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A CENTURY RECALLED

Essays in Honor of Bryn Mawr College
I could hope that college will teach women to be proud that they are women, in the spirit that men, the best of them, are proud that they are men; to feel that honor for one's self that makes no concessions; to believe in one's interest where one is interesting, one's beauty where one is beautiful, and one's supremacy where one is supreme. This is only a desire that women should know, value, and uphold the worth that is theirs and only theirs—I speak of qualities of mind and nature.

—E. Lee Fanshawe '99
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TO THE ALUMNAE/AND FRIENDS OF
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

THE PURPOSE OF THESE ESSAYS in honor of Bryn Mawr College as it enters its second hundred years is to gather together a number of different views which, in combination, will provide a recognizable landscape for a part of our lives. Not everyone will find her or his own vision within these pages, but we hope that this volume will bring to each alumna and alumnus some moment of self-recognition, some sense of an experience which was formative and of the institution which nurtured and provoked it. Our aim has been evocation, insight, and a renewed regard for the extraordinary enterprise in which we shared, that we may become, as Pindar wrote, who we are.

These concerns shaped our criteria in planning these essays. The quality of our contributors led to their being chosen, some thought having been also given to representing the major areas of college life and the curriculum. We encouraged private perceptions where appropriate and accepted plain tales where simple history worked its own magic. Nostalgia was to be eschewed, nor was personality to be magnified. But here and there, a door opens on a forgotten scene, a bright shadow falls across the page, and we are in the commanding presence of memories and those great leaders and teachers whom we have known.

There is, then, a predictable variety of style and substance, but a consistent affirmation of values which, if not unique to Bryn Mawr, have been perhaps particularly felt and pursued in the context of this one small and valiant institution. The worth of individuality, a tradition of high scholarship, freedom of religious observance and personal liberty of conduct: these are part of the inheritance that has been ours, values whose efficacy works in us still.
Beyond Bryn Mawr, these essays have something to say about the education of women and even more to say about education and that larger society served by the women and men associated with Bryn Mawr. From Bryn Mawr’s inception, a broad commitment was implicit in its existence, nowhere more succinctly stated than by its first President at the inauguration: “Bryn Mawr is thus devised to the community at large, which has an interest in its advantages, and a right to its benefits.”

We hope, therefore, that this collection will speak to the condition of many from beyond Bryn Mawr even as it addresses those whose past was at one time more intimately interwoven with the College, and that its resonances will sufficiently celebrate a remarkable legacy in which we have every reason to rejoice.

The Editorial Committee

PHYLLIS GOODHART GORDAN
PATRICIA HOCHSCHILD LABALME
MARY PATTERSON MCPHERSON
BARBARA AUCHINCLOS THACHER
BARBARA JANNEY TRIMBLE
PATRICIA HOCHSCHILD LABALME

A Century Recalled: Introduction
I do feel that Bryn Mawr leaves a stamp on its graduates, in spite of all the evidence from aggregate survey data that college only nurtures qualities already there and does little more in terms of what economists call “value added.” We need to disaggregate such overgeneral figures, and to see the impact of specific institutions small enough to have an impact, and within that, the impact of specific climates of departments and even of individuals; for sagas are the work of individuals, in the creation, the maintenance, and the retelling.

DAVID RIESMAN

The tallow footlights of the Bryn Mawr gymnasium stage never shed their flickering radiance upon a more kaleidoscopic variety of scenes and characters.

TRIENNIAL BOOK OF THE CLASS OF '97
In the beginning there was a hill, and there was an estate called by a Welsh name, and there was Joseph Wright Taylor, a wealthy Quaker doctor who believed in women’s education. There were his serious and like-minded friends who gave their time and experience to the realization of Taylor’s last Will and Testament and to the establishment of the College he envisioned. And above all there was M. Carey Thomas who chose to succeed and had the ability to do so.

