly a matter of conjecture.

As guardian of an ancient trust the Corporation should weigh well the

chances of success and the results of failure before committing the University to the policy of seeking to change its constitution. It is our bounden duty to safeguard the welfare of the institution and to surrender its ancient franchises only when we are certain to make substantial gain by so doing. The Charter is peculiar in that the franchises and privileges granted to the Corporation are safe against change by the State, being secured by constitutional guarantees which are not open to attack. It is a venerable instrument framed in a generation which had a genius for the construction of declarations of independence, great charters and constitutions defining personal liberty and corporate rights and privileges, and is a masterpiece of clear, concise legal composition. Its provisions are singularly free from ambiguity and inconsistency. For one hundred and fifty years it has never required judicial construction, and it is to-day as capable of interpretation as in the eighteenth century.

Your Committee, profoundly conscious of its responsibility, cannot recommend at this time an attempt to secure the proposed amendment with all that is thereby implied. It cannot recommend such action as it believes would lay the Corporation open to a charge of

infidelity to a trust in the mind of even a minority of its friends.

The question then arises,—Have we placed a permanent bar in the way of amendment of the constitution of the University? Our answer is,—Not at all. We have only decided the question of change under present conditions. Changes are inevitable in the course of time. Denominations are not stationary or perpetual. Should it become impracticable to secure Trustees under the provisions of the Charter a court of equity will decree what changes must be made, and such changes as are found desirable may be sought through legislation whenever substantial harmony is reached among the interests concerned. To wait patiently and to work for such a result, while giving careful protection to the interests of the University, is for the present the part of wisdom. Meanwhile the University will not suffer under a Charter under which it has prospered for one hundred and fifty years and which in general has been found so well adapted to the ever varying conditions of life and thought.

In conclusion, therefore, your Committee for the reasons above stated recommends that no action be taken at the present time looking to amendment of the Charter.

SABBATICAL YEARS

Two Brown professors will be absent on their Sabbatic year during the academic year 1915-16: Professor Everett of the Department of Philosophy and Professor Walter C. Bronson of the Department of English. Since no American professor can plan to spend next year in Europe, Professors Everett and Bronson will spend their time in the West and the South. Professor Everett may be, during a large part of the winter, on the Pacific Coast, while Professor Bronson is planning a trip through the Southern States, that he may study at first hand the development of American liter-

ature in the South. Brown alumni in the Southern States or the Far West will eagerly welcome their old teachers, and can ascertain just where these professors will be by personal correspondence. It is desirable that alumni meetings should be arranged in some sections where they are rarely held.

President Faunce will speak in St. Louis before the New England Society on Forefathers' Day, December 21. During the previous ten days he will be visiting Brown alumni in Kentucky, Missouri and Colorado.

REPORT OF ARNOLD BUFFUM CHACE AND EVERETT COLBY, A MINORITY OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE CORPORATION OF BROWN UNIVERSITY TO CONSIDER CHANGES IN THE CHARTER OF THE UNIVERSITY

To the Corporation of Brown University:

The undersigned members of the Committee on Charter Revision appointed by the Corporation on the 18th of June, 1908, being unable to agree in the final recommendations made by the majority of the Committee, beg leave, with much reluctance, to submit the following minority report. In so doing we wish to express our regret that we should find ourselves in disagreement with the majority of the Committee, for whose opinions we have the most sincere and profound respect, and with whom we have worked for many months in perfect harmony and accord. In fact, the meetings and conferences of your Committee have been so agreeable to the spirit of toleration in the Charter of the College, that in the midst of disagreement and sharp dispute there has sprung up a bond of sympathy and friendship that will be cherished, at least by the minority members of the Committee, for many years to come.

Let us first set down the record of our proceedings. The resolution, in pursuance of which the Committee was appointed, was as follows:

"Voted unanimously, — recognizing that in recent years there has been prominently before the Alumni of Brown a suggestion of changes in certain provisions of the Charter of the University, — to appoint a Committee of Nine to carefully consider this whole subject and to report to the Corporation their conclusions and advice whenever ready to do so, such Committee to consist of the President and Chancellor and seven other members of the Corporation appointed by the President and Chancellor acting jointly."

On June 18th, 1908, the Chancellor announced the following Committee:

Hon. Henry Kirke Porter, Mr. R. H. I. Goddard, Rev. Geo. E. Horr, D. D., Mr. Stephen O. Edwards, Hon. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. Arnold B. Chace, Mr. Everett Colby, Rev. W. H. P. Faunce, D. D., Rev. Thomas S. Barbour.

In June, 1909, the Committee made a preliminary report in which the opinion was unanimously expressed that it was desirable to amend the Charter, striking therefrom the denominational requirements for membership in the Corporation, but no positive recommendations were submitted. The Committee presented the following reasons for changing the Charter:—We quote from the Committee's report—

First: Because "the Committee believes that the purposes of the founders in the light of present conditions would be best fulfilled by the removal of specific denominational requirements from the Charter and that harmonious action to this end, with due consideration of all interests affected, would greatly promote the welfare of the University."

Second: Because "a change in the letter of the Charter is necessary to preserve its spirit and intention."

Third: Because "the (Charter) intended to produce and nourish a 'liberal and catholic institution' now, if interpreted literally, surrounds the Corporation and Faculty with restrictions which are antiquated and out of harmony with the spirit of the present age and the desire of the founders."

Fourth: Because the Corporation "in the endeavor to preserve in the University the liberal spirit of the founders"

has "strained the letter of the Charter as far as conscience will permit and can go no further, yet the difficulty of literal adherence to the venerable document increases with every decade as religious conditions change."

Fifth: Because eligibility for membership in the Corporation "cannot be determined without an investigation from which all of us shrink and the results of which might lead different men to different conclusions."

Sixth: Because these investigations "plunge us into a kind of casuistry which was never anticipated by the founders and which is unwholesome for their descendants."

Seventh: Because "even under the most liberal construction of our Charter, the provisions which exclude from our governing Board the great majority of Christian men in America seem strangely at variance with the original design of the founders and the liberal and catholic spirit which they possessed."

Eighth: Because "by assuring our birthright more clearly, and adhering more closely to the purpose and spirit of the founders of the University, we should be sacrificing no principle and should be gaining much for the men who make the University. We should be merely throwing aside fetters that impede us, avoiding misconstructions that pain us and making clear to the world the real temper and spirit of the University."

Such were the unanimous findings of the Committee in 1909.

In 1910 a majority of the Committee filed with the Corporation its final report; three members dissenting. In this report the majority again expressed its belief that the changes in the Charter were desirable, and for the following reasons: We quote from the Committee's report—

First: Because "the Charter of Brown University is so far antiquated that literal compliance with its provisions now conflicts with its spirit and purpose."

Second: Because "the University has grown up in the City of Roger Williams, has nourished freedom of thought in all its graduates and yet its Charter penalizes such freedom. The University excludes a large number of its own sons from sharing in its government."

Third: Because "the questions of casuistry to which reference was made in the preliminary report have grown more obvious and exigent during the past twelve months."

Fourth: Because "actual insistence on the letter of the Charter in the year 1910 is out of the question since the document does not fit present conditions and includes provisions now so obscure as to be unintelligible. In spirit and ideal our Charter is one of the most liberal; in letter it hampers those who do not construe it in a sense different from the original meaning. But *candor and integrity* are the first essentials in Christian education. A relation between College and Church which it is *impossible literally* to carry out and which must inevitably lead to violent construction or tacit evasions is surely not a desirable relation."

The above were the findings of a majority of your Committee composed of the following members: Arnold B. Chace, R. H. I. Goddard, Charles E. Hughes, Stephen O. Edwards, the President, William H. P. Faunce, and Everett Colby.

Attached to the report of the Committee was a bill containing the amendments and a declaration which read in part as follows: "Our desire is to gain release from those provisions of the Charter which have become antiquated and difficult of strict fulfillment."

Nothing further was done until June, 1914. In the mean time the pension fund was raised and interest in the question, so far as the Corporation was concerned, seemed to wane, but not so with the Alumni, who demanded that some positive action be taken. Thereupon the Corporation at its meeting in June,

1914, voted that the report of the Committee on Charter Revision, submitted at the meeting of the Corporation in 1910, be taken from the table and referred back to the Committee with instructions to make a final report at the meeting of the Corporation in June, 1915.

In response to this resolution we again took the question under consideration and every member of the Committee has made an earnest and faithful effort to determine to the satisfaction of his own conscience what the will of the founders would be in this eventful decision.

While, as a result of this further consideration, the majority members of your Committee have come to the conclusion that no action should be taken at the present time looking to amendment of the Charter, the minority members of the Committee still believe that in order to preserve the will and spirit of the founders we should not only reaffirm the unanimous opinion of the Committee in 1909 and the majority opinion in 1910, that the change in the Charter is desirable, but should add thereto the recommendation that the Corporation take action to this end with determination and vigor and with such expedition as counsel may advise.

In order that any possible doubt may be removed as to our motive for recommending that all denominational restrictions be eliminated from the Charter, we cannot emphasize too strongly the fact *that the question of securing money for the College or pensions for the Faculty is not involved.* If there is still any doubt on this point it should be dispelled by the fact that the fund of one million dollars raised in 1912 from which we might pay much needed and well merited pensions to the retiring members of our Faculty is now in operation. *So far as your Committee knows, the College does not stand to gain one dollar by any change that may be made in the Charter,* and we are glad this is so, as it makes it possible, from now on, to dis-

cuss the question free from any misunderstanding on this point, and with but one end in view,—that of determining what the founders would have us do in this crisis in the history of the College.