If Bryn Mawr has a saga, then these are its setting, its authors, and its first protagonist: a young woman from Baltimore who earned her doctorate summa cum laude in spite of strictures which made that accomplishment difficult, who served as the first dean, became the second president, and dominated the early decades of the College. M. Carey Thomas’ passion for excellence was unbridled, her faith unbounded, her sense of prerogative untempered by egalitarian considerations. If the accommodation to the unusual became a commonplace in the succeeding history of the College, no little credit for that flexibility should accrue to its first great woman. So forceful a leader must inevitably play a prominent role in several of the following essays, for she was a president whom faculty and students alike had to reckon with, a zealous of contagious conviction and considerable charm. “Clever babies in their cradles,” she once said, “were predestined for Bryn Mawr.” So seemed she.

Yet M. Carey Thomas was only one of a quantity of formative leaders who have helped to mold and interpret Bryn Mawr to the observant world, and their several parts in the drama of the past century, though paramount, would be incomprehensible without the chorus of the faculty and students whose individual faces look out at us from the class books. Remarkable men and women: a true epic would give each his
due. Here the characters must come and go and sometimes remain unseen. But they are felt in the whole; each one mattered. Not because personality was cultivated, but because intellect was, and these were people whose minds were at work.

The Mind is an Enchanting Thing
  is an enchanted thing
    like the glaze on a
  katydid-wing
    subdivided by sun
  till the nettings are legion
Like Gieseking playing Scarlatti
——Marianne Moore, Class of 1909

“You are old, Mrs. Manning, and endless parades
  Of students come into your sight;
Yet you know all our faces, our health and our grades,
  What makes you so awfully bright?”
“In my youth,” Mrs. Manning replied with a grin,
  “My brain.—I took pains to apply it
In making the facts that I studied sink in;
  And may I suggest that you try it?”
——Class Book of 1928

I want Bryn Mawr to survive. It gave me a sense of standards,
of the distinction between substance and fluff. It taught me to respect the exact and the scrupulous and to have faith in the eventual efficacy of thought.
——Catharine R. Stimpson, Class of 1958, in Change, April 1974

From its inception, Bryn Mawr was a place of learning. It has bred scholars and poets, women of science, of action, of perception and achievement. From Marianne Moore’s song in celebration of the mind to a student’s irreverent view of Helen Taft Manning to a feminist’s faith in the eventual efficacy of thought, the most profound commitment was to the training of intelligence. Whatever else marked the life and atmosphere of the College was spun off from this central activity. The sound of laughter which echoes out from the earlier decades was surely a confident release of merriment from women deeply engaged in serious pursuits in a climate of total endeavor. How else account for the willingness to mock pretension by adopting from Lewis Carroll the name “Reeling and Writhing Club” for a literary club of legitimate practice, one which heard Robert Frost and corresponded with Stephen
Vincent Benét? To those whose lives were so focused, the perspective of humor came easily. So the 1909 Class Book could recall the exuberance of the Freshman Class Supper: “The room resounded to the deafening rhythm of the ‘butchers chorus.’ For an endless time we pounded until, unable to move our arms any longer, we leaned back and shrieked with pure unrestrained joy.”

Conjoined with the training of intelligence, then, was a sense of rejoicing less in accomplishment than in commitment toward achievement, the ardor of composition, the search for meaning. “The joy,” said Judge Learned Hand in his Commencement Address of 1927, “is in the game.” “It is in the struggle for meaning,” said Judge Edmund B. Spaeth, Jr., President of the Board of Trustees, in his Commencement Address of 1969, “that meaning is to be found.” Judicial opinion aside, a master thread of confidence interweaves the myriad concerns and anxieties contained in the fragile sheets of one hundred years of the College’s academic records, its newspapers and magazines, reunion records, alumni quarterly and bulletins. “How many dangers have been sighted in the past! and how justly, on the whole, has the good genius of our little community guided it on a safe and middle course!” So spoke the 1911 editors of Tipyn o’ Bob, one of the Bryn Mawr journals. There was a shared conviction that the game was not only worth the candle but in itself exhilarating and sound.

The candle of education, of course, cost less than it does now, even discounting for what any given sum of money might have bought in 1885. “The charge for tuition,” announced the Bryn Mawr Program for 1885-86, “is one hundred dollars a year, irrespective of the number of courses attended.” But there were other costs which weighed heavily on the earlier generations, burdens of doubt reserved more for what followed graduation than for what preceded it. For the world beyond the college was different from the world within it and challenged it in an unpredictable and often unsettling fashion. An editorial in The Lantern of 1895 commented that it was

perhaps a trifle irritating to the ordinary young woman who goes to college to find that she is still considered a factor in an experiment. She is used rather to regard herself as an accomplished fact, and a grandly triumphant one at that. While she is undergoing her years of scholastic training she is in the company of several hundred other young women, most of them in no way unusual, who are doing the same things as herself; and it is not until she gets back into the everyday world that she finds herself considered by her whilom friends
and acquaintances an awe-inspiring and not entirely pleasing phenomenon. It is not ridicule that she has to contend with now-a-days, but a widely diffused impression that no woman who is not forced to earn her own living will go to college, unless she has good reason to think that she will not be a social success.

Such curiosity about and suspicion of the college woman was evidently keenly felt. The *Triennial Book of the Class of '97*, assembling the remarks of that class three years after its graduation, speaks of "the social element" suspecting the Bryn Mawr graduate of "horrid currents of erudition" and of the efforts to win back "to some extent, the good opinion of family and friends," to quiet "the rising fears of male friends," and to lead them "gently to a fresh belief in our womanly simplicity and ignorance."

The problem, also made clear in this same source, was compounded by the fact that in so many cases there was no way of continuing those collegiate pursuits, except for teaching or graduate work. But these were well-to-do young women, as Joseph Wright Taylor's founding Will had predicted, "of the higher and more refined classes of society," and well-to-do young women did not take paid employment: that was considered an insult to the family. So, in the words of the rueful Triennial respondent, what might a description of her post-college years state, if it were to be "an ungarnished record" of her deeds?


No wonder the author of this piece, entitled "Post A.B.," had begun by saying wryly, "we may be forgiven a smile now, when an echo of the words comes to us over three years' experience: I confer upon you the degree of Bachelor of Arts, with all the honors, dignities and privileges thereunto appertaining."

The sense of being an experiment toward no firm purpose, the nervous speculations of society and family about the residual womanliness of the female college graduate, the lack of serious endeavor or occupation after graduation, not to speak of "honor, dignity, and privilege,"
continue to manifest themselves in college publications and reunion records well into the twentieth century. "Why does the act of going to college convert a girl into a specimen, for the public at large?" complained an undergraduate in the Tipyn o' Bob of 1911. "To the girl who does not have to work," went an editorial of 1915 in that same publication,

after these four years of strenuous effort, the prospect of folding her hands and sitting in idleness for the rest of her life is almost terrifying. . . . If only some inspired person should start an employment bureau for the purpose of bringing to these ladies, not content with being merely leisurely, work interesting and worth doing, though unpaid, "next winter" to many seniors would be a more cheerful prospect than it now is.

Even as late as 1926, President Park could encourage the graduating class to seek employment with these words: "I hope there will be no hiding behind families or fortunes or personal ease. I hope that each one of you will put herself to the test of earning her own living for a round year at least."