We would also have it understood that the minority do not deny in the controversy the existence of a moral issue. In fact, the minority of the Committee go further than the majority and say that there is nothing but moral issue involved. . . .

There seems to be a feeling on the part of the majority of the Committee that we should not move the case in the Legislature because of the fact that the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States appear to stand against amendments to College Charters such as we propose. This was not the opinion of the Committee on Revision in 1910, nor was it the opinion of the Law Committee, of which both Justice Hughes and Mr. Edwards were members, nor was it the opinion of Mr. Olney, one of Brown's most distinguished sons. In 1910, Mr. Edwards, who wrote both the report of the Law Committee and the report of the majority of the Committee on Revision, said, "The Law Committee have frankly set forth the legal difficulties, and they cannot be denied or evaded. But the Law Committee itself urged the entire Committee on Revision not to remit its effort until a judicial determination of the question has been obtained from the courts. No lawyers regard themselves as competent to render a final decision in such a matter. They can only express their opinion and then urge us to seek the opinion of the proper tribunal. The lawyers who have advised your Committee are particularly averse to having their judgment taken in place of a judicial decision. Your Committee as a whole is averse to expressing any opinion on the legality of the proposed change. Your Committee is further averse to having the Corporation as a whole decide what can be legally done. No decision short of a

decision by the courts can make our pathway plain." In 1909, Justice Hughes expressed himself as follows (I quote from a letter of May 21st): "The fundamental question is whether the change should be made; and from such consideration as I have been able to give the matter, I think that it should be made. It seems to me that the change will bring the letter into closer correspondence with the spirit of the Charter under existing conditions, and that it can be sought in entire good faith. If the Corporation believe that the change should be made, then the proper course would seem to be to attempt to secure the needed legislation and to support it against attack, if attack be made. At the worst we shall be remitted to present conditions. I do not think the legal question should deter us. Either the change is desirable or it is not; if it is not desirable, we do not want it in any event; and if it is desirable we should do all we can to procure it."

Furthermore Mr. Richard Olney, than whom no better authority can be found, advised that while the amendment might not be sustained by the courts, the attempt should be made. So the minority of your Committee feel that it is not for us to decide what the courts will or will not do. If the law of the land makes it necessary for a great institution of learning to sacrifice the spirit for the letter of its Charter, then the law of the land should be changed. . . .

Let us now consider the question before us.

Shall the Corporation of Brown University petition the Legislature of Rhode Island to amend its Charter so that no denominational or sectarian qualifications shall be required to make any person eligible to the office of trustee, fellow, president, professor, tutor or other officer, and that the Corporation may have power to delegate the election of some portion of the trustees to the Alumni?

To this question the minority of your

Committee answer in the affirmative, having been brought to this conclusion,—

First: By an examination of the context of the Charter.

Second: By an examination of the historical foundations of the College.

Third: By the interpretation placed upon the Charter by the founders themselves and by the Presidents elected to administer the University under its provisions.

The sections of the Charter bearing on the point at issue are arranged for the sake of convenience in two groups under the heads "A" and "B".

FIRST GROUP—"A"

1. "WHEREAS, Institutions for liberal Education are highly beneficial to Society by forming the rising Generation to Virtue, Knowledge and useful Literature, and thus preserving in the Community a Succession of Men duly qualified for discharging the Office of Life with Usefulness and Reputation; they have therefore justly merited and received the Attention and Encouragement of every wise and well regulated State; And whereas a Public School or Seminary, erected for that purpose within this Colony to which the Youth may freely resort for Education in the vernacular and learned Languages, and in the liberal Arts and Sciences, would be for the general Advantage and Honor of the Government. . . ."

2. " . . . It is hereby Enacted and Declared That into this liberal and catholic Institution shall never be admitted any religious Tests; but on the contrary, all the Members hereof shall forever enjoy full, free, absolute and uninterrupted Liberty of Conscience; And that the Places of Professors, Tutors and all other Officers, the President alone excepted, shall be free and open for all Denominations of Protestants; And that Youth of all religious Denominations shall and may be freely admitted to the equal Advantages, Emoluments and Honors of the College or

University: And shall receive a like, fair generous and equal Treatment during their Residence therein, they conducting themselves peaceably, and conforming to the Laws and Statutes thereof . . ."

3. "That Sectarian Differences of Opinions shall not make any Part of the public and classical Instruction . . ."

SECOND GROUP—"B"

1. "AND FURTHERMORE, By the Authority aforesaid, It is hereby Enacted, Ordained and Declared, That it is now, and at all Times hereafter shall continue to be the unalterable Constitution of this College, or University, that the Corporation thereof shall consist of Two Branches, to wit: That of the Trustees and that of the Fellowship, with distinct, separate and respective powers; And that the Number of the Trustees shall, and may be Thirty-six; of which Twenty-two shall forever be elected of the Denomination called Baptists, or Antipaedobaptists; Five shall forever be elected of the Denomination called Friends, or Quakers; Four shall forever be elected of the Denomination called Congregationalists, and Five shall forever be elected of the Denomination called Episcopalians: And that the Succession in this Branch shall be forever chosen and filled up from the respective Denominations in this Proportion, and according to these Numbers; which are hereby fixed, and shall remain to Perpetuity immutably the same . . ."

2. "And that the Number of the Fellows, inclusive of the President, (who shall always be a Fellow), shall and may be Twelve, of which Eight shall be forever elected of the Denomination called Baptists, or Antipaedobaptists, and the rest indifferently of any or all Denominations.

3. "AND FURTHERMORE, It is Declared and Ordained, That the Succession in both Branches, shall at all Times hereafter be filled up and supplied according to these Numbers, and this established and invariable Proportion from

the respective Denominations by the separate Election of both Branches of this Corporation."

4. "And in Case any President, Trustee or Fellow shall see Cause to change his religious Denomination, the Corporation is hereby empowered to declare his or their Place or Places vacant, and may proceed to fill up it or them accordingly, as before directed . . ."

A careful examination of these sections of the charter brings out with great distinctness the fact that the Charter of Brown University is divided, for the purpose of our discussion, into two parts: one part in which the object of the founders is stated and the broad principles enunciated upon which the college is to be conducted, and the other part providing the machinery, or conveyance, upon which the design of the founders was to be carried forward.

We will consider these groups separately.

We find by examining the sections grouped under "A" the purpose for which the college was founded, namely, to prepare the youth of the country for service to the State and to their fellow-men, and we also find that in the liberal and catholic institution of learning about to be incorporated no religious tests were to be admitted and that sectarian differences were not to be discussed in the classroom.

From these provisions we learn two significant and fundamental facts:—

First: That Brown University was not founded for the purpose of propagating Baptist doctrine.

Second: That the founders meant the University to be absolutely non-sectarian.

The evidence that Brown University was not founded for the purpose of propagating the Baptist faith is full and complete. Harvard College and Yale College were both denominational institutions in fact, although free from specific charter restrictions. . . .

But it may be said that while the

founders did not mean to have their doctrines taught in the classroom, they provided in the Charter that all religious controversies might be studied freely, examined and explained by the president, professors and tutors in a personal, separate and distinct manner to the youth of any and each denomination, expecting in this way to influence the undergraduates indirectly toward the Baptist church and into the Baptist pulpits. But that this was not the intent of the founders is made clear by the graduate records. Of the 81 graduates from Brown who went into the ministry between 1769, when the first degrees were given, and 1800, 52 became Congregational ministers and only 19 Baptist ministers, and this, too, in a colony where two-thirds of the inhabitants were Baptists, where there was a Baptist church in every town, and where the civil government was controlled by Baptists. . . .

It has been the object and aim of the Committee to try and determine, in so far as it is possible, where the founders laid the greater emphasis,—upon the establishment of a liberal and catholic institution where the youth of the colonies would be prepared for service to their fellow men, or upon an institution that would propagate the Baptist faith and enhance the prestige of that denomination. This is important, we repeat, for upon the decision rests the moral issue. If the founders placed in the hands of their successors a creed, a formula or a doctrine to guard and protect and propagate, then it will be a violation of trust to yield a hair's breadth, no matter what the result. If, on the other hand, we find that the founders left us an institution in which they embodied a principle, the principle of religious toleration, which all the circumstances of the case prove beyond cavil was deemed by them to be more important than the denominational restrictions in the Charter, then we shall be equally blameworthy if we do not act so as to preserve

the greater rather than the lesser force.

We have seen now that the intent of the founders was not to establish a Baptist college, or one in which the Baptist faith was to be taught. What, then, was the object of the second part of the Charter requiring a majority of the Corporation to be of the Baptist denomination?

To answer this question it will be necessary to inspect the second part, or the paragraphs marked "B". These paragraphs provide that the President shall be a Baptist; that 22 out of the 36 Trustees shall be of that denomination, while the remaining are distributed between Congregationalists, Episcopalians and Quakers; eight out of twelve members of the Board of Fellows are also to be Baptists, while the remaining four may be Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Pagans or heretics, while none but Protestants shall be members of the Faculty. Why these contradictions? If Brown University was not meant to be a strictly Baptist college; if it was not meant to propagate the Baptist doctrine; if it was not meant that a Baptist atmosphere should pervade the institution, then why were Baptists placed in control? The answer is very simple. History records that at this time the scholarship among Baptist ministers was at a very low ebb, and while at Harvard and Yale Baptists were not debarred, they were not welcome, and we are told that they were looked upon as disorderly brethren, if not as heretics. What more natural, then, that the Baptists in the Colonies should want an institution where the Baptist youth could secure a liberal education for the ministry, and where they would be welcome and free from the sectarian influence of other denominations? . . .