By the mid-twenties, due partly to the pressures put on the labor force during the first World War, and partly to the establishment and growth of vocational bureaus, the opportunities for college women's employment, paid and voluntary, had greatly widened. Bryn Mawr's own Appointment Bureau which began with an "Appointment Secretary" in 1906 had, by 1915, actually broadened (perhaps unknown to the Tipyn editor) to deal with "a very large number of requests . . . from Washington for candidates for every kind of position, clerical, technical, scientific, and manual." It reverted, however, in 1919 "principally to filling teaching positions in the schools and colleges." Meanwhile, voluntary activities multiplied, and alumnae notes are replete with accounts such as the following for an alumna in 1921: "This autumn she started the 'League of Women Voters' and is chairman for Pottsville. She is also president of the Philanthropic Club, and is vice-chairman of the Red Cross for Schuylkill County." One alumna, Class of 1899, triumphantly reported for her twenty-fifth reunion a list of fourteen clubs to which she belonged. The significance of such activities should not be lost, for in such forums a woman could find public use for her talents, acquiring skills of discourse and management which would well serve them and society. So might a successful transition be made between the mandated privacy of the nineteenth-century wom-
an’s life and the permitted public persona of the later era through women’s clubs. Their history invites attention.

There was once a lovely young girl who went to college. . . . Well anyway she stayed at college for years and found it was all right after all and even though a college woman she still had a few boy friends though by senior year the competition was pretty strong. But the worst part of it all was that she got interested in her courses and got ideas and talked about disarmament and how Coleridge got that way and even knew that Aphasia was different from Pericles’ girl friend and why not give a companionate marriage a trial for a while? But still she was a lovely young girl and when spring of senior year came round she discovered she was in the upper ten and hence socially unacceptable as beautiful but dumb and her career was ruined because she hadn’t meant to work . . . so she drowned herself in the cloister fountain.

—“A Simple Story,” Class Book of 1928

83 percent prefer marriage to a career, and 94 percent would place marriage first in case of conflict. Trial marriage is overwhelmingly opposed by 91 percent, and companionate marriage,—defined as legal marriage entered into with a view to permanence, but with knowledge of birth control, and with acceptance of divorce by mutual consent where there are no children—is carried only by a scant 5 percent majority.

—“Marriage Questionnaire,” The College News, February 24, 1932

The conflict felt between marriage, or merely femininity, and a commitment to college and a career was less easy to resolve than the question of work and activity after college. Changing social patterns, the exigencies and attractions of the marketplace, the increase in opportunities for professional women, the erosion of barriers and prejudice against women in the work force, and perhaps the diminished number of servants, which made housework the alternate to outside work, eased the plight of those who sought useful and perhaps gainful employment. But the view of college as an interval bracketed by domestic obligations, the fear that these young scholars would scant their lives as women, the uneasy opinion that the claims of life and learning for women were antipodean are a continuous theme in every decade up to the recent past. Sometimes presented in a fictional tale, sometimes in
humorous verse, or through some symbolic account (had Denbigh abandoned feminism for the *res feminae* because it boasted a sewing machine? queried a member of the class of 1914), the tension remained and became more, not less, palpable for later college generations. For though there were choices to be made in the earlier decades, they seem to have been clearer, more socially determined, more sequential: first college, then marriage or a career, and only rarely the two in tandem.

Romance, moreover, was in competitive vogue. *A Book of Bryn Mawr Stories* published in 1901 includes several of romantic nature. “Catherine’s Career” recounts how Catherine, a junior at Bryn Mawr, rebuffed Jack’s proposal of marriage with this unfeeling reply: “Now, Jack, please don’t be sentimental. You know how I hate it. Besides you have interrupted me just when I was convincing you that education will solve the race problem, and that is annoying.” The pair quarrel and separate. Jack goes off to Chicago, a long distance in that day. Catherine, full of remorseful second thoughts, publishes a revealing story in *The Lantern*, which Jack happens to see at a friend’s house in Chicago. He rushes back East to find Catherine playing as “Varsity’s most graceful forward” in a Philadelphia basketball game and shooting the winning basket. She promptly sinks fainting to the ground, having sprained her ankle, but regains consciousness briefly to see him leaning over her. “In spite of her pain, Catherine gave a little gasp of pleasure. ‘He does care for me after all,’ she murmured under her breath.” A few months later they were married, ending Catherine’s college years: “Catherine had decided upon her career. She had found her purpose in life.” The story was written by an undergraduate.