It should be remembered, too, that this explanation of the purpose of the founders is consistent with the policy of the Baptists as a denomination. They have never attempted to increase their power by means of control over institu-

tions of learning, as have other churches, through their synods, councils and education boards. Of the twenty-five or thirty Baptist institutions in the United States, only one, the University of Chicago, was organized under the auspices of a Baptist body. The others have been founded by individuals who have placed denominational restrictions in the charters to prevent them from becoming sectarian, and not to make them sectarian. This was true of the University of Chicago, although Dr. Horr, in his able minority report of 1910, answered the charge that the provisions of the Brown Charter were archaic by citing the fact that the modern charter of Chicago University also contained denominational restrictions.

It may be well to quote in full a letter received by a member of your Committee from Mr. F. T. Gates, one of the founders of the University of Chicago and for many years a member of its Board of Trustees. Mr. Gates' letter, under date of January 12th, 1915, is in the form of answers to certain questions put to him by a member of the Committee.

"26 Broadway,
New York.

"My dear Mr. Colby:

"Let me put in writing, briefly as my very limited time will admit, such answer as I can give to your verbal inquiries of the other day.

Did Mr. John D. Rockefeller cause to be incorporated in the charter of the University of Chicago the clause requiring that two-thirds of the Trustees and the President of the institution must be Baptists?

No; he had nothing to do with it.

Did he not found the University of Chicago?

He is called the founder with justice and propriety because he has contributed at least three-fourths of the money which has made this great institution. In no other sense is he the founder.

Who, then, drew the charter and incorporated these denominational restrictions?

The American Baptist Education Society.

Was it true that Baptists gave nearly all the money?

Yes. Mr. Rockefeller gave \$600,000; other Baptists gave between \$300,000 and \$400,000; all other denominations put together gave between \$100,000 and \$200,000 of the funds which founded the University—June, 1890.

Was there objection on the part of other denominations to this Baptist clause?

No. I made the canvass myself for the money, with Dr. T. W. Goodspeed, and we met only one man in all Chicago who did not think that the institution ought to be under the auspices of some religious denomination; one better than several, because it was thought that there would be friction if several denominations had control.

You ask me if I personally believe that institutions of learning should be under denominational control. I answer, No. But I should wish to qualify that answer as follows: Denominational control in this country until recent times has been a necessity; an evil, but a necessary evil. The necessity is not the same in all cases, and the evil is not the same in all cases.

Let me explain. It is intrinsically and in itself an evil that an institution of learning should be under denominational control, because in so far as that control is actually exercised, and institutions are actually run from a denominational point of view, they cease to be institutions of learning and become mere agencies of propaganda. An institution of learning should be absolutely free to seek, to teach, to proclaim the truth. It should be as free to announce the truth as a judge to announce his decisions, and as absolutely free from bias in arriving at the truth. This requires no argument. The usefulness of all institutions of learning depends on this freedom, and institutions of learning may be and have been in the

history of the world immensely harmful because they have not been thus free. Many in Europe and some in this country are so now. A university under denominational control is a contradiction in terms. There either will not be control or there will be no university; the two cannot exist together. Not only is this true, but thinking men the world over know it to be true, and the consequence is that the institutions of learning that have been under denominational control in their infancy, due to the necessities of the times, have sought to throw off the denominational shackles just as rapidly as they could. The illustrations of the great institutions of the United States are familiar to everybody.

Put it down, then, that a university under denominational control, that is to say, effective denominational control—actually exercised, I mean, and effective in the classrooms of the institution—is a contradiction in terms. Either the control cannot be effective or there can be no university. The practical evil of denominational control increases with the size, the importance and power of the institution. Great institutions require great men in their boards of trustees and in the office of president, and in any community in which a great institution is placed, the university should command the services in its boards of trustees and offices of administration of the fittest men. Those qualifications often cannot be offered by a single denomination; perhaps not by several. It is quite conceivable, for illustration, that the Baptist denomination might not afford just the fit man to be President of Brown University or of the University of Chicago, or even of several minor institutions now under Baptist auspices. The same, I need not say, is quite true of fit men for Boards of Trustees. The injury which might be conceivably wrought to the power and influence of an institution of learning by its inability to secure the fittest men to conduct it is difficult for the imagination to compass, and it

will be perceived that the more powerful, the more influential, the more widespread, the more precious is the influence of the institution, the greater danger these limitations bring.

The University of Chicago is the only institution which the Baptist denomination as a whole, acting in corporate capacity, has ever founded. All its other institutions of secular learning have been founded by Baptist individuals or groups of Baptist individuals, acting in their private capacity. The University of Chicago is the only instance, so far as I know, in which the Baptist denomination, through a national and representative denominational organization, has ever imposed denominational conditions on an institution. In all other cases, so far as known to me, the denominational conditions imposed in the Charter have been put there by private men acting in their private capacity and expressing only personal and private preferences. I presume that is the case with Brown.

It is probably true that today the rank and file of Baptists suppose it to be desirable that institutions of learning should be under denominational control, and they think so because they have given no thought to the question. They have adopted the traditions of their fathers. Thoughtful Baptists, who have given special attention to the subject, think the day has passed when institutions of learning should be under denominational control. The ends sought are either not obtained or, if attained, then the ends of an institution of learning are thwarted. In nearly all institutions today, therefore, the denominational control is practically a dead letter. Liberty of inquiry, liberty of speech, of instruction, has almost everywhere prevailed; ultimately it will everywhere prevail. The denominational ends that were formerly sought are now given up. The means by which they were sought, namely, control of trustees and the office of president, should now be surrendered, with the surrender of sectarian ends.

In this day and age of the world, religion gains nothing by packed juries or packed boards of trustees or packed university chairs. Rather does it lose. Beliefs must stand or fall on their intrinsic merits in this day of light and of universal inquiry, as they ought always to stand. The dead hand should release its hold and give over the institutions of each generation to its own time, to be governed by its own truth and light. Liberty of thought, of speech and of instruction is a condition of truth, and Baptists of all people should yield that liberty to others and demand it for themselves."

This letter from one closely connected with the founding and early history of the University of Chicago illustrates perfectly the point the minority members of your committee wish to make and which they want to emphasize,—namely, that the main object of the Baptists who founded colleges and universities was not to propagate the Baptist doctrines, but to establish centers of culture and learning where Baptist youth would be free from sectarian influence of other denominations, and this was clearly the intent of the founders of Brown. No other explanation of the second part of the Charter can be made to harmonize with the full purport of the whole document.

Let us now very briefly inquire as to the effect of time on these designs of the founders. It is evident that no Baptist youth would now, in this year of grace, 1915, receive any but a cordial welcome in the colleges of New England; in fact, he can secure a liberal education in any quarter of the country.

There is no possibility, either, that any denomination would attempt to secure control for sectarian purposes for the simple reason that the day of the denominational college has gone by. Furthermore, while there will always be an unusually strong bond of sympathy between the College and the Baptist denomination which brought it into being and mothered it through its early and

tender years of infancy, we will need no longer to ask of that denomination the sacrifices it has made so willingly and generously in the past. . . .

We see from these changes wrought by time that every one of the reasons that compelled the founders to incorporate the denominational qualifications in the Charter have disappeared. And what is the result? This! That the Corporation is continually forced to violate the spirit of the Charter in a vain attempt to comply with provisions with which it cannot comply without great sacrifice, and for which there is no longer any reason or justification. We debar a large percentage of the alumni from participation in the affairs of the College, which was surely not intended by the founders, and are forced to establish an inquisition into the religious beliefs of candidates for membership in the Corporation which would certainly be repugnant and abhorrent to those who wrote the instrument.

Let us for a few minutes consider some of the questions the Corporation is forced to answer every time there is an election to the Board of Trustees. Here is one, for instance: What test shall be applied to determine who are and who are not Baptists, Congregationalists, Episcopalians and Friends? Must we apply the tests of 1764 or the tests of 1915? If the tests of 1764, what confusion at once arises! Every one of these denominations since that time has passed through a schism and revolution so complete that in some cases it would be almost impossible for the founders to recognize their own denomination were they alive today. An open-communion Baptist of 1915 is more like a liberal Episcopalian of 1915 than a liberal Baptist of 1915 is like an orthodox Baptist of 1764. Your Committee have received many interesting letters from eminent divines to whom they wrote on this point. One Episcopalian rector writes that while the creed of his church has not changed for fifteen centuries, the

thought of the members of the church toward the creed has changed so completely as practically to make it a dead letter. Another writes that he thinks the creed of his church has probably been changed since he dated his letter.

As we have said before, a large percentage of the alumni of this liberal and catholic institution are proscribed from serving their Alma Mater by these restrictions. They are frequently the most loyal friends of the college among the alumni; men of the finest Christian character and the highest ideals, and yet they are shut out from the Board of Trustees and discriminated against because of their religious beliefs. So keenly do the minority members of the Committee feel about this injustice that they do not hesitate to say that in their opinion it reflects upon the character of the founders by insulting their intelligence and stamping them as bigots and little men with little minds, when in truth they were the great liberal leaders and spiritual giants of their day.

It becomes evident, then, that we cannot apply the tests of 1764, and experience has taught us that we cannot formulate denominational tests to meet conditions in 1915 without plunging the Corporation into an ecclesiastical controversy that would be most disastrous to the interests of the college. How, for instance, if pressed for a technical definition, could we reach an agreement as to who among the alumni are Baptists within the meaning of the Charter? Is attendance upon church services sufficient allegiance to that faith to make an alumnus eligible as a candidate for a Baptist vacancy on the Board of Trustees, or is it necessary that he should have been immersed? Is a Baptist eligible who becomes a member of a Congregational church? What is a Congregationalist? Is the mere statement of the candidate that he considers himself a Congregationalist sufficient, or must he be a communicant? Then the question arises as to what is a communicant. Is participa-

tion in one communion service as a child all that a strict compliance with the Charter requires, or would that be considered a mere evasion of Charter obligations? What is an Episcopalian? Is a member of the Methodist Episcopal church an Episcopalian? Who shall say! Must one give full faith to the creed and doctrine of the church as published and proclaimed today, or is it sufficient if one's name appears on the official records of the church as a member thereof? What is a Friend, or Quaker? If one is brought up in his youth as a Quaker, but has ceased to attend the service of that church, does he lose his membership therein? What is the effect if he regularly attends another church and gives his time and attention to the welfare and interests of another denomination.

So we could go on indefinitely giving illustrations of the questions in casuistry that continually confront the Corporation when elections are held for positions on the Board of Trustees. Let us illustrate the absurd situations to which these provisions give rise:

In the first place, the Charter provides that only Protestants shall serve as members of the Faculty, yet no candidate for appointment to the faculty in the history of the college, so far as the records show, has ever been questioned to determine his church affiliations, and it is commonly believed among the alumni and undergraduates that Roman Catholics are now members of the teaching force. And yet the inhibition against Catholics is clear. For the same reason the Corporation has declared that Jews are Protestants, and Jews have served upon the faculty. What is more, in order to avoid the necessity of putting Unitarian candidates for Congregational vacancies through an ecclesiastical inquisition, the Corporation violated one of the fundamental principles of the founders, surrendered its prerogative and under a strict interpretation of the Charter shirked its clear duty by turning a question of the conscience and

religious belief over to the courts because the courts in Massachusetts and New Hampshire have quite properly declared for certain purposes that a Unitarian is as good as a Congregationalist, and this in spite of the fact that no attempt was made in the decision to deny a distinct and fundamental difference in doctrine and belief.

It has even been charged that one member of the Corporation resigned his seat as a representative of one denomination only to be immediately re-elected to fill a vacancy to which another denomination was entitled.

Another illustration: A few weeks ago a member of your Committee was informed in New York that many loyal alumni were planning to file their claims as orthodox candidates for the next Quaker vacancy. So unjust do the Charter restrictions seem and so at variance with the clear intent of the founders, that these alumni do not hesitate to advance the most absurd and frivolous evidence to show their Quaker affiliations.

All this we claim is detrimental to the morale of the college and undignified in a great institution of learning, but worst of all, it subjects the college to the charge of being hypocritical and insincere in its administration.

So much for the context of the Charter which shows a clear conflict between the letter and the spirit. . . .

There are three great fundamental and historic facts that prove beyond all possibility of doubt that the founders of Brown University, true to their breed and birth, had but one purpose in mind, and that was to establish in the colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations an institution of liberal learning that would not only sound a challenge to the bigot in the church, but invite the admiration of all lovers of liberty for its broad spirit of religious toleration. What are these historic facts?

First: In the year 1611 the Baptists, having fled from England to Holland, issued a proclamation which contained

the first expression of absolute liberty of conscience in any profession of faith in the history of the world.

Second: The Charter of Rhode Island of 1660 was the first complete legal instrument that the world ever saw wherein the rights of conscience in all matters of religious faith were guaranteed to every citizen alike.

Third: The Charter of the College itself, granted in 1764, was the first college or university charter in the colonies, and probably in the world, that secured absolute liberty of conscience in the organic law of the institution.

Such are the foundations upon which Rhode Island College was reared, and we, the minority members of the committee, believing as we do that no other university in the country can, in the long reach of history, point to a more glorious record of achievement in the cause of religious liberty, ask, with all due respect to the majority members of our committee, whether it is conceivable that the founders of Brown University, who inherited the traditions of the men, who wrote those inspired documents, and knew the heroic story of their forebears as they knew the story of the Bible, would today counsel us to exclude from membership in this body any alumnus of Brown who had served his God and Country well because, forsooth, he was not a member of a certain religious sect?

We have now examined the context of the Charter and the historical foundations. It remains to see how the Charter was interpreted by those nearest to the founders and by those who were given the authority to execute their will.

President Sears, in his eloquent discourse at the Centennial Celebration in 1864, said that if the College had done no other service than to abolish religious tests in a school of liberal learning and to exclude all sectarian instruction from the course of study, that were honor enough. "What other institution in the country" he said, "beginning at a time when it would be exposed to ob-

loquy and incur violent opposition, has with equal devotion and for so long a period been the strenuous advocate of entire liberty of conscience? Through the whole century these same voices of liberty, like pealing bells, chiming out their music, have been uttered. From the lips of every succeeding president the refrain begun by Manning has been repeated until the present hour."

In order to prove this assertion that every president of the University has been a strenuous advocate of entire liberty of conscience, the minority members of your Committee, with the efficient and willing assistance of Dr. Koopman, have examined the writings of the presidents and will take the liberty of quoting such passages as we believe throw light on the question as to what their attitude would be in this controversy. Quotations from all the presidents will be found under Exhibit "B." In presenting this evidence it must be remembered that it is not our object to prove that the presidents and the first movers of the College project were not loyal Baptists, or that they did not mean that the College should be under the control of Baptists. Far from it. We are simply establishing the truth of the fact that they placed the greater emphasis upon the College as a liberal and catholic institution and not upon its influence in promoting the interests of the Baptist church; this distinction being made, as we have before explained, because one part or the other of the Charter must give way, and it becomes our duty to determine which part the founders would have us surrender. Bearing this point in mind, let us examine the writings of the presidents and friends of the College.

What has Morgan Edwards to say, the man to whom Brown University probably owes more than to any other of the early friends of the college? If any one knew what the founders had in mind, it was Morgan Edwards. As the first mover of the idea in the Philadelphia Baptist Association, and as the ac-

tive director in the efforts to secure the Charter, his opinion is of great weight. We find on a yellow, faded and discolored parchment in the archives of the University the rough draft of a history of the College by Morgan Edwards in which he makes the statement that he and his friends are founding in Rhode Island an institution the Charter of which "according to the genius of the government which granted it is the most liberal and catholic now extant on this continent, and perhaps in all the world." Where does Morgan Edwards place the emphasis? There can be no doubt. He glories not in a Baptist college, but in a liberal and catholic institution which he hopes and believes will be the most liberal in the world. What would he say if he knew that Brown University was now, in so far as Charter provisions are concerned, not the most liberal, but the most narrow and denominational in all the New England States?

What says James Manning, the first President of the University? In the draft of a letter written in 1772 to a French nobleman, President Manning said in reference to the discriminations in the Charter against Catholics on the Faculty, that they were inserted "in the early days of our ignorance." This expression was stricken from the letter, doubtless because it would have offended some of the friends of the College, but as Professor Bronson says in his delightful and scholarly "History of Brown University,"—which every alumnus should read,—"it showed the spirit of the head of the Corporation." . . .

E. Benjamin Andrews, the eighth president, under date of January 3d, 1915, wrote a member of your Committee as follows:

"It is good to learn that the effort to widen Brown's venerable Charter is not relinquished. Such widening is absolutely essential to the continuance of the proud hold which Brown enjoys upon the public life and thought of the American people. Not a man among us but would

somewhat radically change it, if he could. Denominational colleges of every kind have become unpopular, and they grow more and more so each year. Christianity itself has to be liberally interpreted in order to maintain its ground among thinking men.

"Of course the re-writing of the Charter is beset with some difficulties, but they are not insuperable. The task must be undertaken unless we are to lose standing and power year by year. Perhaps I have had better opportunity than most alumni to learn the views and feelings of university people touching our Charter problem. I think I cannot be mistaken in the belief that the overwhelming majority of them consider the retention of our old Charter very foolish. This would be no reason for change if we were sure our conservatism in the premises was right, but it is a telling consideration in favor of change to reinforce other valid considerations if such exist. That they do exist and in considerable number and seriousness, has been amply shown. If we presume to deny their force, do we not do so by privately falling back into denominational prejudices and preferences which we publicly and to each other repudiate in the name of the Charter itself?

"I hope the Corporation will adopt your Committee's admirable draft, thereby putting the University in the way to possess a Charter which we can read without merriment, administer without subterfuge, and publish without apology or gloss!"

These statements from the presidents and friends of the College we believe will remove the least doubt that may remain as to where the emphasis has been placed throughout the entire history of the University and make clear the fact that the principal concern of the founders was not to establish a sectarian college, but an institution where Baptists might receive a liberal education without discrimination and without prejudice. . . .