This is not to say that the choice was necessarily easy. David Riesman’s mother was in the Class of 1903 and won the European Fellowship, the most important award given each year to the outstanding senior for study abroad. But she declined the fellowship, because her family feared that to accept it would lead to spinsterhood. Riesman goes on to say that his mother then postponed marriage in an effort to resolve the needs of her own mind and spirit with what she considered important intellectual and aesthetic activities in the interval. Nevertheless, a choice had been made, for her and by her. According to her son, she knew some resentment. We may represent it as a sacrifice, but there is no evidence that it was felt to be more difficult than the expressed conflicts of today’s students whose hope embraces both career (and almost every job is viewed now as a potential career) and marriage, and whose consequent experiences, both in college and after, may suffer from an internalized sense of rift, dissonance, and even hypocrisy.

Yet for all the continuing parallels, a transformation was felt over the
first few decades in what it signified to be a “college woman.” Those earliest graduates were stalwart. They were, and knew themselves to be, and were later admired as pioneers. They were exceptional and as such did not threaten the established social order so much as pique its curiosity. For them, college remained a sanctuary within whose confines an atmosphere of quiet endeavor and proud assurance prevailed.

That assurance was drawn in large part from Miss Thomas’ leadership. A woman of absolute certainty: so M. Carey Thomas emerges from her speeches, letters, and pronouncements. Her cousin, Logan Pearsall Smith, said that she met difficult problems with “imaginative dominion” over them. A passion for quality and style extended from the classroom to the collegiate Gothic architecture which she claimed she had helped to introduce into the country as well as to Bryn Mawr, from the oral language examination (whose rigor she maintained partly to defy what was considered a natural timidity in women students) to the college seal, devised at her request, by the College of Heralds in London. She was an elitist who once instructed Theresa Helburn: “If you must write, write for the thinking few.” She was a racist, convinced that upon the Anglo-Saxons had devolved the imperial mantle of Rome. She intended her students to be among the elite, to share fully in their rulership.

Her goal was both simple and exalted: the parity for women of intellectual and professional opportunity with men. The highest standards of admission for her students: Bryn Mawr was to set her own entrance examinations until 1926; a curriculum which reflected no distinction between the sexes: “Science and literature and philology are what they are and inalterable”; the release from domestic chores: as in men’s colleges, maids were supplied for cleaning and dining-room service; sobriety of costume: academic gowns were to be worn; the concentration serious study demands: each student was to have, at the least, a room of her own, and many were to have suites. These were requisite elements in the grand design, and the design was paramount.

That design of intellectual achievement and parity is with us still. If there is, in every account of Bryn Mawr’s past, a surfeit of Miss Thomas—so powerful, so colorful, so able a woman is hard descriptively to restrain—she was succeeded without exception by equally able presidents whose individual tenures might well, in a proper epic, have provided full and redundantly fulsome chapters on the working out of that design. Each of these protagonists has contributed new impetus and particular emphasis. Marion Park was to state, at the end of the 1920s, that “Bryn Mawr has continued to equip itself to train intelligence and to believe it was not chartered for anything else” and then go
on, in the darker decades which followed, to extend that charter to humanitarian needs in a world shaken by fascism and its wars. Katharine McBride, whose magnetic energies touched so many, spoke of the force gained from a liberal education as "a dynamo that never loses its power." "The student," she said in 1960, "who has been in close touch with research and known the joy of a new knowledge... is for life a person who understands that a solution can be found, that the impossible can be made possible and that initial defeat requires only more imagination and more effort." In 1970, Harris Wofford in his inaugural speech declared American higher education "indicted for its readiness to invent atomic bombs and do weapons research while neglecting questions of life and death like war, poverty, discrimination, urban breakdown, over-population, and pollution," and he led the Bryn Mawr community into an increased awareness of unresolved social and international tensions, encouraging it towards action and understanding through "a deep respect for persons, an enjoyment of differences, a robust readiness for dialogue." And since 1979 Mary Patterson McPherson, who unwittingly portrayed herself in likening one of her predecessors to the jujitsu player, harnessing the strength of his opponent to increase his own, has met change with flexibility, resolved confusion with humor, kept true course in every wind and weather, remaining as finely tuned to the past as she is perceptive of the future. "Bryn Mawr," she affirms, "has been shaped by people of concern and passion and talent and, in turn, it provides to each generation of students, graduate and undergraduate, an atmosphere of expectation."

An atmosphere of expectation: intellectual achievement, parity and something more: the obligation to put to good and common use those trained talents and achieved accessibilities. The privacies of women's lives in the past ceded to the community's present expectations. The cultivation of the mind was to find its balance in a sense of society, so that from this obligation followed a commitment to written and verbal communication which, in earlier days, spurned the badinage and frivolity usual among socially advantaged young women and by the centennial decade was magisterially expressed: the Committee to Review the Curriculum in 1981 invoked as "an equivalent for the Christian gentleman whose virtue informed the educational project of early American colleges, the woman whose public expression bespeaks care." A student of the Class of 1986 was to find that "one of the most remarkable things about Bryn Mawr College is that women with respect speak to one another in complex sentences with the clear expectation that there will be mutual understanding." The verbal search for
that “mutual understanding” was essential in a community so mindful of variation and replete with personality.

QUESTION: “How about individuality at Bryn Mawr?”
ANSWER: “Most of us were so bizarre that individuality was redundant.”
—Interview with an alumna from the Class of 1960, The Bryn Mawr-Haverford College News, April 27, 1984

Individuality implies limitations and lacks in one direction or another. It is a sort of romantic lop-sidedness due to a perverse and illogical being what one likes instead of what one ought.

—Tipyn o’ Bob, 1910

Upon such designs and with such expectations, respecting both the search for self and the social imperative, Bryn Mawr became the setting—as did many another educational institution—of a dialectic between the private and the public, the perquisites of learning and a world whose needs remain compelling and whose ways are so often irrational. Whether this dialectic was phrased as a conflict between the educated woman and the family and circles she came from and might return to, or as the young mind preoccupied with an inner evolution and a phalanx of organizations and groups clamoring for her energies and talents, whether suffering in isolation or explored in published verse and prose, this was and is that perpetual challenge susceptible to only temporary and personal resolution. It was and is, in the end, the central educative process in which the College participates, but neither initiates nor completes. Yet what it contributes is forever: the conviction that there is a possible resolution, that, with more imagination and effort, the job can always be done; and that, in doing so, both self and society served.

These then are the main themes in what follows: the fructifying tension between the private search for self and a society with its assumptions and needs; the confidence acquired in the practices, perceptions, and empowerment of learning. These are the enduring legacies of the past, and they remain prominent themes throughout the kaleidoscope and continuity that over one hundred years of collegiate experience contain. They have led to an alliance between faculty and students quite remarkable in its dedication to accomplishment. They precluded rules against nepotism which might prevent the opportunity to work with two extraordinary scholars whose marriage to each other was less pedagogically significant than their combined skills. They have continu-
ously fixed the College’s attention on written and oral expression, so that, outweighing any lingering Quaker distrust of the human wilfulness implicit in speech, an adherence to clear, precise, and elegant communication has pervaded the counsels of Bryn Mawr educators and distinguished so many of its graduates. Barriers are there to be leaped; distinctions, whether personal or disciplinary, are to be respected and then used to connect, not divide.