Another point emphasized by the ma-

jority is the anticipated displeasure of those who have contributed or the descendants of those who have contributed to the funds of the College, if the amendments are adopted, because of their belief that it would always remain under the control of the Baptist denomination. As a matter of fact, no contribution has ever been received by the Corporation to which there was any denominational restriction or condition attached. In 1875 one Shadrach Standish Bradford died leaving a will in which he provided that Brown University should receive three thousand dollars for the establishment of three scholarships, but upon the expressed condition that should changes be made in the Charter, then the fund of three thousand dollars was to go to the Newton Theological Seminary. At a meeting of the Corporation in 1875, the following resolution was adopted: "Resolved that in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee appointed to consider what action is desirable in reference to the legacy of the late Shadrach Standish Bradford, the Treasurer be instructed to inform the executors of Mr. Bradford's will, that Brown University respectfully declines to accept the legacy." The members of the Committee recommending this action were the then Chancellor, Hon. Benjamin F. Thomas, LL. D., and the President, E. G. Robinson

This would seem to indicate that the Corporation did not propose to be bound by any agreement not to change the Charter when it should prove necessary to meet the designs of the founders.

In this connection there is another point to be remembered. In the majority report of the Committee on Charter Revision of 1910 we gave the alumni the impression that if we could raise a pension fund for our professors among the friends of the College, that then one of the most serious difficulties would be eliminated in that it could no longer be said that we were about to amend our Charter for pecuniary motives. We be-

lieve that because of this appeal many of the alumni contributed to the fund and that there will be quite as much discontent among this class, if we do not change the Charter, as among those who have hitherto contributed to the College because it was under the control of the Baptist denomination. . . .

If it must be that the College of our fathers is to lose its honorable place in the foremost rank of America's universities, it will not be because of the Charter; it will not be because the founders were narrow men, for they were not narrow men, nor because the College was under the control of a denomination, for at every step in its development Brown University has reflected the highest and truest standards of Christian character and liberal learning. No; it will lose its place because the Corporation failed to keep it in harmony with the universal law; with the law of the spirit of relig-

ious liberty; because it will attempt to be something it is not and never can be; and because it will not be true to itself, straightforward or courageous. . . .

We recommend:

First: That a Committee of Five be appointed by the President to file a petition with the Legislature of Rhode Island praying that the Charter of Brown University be so amended as to strike therefrom all denominational restrictions.

Second: That it be instructed to include with the bill containing the amendments the preamble recommended by this Committee in 1910, a copy of which is hereunto attached, making dominant in the College for all time the spirit of the Christian faith.

Signed:

*Arnold Buffum Chace
Everett Colby*

COMMENCEMENT A HUNDRED YEARS AGO

(Commencement in 1815 occurred on Sept. 6. The class numbered 22. Two members, Turner and Pond, died respectively in 1816 and 1817. Eight members lived beyond the fiftieth anniversary of their graduation, of whom Alvan Bond completed sixty-eight years out of college, dying July 19, 1882, in his ninetieth year. He was professor of Sacred Literature in the Bangor Theological Seminary, 1831-5, and a minister at Norwich, Conn., 1835-64. Four members of the class won recognition in the biographical dictionaries: Jaspar Adams, who was professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy at Brown, 1819-24, and was afterwards president of the College of Charleston, S. C., and of Hobart College, a professor at West Point, and principal of a seminary at Pendleton, S. C.; Wilbur Fisk, a leading Methodist, organizer and first president of Wesleyan University, serving from 1831 until his death in 1839; John Edwards Holbrook, physician

and naturalist, professor of Anatomy in the South Carolina Medical College, 1824-55; and Silas Pinckney Holbrook, lawyer and author. Another member of the class, Charles Edward Forbes, was a justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Court, 1848-9, and founded the Forbes Free Library at Northampton, Mass. The following account is taken from the Rhode Island American for Sept. 8, 1815.)

COMMENCEMENT

On Wednesday last, the annual Commencement of Brown University was celebrated in the First Baptist Meeting-House in this town. An impressive and appropriate prayer by Rev. President MESSER introduced the following exercises:

FORENOON

MUSIC

1. Salutatory Addresses in Latin, and an Oration in English: Preeminence of Modern Genius, by JASPAR ADAMS.

2. An Oration: Man formed for Happiness, by JOHN E. HOWARD.

3. An Oration on Elective Governments, by CRAWFORD ALLEN.

4. An Oration: Influence of Science on Liberty, by DANA A. BRENNAN.

5. A Greek Oration: Battle of Bridgewater, by WILLIAM A. SHEPARD.

6. An Oration: Oriental Idolatry, by JOHN B. WARREN.

MUSICK

7. Hero of the South: A Poem, by ALVAN BOND.

8. An Essay on Patriotism, by BENJAMIN COPELAND.

9. An Essay on Party Spirit, by JOHN SEAMANS.

10. An Essay: Uniformity of Conduct, by GEORGE COPELAND.

11. A Latin Oration, by SILAS P. HOLBROOK.

12. War considered in its relation to natural and revealed Religion: An Essay, by EBENEZER COLMAN.

MUSICK

13. Means of preserving Peace: An Oration, by ABRAHAM POND.

14. "The Star of the East:" An Oration, by GEORGE TAFT.

15. An Oration: The Fine Arts, by JOHN E. HOLBROOK.

16. The Pursuit of Fame: An Oration, by JOSEPH THAYER.

17. Hero of the North: A Poem, by BENJAMIN WHITMAN.

MUSICK

AFTERNOON

MUSICK

1. The Ravages of Time: An Oration, by WILBUR FISK.

2. National Importance of the Fine Arts: An Oration, by JOSEPH CLARK.

3. Remarks on the Federal Constitution, as connected with the American Union, by CHARLES E. FORBES.

4. Patriot's Vision: A Poem, by JOHN G. POLHILL.

MUSICK

5. An Oration on Mental Improvement, by BENJAMIN COZZENS, Esq., Candidate for the Degree of Master of Arts.

6. The Conferring of the Degrees.

7. Influence of the Study of Philosophy: An Oration, with the Valedictory Addresses, by CHARLES TURNER.

The Degree of Bachelor of Arts was then conferred on the following young gentlemen:

JASPAR ADAMS, CRAWFORD ALLEN, ALVAN BOND, DANA AUGUSTUS BRAMAN, JOSEPH CLARK, EBENEZER COLMAN, BENJAMIN COPELAND, GEORGE COPELAND, WILBUR FISK, CHARLES E. FORBES, JOHN E. HOLBROOK, SILAS PINCKNEY HOLBROOK, JOHN E. HOWARD, JOHN GOLDWIRE POLHILL, ABRAHAM POND, JOHN SEAMANS, WILLIAM A. SHEPARD, GEORGE TAFT, JOSEPH THAYER, CHARLES TURNER, JOHN B. WARREN and BENJAMIN WHITMAN.

The following gentlemen, all alumni, were admitted to the Degree of Master of Arts:

ROBERT HUME, BENJAMIN COZZENS, CYRUS KINGSBURY, CHRISTOPHER C. DENTER, JOHN SANFORD, JAMES SANFORD, PRESERVED SMITH, JOHN L. BLAKE, JOSEPHUS WHEATON, RICHARD W. GREENE and WILLIAM G. GODDARD.

The Honorary Degree of Master of Arts was conferred on Rev. Aaron LELAND, of Chester, Vermont.

The Degree of Doctor in Medicine was conferred on JAMES MANN, JOHN M. EDDY and THOMAS M. BARROWS.

The Degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred on the Hon. JOSEPH STORY, a Justice in the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred on the Rev. EDWARD RICHMOND, of Stoughton (Mass.) and on the Rev. WILLIAM STEADMAN, of Bradford (England.)

The Rev. Dr. BALDWIN, of Boston, made the concluding prayer.

Notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather, a numerous and discriminating audience assembled to hear the exercises

of the day, and we utter the publick sentiment in declaring, that they discovered unusual ability and were received with unusual applause. If the reputation of an University depended exclusively on these annual displays, the seminary which it is the happy lot of this town to contain, and which it should be its pride to support, would not suffer by a comparison with similar institutions, full of years and honours, and almost encumbered by the pecuniary patronage they are constantly receiving.

At a meeting of the Corporation, yesterday, the Right Rev. ALEXANDER V. GRISWOLD was elected Chancellor, vice the Hon. JABEZ BOWEN, deceased.

We are happy to announce that TRISTAM BURGESS, Esq., was appointed Professor of Oratory and Belle Lettres; Dr. LEVI WHEATON, Professor of the Theory and Practice of Physick; Dr. JOHN MACKIE, Professor of Chemistry; and Dr. JOHN M. EDDY, Adjunct Professor of Anatomy and Surgery.

The Corporation adjourned to the fourth Tuesday in October next.

FEDERAL ADELPHI SOCIETY

Yesterday was celebrated the Anniversary of the Federal Adelphi. The Society convened at Brown University at 8 A. M. and made choice of the following gentlemen as officers for the year ensuing:

TRISTAM BURGESS, A. M., President; PHILIP CRAPO, A. M., Vice-President; WILLIAM WILKINSON, A. M., WALTER R. DANFORTH, A. M., JOSEPH L. TILLINGHAST, Esq.,—Curators; THOMAS RIVERS, A. M., Recording Secretary; JOHN

MACKIE, M. D., Corresponding Secretary; JEREMIAH LIPPITT, A. M., Treasurer; GEORGE TAFT, A. B., Librarian.

The Society then moved in procession to the First Baptist Meeting-House, where, after the Throne of Grace was addressed in a peculiarly elegant and fervent manner, by the Rev. Mr. CROCKER, an appropriate Oration was eloquently delivered by Mr. THOMAS CARLILE, A. M.: a learned and ingenious Forensick Dispute on the following question—"Is it expedient to cultivate the vine in New-England?" by TRISTAM BURGESS, and JOSEPH L. TILLINGHAST, Esq's. and a chaste Poem by the Rev. OTIS THOMPSON, A. M. The loud, repeated and spontaneous plaudits, which always followed and sometimes interrupted the respective performances, form the most unequivocal eulogium on their merits and render nugatory the hacknied commendation of a newspaper. The audience was never so numerous on a similar occasion, and it would not be irrelevant to add, that we have rarely witnessed a more brilliant association of intelligence, beauty and fashion.