These themes are recognizable in what follows and give, it is hoped, some coherence to what is, perforce, a composite portrait. Like all portraits, it is essentially a period piece, savoring more of the past than the present, regrettably vague on the vigorous and contemporary character of Bryn Mawr today while identifying the beguiling stuff and formative stamp of the past. It is a partial portrait, too, in its jubilant tone. There may have been more dissent than such a collection indicates, perhaps more discontent than the records show or the writers recollect. This was no utopia but rather an institution firmly anchored in and reflective of a conservative and established society. Let those whose trajectories have taken them away from what Bryn Mawr was realize that they too played an important part in its history, which, if unexplored in these pages, is not unacknowledged. To them, above all, Bryn Mawr owes its invigorating uncertainties and its respect for alternative solutions. If, in what follows, there is more laud than lament, that is not because criticism was uninvited but because recollection softens what was sharp and time seems to sanction the event, however refractory that event may have been perceived in the passage.

Another collection, moreover, might legitimately have addressed other matters which here can be only briefly alluded to. One chapter might well have chronicled the early anxiety over the health and physical education of the students, intensified by prominent medical pronouncements that to exercise a female’s mind was to put her reproductive system at risk. “Why spoil a good mother by making an ordinary grammarian?” queried one authority, while another (the often-cited Dr. Clarke) predicted that over-educated females would have “monstrous brains and puny bodies; abnormally active cerebration and abnormally weak digestion; flowing thought and constipated bowels; lofty aspirations and neuralgic sensations.” These anxieties were gradually dispelled when investigations of undergraduate and graduate health proved reassuring, and President Rhoads’ claim for the graduating class of 1889, that “all of them left the College in their best state of health, with the exception of some temporary fatigue that soon passed away,” could have been applied to the vast majority of successive Bryn Mawr students.
Fashions in collegiate sports might also have made an absorbing account. "Track," reported the College physician in 1918, "I am glad to say, has died a natural death—it seems to me quite unsuited to women's needs and temperaments." The evolution of the admissions process would have made a fine essay. There are tempting traces in the records. According to M. Carey Thomas, "Bryn Mawr solves the problem of getting the right students by making her entrance examinations the most difficult in the United States." Such a reputation is confirmed by the following advertisement printed in the New York Herald on October 29, 1905:

Wanted—About June 1, a Bryn Mawr graduate to travel for about three months to Egypt and Palestine with father, mother and young daughter in order to coach the young lady while traveling for entrance examination to Bryn Mawr.

Entrance qualifications were and remained predictably (and perhaps monotonously) high, but other considerations would have made lively copy, such as the following 1929 report to President Park from Dean Millicent Carey and the Admissions Committee:

We had 184 people to consider all together. . . . The committee decided to let in almost automatically the 57 people who had averages of 78 or over. We ran through them in the customary way and questioned one or two who seemed particularly maladjusted (!), but we finally decided to let them all in.

No account is included here of curriculum development, the transformation from the group system adapted from Johns Hopkins at Bryn Mawr's inception into new structures and combinations. Some reassurance about what appears a steady metamorphosis toward narrower and narrower foci might be gained from the words offered in 1885 at Bryn Mawr's inauguration by Thomas Chase, President of Haverford:

Wise men have feared that the present tendency to exclusive specialization in university studies will lead to lamentable narrowness and one-sidedness. This result has undoubtedly been seen in some cases; but we may trust that in time the evil will correct itself. The man who aims at special excellence will soon find, if he is farsighted, that that very purpose will compel him to make wide excursions into many fields.

Omitted neither accidentally nor intentionally is an essay on the arts at Bryn Mawr, but because the subject and its possible authors fell victim to such pressures as must always pertain to those who are seriously
and professionally engaged in these endeavors. No absence is more keenly felt, especially in its apparent confirmation of the ambiguous part played by the arts in the curriculum. President Rhoads' report to the trustees in 1884, before the College opened, was prescient: "That a complete education should not neglect the sense of the beautiful with reference to expression in form and color as well as in literature, is admitted; but how far attention can be given to the former in a college is debatable."