At a subsequent meeting of the Society, WALTER R. DANFORTH, A. M. was appointed first, and JOSEPHUS WHEATON, A. M., second Orator; the Rev. DANIEL THOMAS, A. M., first, and WILLIAM E. RICHMOND, Esq., second Poet, for the next Anniversary.

The Society then partook of a sumptuous repast, prepared for the occasion. After the cloth was removed, many classic toasts were drank, and the festivities were heightened by the coruscations of wit, and by "*very good songs very well sung*".

EFFECTIVE ADVERTISING

The Perkiomen Club of Brown, which is composed of graduates of Perkiomen Seminary, Pennsburg, Pa., one of the largest preparatory schools in the country, has recently purchased and sent to the Perkiomen Seminary a collection of books written by Brown professors.

The books sent in the first lot include:

MacDonald's "From Jefferson to Lincoln," and "Jacksonian Democracy;" Bronson's "History of American Literature," and "American Poems;" Colvin's "The Learning Process;" Crowell's "Translation of Mortensen's Norse Mythology;" Allinson's "Greek Lands and Letters," and President Faunce's "Meaning of Christianity."

BROWN ALUMNI MONTHLY

Published for the Graduates of Brown University
by the Brown Alumni Magazine Co.

ROBERT P. BROWN, TREAS., Providence, R. I.

ADVISORY BOARD

William W. Keen, '59, Philadelphia.
Henry K. Porter, '60, Pittsburgh.
Francis Lawton, '69, New York.
Robert P. Brown, '71, Providence.
William V. Kellen, '72, Boston.
William E. Foster, '73, Providence.
Zechariah Chafee, '80, Providence.
Gardner Colby, '85, New York.
Joseph N. Ashton, '91, Salem.
William R. Dorman, '92, New York.
George A. Gaskill, '98, Worcester.

HENRY ROBINSON PALMER, '90, Editor.

HARRY LYMAN KOOPMAN, Associate Editor.

HOWARD M. CHAPIN, '08, Business Manager.

Business Office, 68 Waterman St. Tel. Angell 1159-W
Address all communications to the Brown Alumni
Monthly, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

Subscription, \$1.00 a Year, Single Copies, 10 cents.

There is no issue during August and September.

Entered at the Providence post-office as second-class
matter.

OCTOBER, 1915

The Brown Alumni Monthly cannot undertake to return manuscripts sent to it for publication, unless they are accompanied by sufficient postage.

THE CHARTER QUESTION

In recent years there has been prominently before the alumni of Brown a suggestion of changes in certain provisions of the Charter of the University. We believe that it is desirable to amend the Charter as proposed, so that all denominational requirements for membership in the Corporation shall be stricken out.

We believe that the purposes of the founders in the light of present conditions would be best fulfilled by the removal of such requirements and that harmonious action to this end, with due consideration of all interests affected, would greatly promote the welfare of the University.

We believe also that a change in the letter of the Charter is necessary to preserve its spirit and intention.

We believe that the Charter, intended as it was to produce and nourish a "lib-

eral and catholic institution" now, if interpreted literally, surrounds the Corporation and Faculty with restrictions which are antiquated and out of harmony with the spirit of the present age and the desire of the founders.

We believe that the Corporation in the endeavor to preserve in the University the liberal spirit of the founders has strained the Charter so far as conscience will permit and can go no further, yet the difficulty of literal adherence to the venerable document increases with every decade as religious conditions change.

We believe that eligibility for membership in the Corporation cannot be determined without an investigation from which all of us shrink and the results of which might lead different men to different conclusions.

We believe that these investigations plunge us into a kind of casuistry which was never anticipated by the founders and which is unwholesome for their descendants.

We believe that even under the most liberal construction of our Charter, the provisions which exclude from our governing board the great majority of Christian men in America are strangely at variance with the original design of the founders and the liberal and catholic spirit which they possessed.

We believe that by assuring our birth-right more clearly, and adhering more closely to the spirit of the founders of the University, we should be sacrificing no principle and should be gaining much for the men who make the University. We should be merely throwing aside fetters that impede us, avoiding misconstructions that pain us and making clear to the world the real temper and spirit of the University.

The Alumni Monthly realizes that this statement of its sincere convictions on the Charter question may seem to some of its readers too advanced for the present stage of the discussion, so it hastens to add that they are taken

MIDDLE CAMPUS SOWN TO BUCKWHEAT



For the purpose of enriching the impoverished soil, the lawns were ploughed in June and a good crop of the breakfast cereal was raised

verbatim from the unanimous report made in 1909 by the special committee of the Corporation to consider changes in the Charter. This Committee was made up of the following members, all alumni of Brown: Arnold B. Chace, R. H. I. Goddard, Charles E. Hughes, Stephen O. Edwards, President Faunce, Everett Colby, Rev. George E. Horr, Rev. Thomas S. Barbour and Henry Kirke Porter.

This continues to embody our best hope and judgment on the Charter question.

A THEATRE FOR BROWN

Few additions to the equipment of

Brown would increase the attractiveness of the University so much as a theatre. We do not mean a plaything, but a small working theatre, completely equipped. It should seat not less than five hundred, and its size, therefore, might be about that of the John Carter Brown Library. It should be acoustically perfect, attractive esthetically and socially, and comfortable. The need of such a dramatic equipment for Brown is not lessened by the fact that a small theatre is now building on the East Side, not far from the University. A theatre to serve the purposes of Brown must be all our own and must not be

under the influence of commercial considerations.

Had we such a building, we should be astonished at the amount of use to which it would be put. Music, exhibitions, concerts, literary functions, of both the men's and the women's colleges, would here find their proper setting, and the rehearsals as well as the performances would be provided for. The theatre would, in several fields, form a true art centre of our extensive college community. It would afford hospitality to plays that never can be presented by a professional manager owing to their lack of popular appeal. The drama, with its renewed vitality, is destined increasingly to be a force in modern art, and here it would find a sympathetic atmosphere and an adequate means of production.

The drama is even nearer to life than the novel, and in that sense is the most vital as it is the most popular current form of literary expression. It is there-

fore a legitimate subject of college study, and the increasing recognition of this fact is reflected in the rapid growth of courses in the drama offered in our colleges. The old courses in Shakespeare are giving way to courses covering the whole field of the drama, ancient and modern, foreign and English. To these are added courses in dramatic technique. The college theatre is the natural and necessary laboratory for all such study. In response to this new need the colleges are everywhere acquiring theatres. There are five in California; Harvard has one; Yale is about to have one; Dartmouth has one just completed; Oberlin has one in prospect, and other colleges in the Middle West are fast acquiring them. In no college is there a better director for such an enterprise than at Brown. Who will come forward and provide the University with an attractive centre of activity and interest by building a theatre of its own?

BRUNONIANS FAR AND NEAR

Faculty

Professor Gorham has resigned his position as deputy inspector of milk for the city of Providence. When Professor Gorham accepted the position in 1913, following the milk investigation, it was with the understanding that he would hold the office only temporarily, until a competent man could be found to take it permanently.

Professor Mitchell of the German department has contributed to the Publications of the Modern Language Association of America a study of "Goethe's theory of the Novelle: 1785-1827."

Professor Langdon contributed to the Providence Journal for June 23 a strong plea for "Justicism" as opposed to both militarism and pacifism.

Professor Benedict has been elected president of the Alumni Association of the University of Vermont.

Alumni

1769

William Phillips Thompson, a former merchant in Chicago, died, August 17, at the Thompson homestead on South Main street, Warren, in his 73rd year. He had been ill for nearly three

years. He was a great-grandson of Rev. Charles Thompson, a Baptist clergyman and valedictorian of the first graduating class of Rhode Island College.

1849

The University of Michigan has just issued "A Memorial of the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary" of its founding. The exercises were held in June, 1912. The volume contains two speeches by President Angell, who at this anniversary received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws. The degree was accompanied by the following tribute: "Scholar, journalist, diplomatist, orator, university president, a man whom we all love and honor, whose distinguished services to State and Nation, and particularly to this University during the many years when he so wisely shaped its policy and guarded its interests, call for the highest recognition that can be afforded."

1860

Six members of the class lunched together at the University Club June 16,—Bicknell, Jastram, Pabodie, Porter, Rice, and Spooner.

1863

Orsmus Augustus Taft died in East Greenwich, R. I., June 28. He was born in Uxbridge, Mass., Oct 11, 1811, the son of Orsmus and Margaret Smith Taft. He was fitted for college in the Providence Classical High School. He did not complete his college course, but was granted

his degree by special vote in 1891. He was a corporal in Company E, Tenth Rhode Island Volunteers, May 26 to Sept 1, 1862. He returned to Providence and took up the work of an accountant. He was a member of the Providence School Committee for sixteen years between 1886 and 1903. He married, Dec. 24, 1871, Caroline L. Irwin. They had three children. One daughter was married to Louis M. Lincoln, '92, and another to George L. Miner, '97. These with his son, James W. Taft, survive him.

1869

Ray Greene Huling, a native of Rhode Island and a graduate and trustee of Brown University, died at his summer home in Marshfield, Mass., Sept. 4, 1915. He was 67 years old. Mr. Huling was a prominent figure in the educational world, having been connected with various institutions of learning ever since his graduation from Brown University in 1869. Shortly after leaving college he was appointed assistant principal of the Fall River High School, a position he held until 1875, when he was made principal of the Fitchburg High School. In 1886 he was appointed principal of one of the New Bedford High Schools, continuing in this capacity until 1893. In the latter year he accepted the post of head master of the English High School at Cambridge, where he had since lived. Mr. Huling was a member of many educational organizations and had filled the most responsible offices in these. He had been President of the Worcester County State Teachers Association, the Massachusetts State Teachers Association, American Institute of Instruction, Massachusetts High School Masters Club, Fitchburg Benevolent Union, the Boys' Amusement Society and the Boston Baptist Social Union. He was one of the founders of the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, of which he was elected secretary in 1897. He also served as a member of the Madison conference on history in 1892, the New England conference on history in 1895 and the Columbia conference on history in 1896. Mr. Huling was a member of the executive committee of the American Historical Association, the American Baptist Union and the Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania Historical Societies. He was the author of a number of historical and educational articles covering a long period of years. In 1897 he received the degree of Master of Arts from Harvard University.

1877

Rev. Patrick Whitney is on account of ill health living for the present at 65 Power st., Toronto, Ont.

The board of trustees of the Homeopathic Hospital of Rhode Island has passed a resolution on the retirement of Dr. Charles H. Finch, who has served as superintendent of the institution for the past eleven years, and who will now devote his time to private practice. The board expresses its appreciation of Dr. Finch's services, and thanks him for his "constant interest and devotion to the upbuilding of this institution, in which he has filled so important a place."

1878

Robert Alexander is at Burbank, Cal. He

has been in the far West for over thirty years.

The Providence School Committee passed, June 25, the following resolutions: "Whereas, George F. Weston has resigned his position as principal of the Providence Technical high school after faithful service at the head of that institution for 20 years, which was preceded by 17 years of service as principal of two Providence grammar schools and three years as principal in the evening schools; and Whereas, the Providence school committee have yielded to his desire to be relieved of such a great and growing responsibility as the head of Technical high school and have reluctantly accepted his resignation, to take effect at the end of the present school year, after 40 years of continuous services; therefore be it Resolved, That the school committee wish to place upon record their commendation of Mr. Weston's splendid work in the upbuilding of the Providence Technical high school, which under his administration has been brought up from a minor place in the school system to its present prominent and dominant position as the largest and most popular high school in the city and State, and which will long stand as a monument to his ability as an educator and executive. Resolved, That we wish in this memorial to emphasize our satisfaction with his able services both as principal of the Technical high school and principal of the Evening Technical high school and his activity in promoting and developing an athletic field for the training and enjoyment of thousands of students both now and in the years to come. Resolved, That Mr. Weston both as principal and teacher has, by unflinching courtesy, marked kindness and sympathetic co-operation so attached himself to the teachers and students of the Technical high school, both present and past, that his resignation comes to them as a personal sorrow. Resolved, That the entire membership of the school committee of the city of Providence, as well as its individual members, learned of Mr. Weston's proposed retirement with surprise and regret and wish to convey to him their thorough appreciation of his long, faithful and arduous services, and to express the hope that his remaining years may be happy and prosperous and full of ease and honors. Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be suitably engrossed and framed, signed by the President and Secretary of this committee, and transmitted to Mr. Weston as a visible mark of the sincere feeling of this body."

1881 and 1883

The Providence Journal said editorially in connection with a letter from Justice Hughes, '81, to ex-Governor Stokes, '83: The interpretation put in some quarters last week on Mr. Justice Hughes's letter to ex-Governor Stokes of New Jersey is not borne out by the full text of the communication. It was stated that Mr. Hughes had declared that if he should be nominated for President, he would decline the nomination, but such a conclusion is difficult, not to say impossible, to be drawn from his exact words. The letter, which turns out to have been written more than three months ago, is as follows:

Washington, May 20, 1915.

My Dear Governor: Your letter of May 17 has been received. I think that my recent state-

ment covers the ground. It seems to me very clear that as a member of the Supreme Court I have no right to be a candidate either openly or tacitly. I cannot do my work here and hold an equivocal position before the country. I must, therefore, ask that no steps be taken to bring my name before the country. With cordial regard, I am very sincerely yours.

Charles E. Hughes.

The Hon. Edward C. Stokes, Mechanics' National Bank, Trenton, N. J.

Mr. Hughes's position is perfectly plain. He divorced himself absolutely from politics when he went on the bench. He believed it incompatible with the dignity and character of his present office to engage in any political negotiations whatsoever. He has no right "to be a candidate either openly or tacitly," and he asks that no steps be taken to bring his name before the country in connection with the presidential nomination. But if Mr. Hughes's name should now be dropped, and if the claims of other Republicans be pushed to a deadlock such as is likely to occur in the convention by reason of the multiplicity of favorite sons, and if after many fruitless ballots the justice should be proposed as a leader satisfactory to all factions, and if the suggestion should go through with a rush, would Mr. Hughes refuse the call? Nothing that he has so far publicly said would make his acceptance impossible. He has requested his friends to abstain from working for him. He has resolved not to embarrass his work on the bench by giving any warrant whatsoever for the pushing of his candidacy. But having emphasized his judicial aloofness, he still omits the decisive word which would finally block the hopes of those who prefer him above all other Republican standard-bearers for 1916. He does not say, so far as the published text of the Stokes letter shows, that he would not accept if nominated or serve if elected. Until he expresses himself in that conclusive way, there is always a possibility that events will so shape themselves as to bring about his selection. Meanwhile, it would be well to address no further communications to him on the subject. He has sincerely excluded himself from consideration, and he ought not to be compelled to speak more forcefully and definitely.

1882

The address of Rev. Albert Buxton is Ipava, Ill.

1884

Dr. Robert Henry Ferguson of East Orange, N. J., has continued his important contributions in the field of anaesthetics by publication of "Some psychic factors of surgical anaesthesia," an address delivered before the Illinois State Surgical Society; and "Open ether," being a revision of the official report at the 17th International Congress of Medicine at London.

1887

Philip J. Reid is editor of the Detroit Free Press.

1891

Frank Edward Winsor has been selected by the Providence water supply board to be chief

engineer in charge of the development of the new municipal water supply at Scituate. He received in 1892 the degree of Bachelor of Science in civil engineering and in 1896 the degree of Master of Arts. His first work was that of engineer for the Massachusetts metropolitan sewerage system, having charge of the system embracing Boston and surrounding cities. He remained in this position 1891-5. In 1896 he became resident engineer in charge of the Natick, Mass., sewerage system, and was also connected with the Massachusetts metropolitan water works, 1895-03. In the latter year he was made a member of the Commission on an increased water supply for New York city, and at the same time became division engineer in charge of the designing of the Charles River basin, Boston, a position which he held until 1906. Since March, 1910, he has been division and department engineer on the New York city Catskill water supply, in charge of construction in the southern aqueduct department.

1893

At an outing of Massachusetts Republicans at Springfield a few weeks ago one of the speakers was Edward A. Thurston of Fall River, chairman of the State Committee. The Springfield Republican says: Chairman Thurston's address was full of the usual vigor and party fire for which the energetic State machine leader is famed. He expects the increase in the Republican vote this year to be double that of last year over 1913, he said. This growth of party strength presages victory this fall. The failure of the party to elect a Governor last year does not leave him palpitant. "Why, if you'd believed the things we told you last fall we'd have been victorious then. As it was we got everything but the governorship, and we'd have had that but for a few faint hearts. Everybody knows we're going to win this time. We're not in Springfield like some other parties, looking for an angel to put on the ticket, either. We don't have to." He said he had heard some business men here and there whose business had been hit by the Democratic regime croaking hard times and saying the time had come for a change back to Republicanism. "Well," said the chairman, "if those fellows had taken an interest in politics as a patriotic duty and not waited until their pocket book was hit before waking up, the pocket book never would have been hit. I have no sympathy whatever with the man who can't tell you the name of his representative and who doesn't know whether the candidate he votes for is good or crooked." In closing his speech he said: "No man can run on the Republican ticket in this state without being put right into the searchlight so that we'll know whether he is fit. I'd rather have a Democrat in office than a Republican who is open to suspicion."

1897

Born, at Utica, N. Y., Aug 22, to Mr. and Mrs. Albert O. Foster, a daughter, Evangeline Norton.

1901

Born, August 2, to Mr. and Mrs. Amos L. Taylor, of 117 School st., Belmont, Mass., a daughter, Elizabeth Fairbank.

1903

Married, in New Bedford, Mass., June 26. James Leonard Sherman and Miss Grace May Atwood, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Melville Atwood.

1905

The address of Paul Weiss is Bernice, La., where he has been elected principal of the High School.

Arthur D. Call writes: "Boost the Loyalty Fund for all it's worth. It would seem that at least 3000 of the 4000 alumni ought to contribute something, if no more than a dollar a year. Mt. Hermon Boys' School, Mt. Hermon, Mass., is receiving about \$7000 annually from its alumni, and surely we ought to treble that amount."

William Henry Camfield in August took his oath of office as Assistant United States District Attorney for Rhode Island before Judge Arthur L. Brown in the United States District Court. The appointment is for a period of six months. The press of business made it imperative that a second assistant be named to help United States District Attorney Harvey A. Baker, '03, and Assistant Peter B. Cannon. The new appointee was born at Greeley, Col. He was graduated from the Classical high school here and from Brown University in 1905 with an A. B. degree. He received his LL. B. from Harvard Law School in 1908. In 1909 Mr. Camfield was admitted to the bar of this State and since that time has been associated with the firm of Gardiner, Pirce and Thornley (all Brown men) of this city in the practice of the law. He is a member of the Catholic Club, Phi Beta Kappa Society, Phi Kappa Fraternity, Rhode Island Bar Association, St. Michael's Catholic Club, University Club and Woodrow Wilson College Men's Club of Rhode Island.

1906

Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Graham announce the birth of their second son, Geoffrey, on June 8, 1915.

Edgar S. Brightman has been elected to the chair of Ethics and Religion, at Wesleyan University, and hopes that any Brown man going through Middletown will look in on him.

Leigh Lynch, Jr., is with the Studebaker Corporation, Detroit, Mich.

Dr. Wm. A. Roberts is a practicing physician at 205 Broad st., Providence.

Benjamin C. Baker has a farm at Ivy, Va.

Henry F. Beckworth taught last year at Leeland Stanford University, Cal.

Lester F. Falk is a lawyer with the firm of Scott, Bancroft & Stevens, Corn Exchange Bldg., Chicago, Ill., and trusts that any '06 man passing through Chicago will look him up.

W. G. Slocum is with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Detroit, Mich.

The class Secretary would be pleased to get the present address of:—Louis I. Dexter, Henry G. Carpenter, Herbert E. Cory, Arthur G. Fowler, Chester L. Hayward, Rev. John E. Fleming.

1907

Born, Aug. 23, at Ashaway, R. I., to Dr. and Mrs. Asa Sheldon Briggs, a son, Sheldon Alexander.

1910

Married, Sept. 4, at South Yarmouth, Mass., Maxwell Barus and Miss Jane Garey, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Willis Lincoln Garey.

1911

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Cushman Murphy (Grace Barstow sp. '09) of Brooklyn, N. Y., announce the birth, Sept. 6, of a son, Robert Cushman Murphy, Jr.

During the latter part of March and the first half of April Robert Cushman Murphy of the Brooklyn Museum conducted an expedition into the desert of Lower California in order to study and obtain specimens of the Pronghorn Antelope and other desert mammals. The material collected is to be used in museum exhibits illustrating the plant and animal life of the arid regions of North America. Following this trip, Mr. and Mrs. Murphy set out from Mexicali, southward into the Mexican portion of the Imperial Valley, with the object of making an ornithological reconnaissance in the wilderness along the lower stretches of the Colorado River.

1912

Married, Sept. 1, in Providence, John Henry Williams and Jessie Isabelle Monroe, both of '12. After a short wedding journey, Mr. and Mrs. Williams took up their residence at Brentford Hall, Massachusetts av., Cambridge, Mass.

1913

Born, Aug. 13, to Mr. and Mrs. James H. Radio, Jr., a daughter, Mary Elizabeth.

1914

Sidney W. Wray is working for the American Electrical Works at Phillipsdale.

Earl H. Walker and Ray L. Smith are working for the Solvay Process Company at Syracuse, N. Y.

F. R. Hazard, Jr., has completed his first year at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he is specializing in chemical engineering.

Gilbert W. Hodges is working for the New York Telephone Company in New York City.

Larry W. Gardner is reporting on the Springfield Republican.

FOOTBALL SCHEDULE, 1915

September 25, Rhode Island State at Providence—38-0.

October 2, Trinity at Providence.

October 9, Amherst at Amherst.

October 16, Williams at Providence.

October 23, Syracuse at Providence.

October 30, Vermont at Providence.

November 6, Yale at New Haven.

November 13, Harvard at Cambridge.

November 25, Carlisle at Providence.

RHODE ISLAND HOSPITAL TRUST CO.

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

CAPITAL	-	-	\$2,500,000
SURPLUS	(EARNED)	-	\$2,500,000

Transacts a General Banking and Trust Business

ALLOWS INTEREST on accounts subject to check at sight. Executors, Administrators, Guardians or Receivers depositing funds with this Company are by law exempted from all personal liability.

ACCEPTS TRUSTS, created by will or otherwise, and is by law authorized to act as Executor, Administrator, Guardian or Receiver.


RENTS SAFES in its vaults at \$10.00 per year and upwards; also receives Bonds, Jewelry, Silverware and other valuables for **SAFE KEEPING**.

LOANS MONEY on Real Estate or other approved Collateral.

ISSUES LETTERS OF CREDIT and **INTERNATIONAL CHEQUES**, available everywhere.

DRAWS DRAFTS on London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna and other European cities.

FOREIGN MONEY BOUGHT and **SOLD**.



Depository and Custodian of Funds of Brown University

OFFICERS

HERBERT J. WELLS, President

HORATIO A. HUNT, Vice-President

THOMAS H. WEST, JR., Vice-President

CYRUS E. LAPHAM, Assistant Secretary

HENRY L. SLADER, Assistant Secretary

HENRY B. HAGAN, Assistant Secretary

JOHN H. WELLS, Assistant Secretary

PRESTON H. GARDNER, V.-Pres. & Trust Officer

WILLIAM A. GAMWELL, Vice-Pres. & Sec'y

JOHN E. WILLIAMS, Assistant Secretary

GILBERT A. HARRINGTON, Asst. Trust Officer

ERNEST A. HARRIS, Assistant Secretary

GEORGE H. CAPRON, Assistant Secretary

DIRECTORS

Robert H. I. Goddard

Edward D. Pearce

Herbert J. Wells

Lyman B. Goff

Rowland G. Hazard

Samuel R. Dorrance

Howard O. Sturges

Stephen O. Metcalf

Walter R. Callender

Edward Holbrook

James E. Sullivan

Benjamin M. Jackson

John R. Freeman

Robert W. Taft

Webster Knight

Stephen O. Edwards

Frank W. Matteson

Robert H. I. Goddard, Jr.

Henry D. Sharpe

Isaac B. Merriman

Charles C. Gardiner

Alfred K. Potter

Shall Poe's Letters Come to Brown?

The nine letters written by Edgar Allan Poe to Mrs. Sarah Helen Whitman, his betrothed, have never been put on the market, but are now offered for sale as a single lot to any one who will agree to give them to Brown University for the Harris Collection of American Poetry. Besides the letters are a presentation copy of Poe's "Eureka," with his inscription, and a lock of Poe's hair, also letters from Mrs. Clemm to Mrs. Whitman, and a few other items of Poe interest.

Further particulars will be furnished by the Librarian of the University.

Who Will Make Brown This Anniversary Present?

Drugs

Chemicals and Medicines

Electric Batteries
Invalid Roller Chairs
Prescriptions a Specialty

GEO. L. CLAFLIN CO.

62 to 64 South Main Street,
Providence, R. I.

Fine Perfumes

And Toilet Articles

A Choice Selection of CIGARS, Imported and
Domestic.

Physicians' Prescriptions Carefully Prepared

BLANDING & BLANDING

54 and 58 Weybosset Street

Classified Business Directory

NOTE:—A Brown Man should be listed in this Directory. It assures you of the patronage of Brown Men.

Send in your business card to HOWARD M. CHAPIN, Business Manager,
Price \$5.00 per annum Providence, R. I.

Providence

MENDELL W. CRANE,

Attorney at Law,

87 WEYBOSSET ST.

THOMAS A. JENCKES,

Attorney at Law,

32 WESTMINSTER ST.

CLIFFORD S. TOWER,

Attorney at Law,

410 INDUSTRIAL TRUST BLDG.

St. Louis

ABBOTT & EDWARDS

Attorneys at Law,

1117-1123 New Bank of Commerce Building

Boston

SAMUEL H. WHITLEY,

Counsellor at Law,

89 STATE ST., BOSTON, MASS.

ALVIN F. PEASE,

Winship Teachers' Agency,

Long Distance Telephone 6 BEACON ST.

DANIEL HURLEY & CO.

Engineers and Contractors

Power Plants. New John Hancock Bldg.
(Daniel Hurley, '95)

New York

DORMAN & DANA,

Attorneys at Law,

48 WALL ST.

BLANCHARD & HUBBARD

Highway Efficiency Experts

Broadway and 117th St., New York City

FRED W. WOODCOCK

Twenty Years'

Experience in

Life Insurance

Correspondence Invited

176 Federal Street, Boston

Established 1863

Elsbree-Valleau Co.

**Fine Hats
and Furs**

101 Westminster Street, Providence

BROWN ALUMNI MONTHLY

PROVIDENCE COAL CO.

ANTHRACITE and BITUMINOUS

WHOLESALE **COAL** AND RETAIL



Central Office, Corner Custom House and Weybosset Streets
Yard, Corner of Dorrance and Dyer Streets

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Lehigh Coal

(Old Company's)

SAVE YOUR MONEY

We Sell at White Ash Price

Rhode Island
Co-Operative
Coal Company

193 South Water Street, Providence, R. I.

*Phone Union 4064 R.

The Best T O N I C

Horsford's Acid Phosphate is especially recommended for the restoration of energy and vitality, the relief of mental and nervous exhaustion, impaired digestion or appetite.

HORSFORD'S
Acid Phosphate
(Non-Alcoholic)

Is a scientific and carefully prepared preparation of the phosphates, and has been found a most valuable general Tonic.

A teaspoonful added to a glass of cold water, with sugar, makes a delicious and wholesome beverage.

If your druggist can't supply you, send 25 cents to Rumford Chemical Works, Providence, R. I., for trial size bottle, postage paid.