The debate has been vigorous ever since. Quaker scruples—which had permitted only a comb orchestra "as the trustees objected to the worldliness of hired violins"—gave way gradually to Miss Thomas' aesthetic tastes and penchant for the good life; to student talents and interests (said one plaintiff in 1902: "why can we not have free concerts now and then as they do at Wellesley"); to the contemporary conviction that the arts must be nurtured in any community which seeks cultural excellence; to the recent appointment of an arts coordinator to counter what one observer in 1934 called the "uncontrolled centrifuge" of arts at Bryn Mawr. Helen Taft Manning put the problem with characteristic succinctness in 1928, referring to "the reform that is always being advocated, i.e. greater emphasis on creative work. . . . [She] said the distinction must be kept between the professional and amateur attitude. The creative work done in the arts by students in college would, judged by exacting standards, in the main, be amateur. And the College in its intellectual work has never stood for the amateur as opposed to the professional attitude." Yet there are Bryn Mawr graduates whose careers in the arts have belied this prediction, and the creative and performing arts remain integral to if not paramount in the College's liberal arts tradition.

Perhaps the omission least justified in describing a community such as Bryn Mawr's is some account of the role and effect of visitors from outside the campus, the legendary great who came and went and made a difference. In 1885 James Russell Lowell "travelled south from New England to give encouragement and advice to the students, faculty, and trustees of Bryn Mawr College, then about to enter on the first year of its existence." He was followed by such a galaxy that only few of these luminaries can be mentioned. William Butler Yeats came twice to the College, in 1903 to talk publicly on the Irish "intellectual movement" and heroic poetry and more privately at the President's table (reported Miss Thomas) "about faries [sic] which he firmly believes in (or says he does)." In 1911, the poet returned to lecture to the College on "The Twentieth Century Revival of Irish Poetry and Drama."
As he chanted his poetry in the manner of an ancient bard, as the musical cadences rose and fell with the lyric emotion, we looked away from the glare of the chapel lights and silvery moonlight outside. Then for a moment we saw all outward beauty glorified and spiritualized under the spell of the poet’s voice.

Shortly after the First World War, Siegfried Sassoon came to read his verse to awed undergraduates, one of whom described her (and his) impressions:

[He] took his cup of tea and settled himself comfortably at ease in Miss Adair’s arm chair, and gradually, as I became conscious of his personality, I grew more calm. . . . “Do you know,” he said, smiling across the tea table, “this is very pleasant. I had expected to be met by a lot of dowagers.”

In 1927 Will Durant arrived to name the ten greatest thinkers and support his selection in the discussions which followed. Edna St. Vincent Millay first came in 1928 to read her own poems, wearing “a soft, rather mediaeval-looking gown and a long golden scarf with which she wove patterns of colour as she twisted it in her hands.” In that same year, Mr. Bernard Flexner of New York established a resident lectureship at Bryn Mawr in honor of his sister, Mary Flexner of the Class of 1895, and to these Flexner Lectures other endowed appearances and residencies were added, such as the Anna Howard Shaw Lectures and the Lucy Martin Donnelly Fellowship, so that the community might never go undisturbed, untouched, unmindful of the lights without. The Class Book of 1907 gave, with its description of the visit to Bryn Mawr of Henry James, the most succinct appreciation of what such personalities have wrought. “At all events” it said, “the lesser folk rejoiced with tremulous joy in the prostration of the mighty before a still mightier—in the acknowledgement by all of a common master.”

So many of the world’s great have come and gone over the decades. Let every alumna ponder the incalculable effects these visits may have had when the community as a whole—or large parts of it—listened. Here is a reminiscence of the Class Book of 1937:

Gertrude Stein came, came Gertrude Stein—the whole world turned out, motivated by intellectual curiosity, morbid curiosity, idle curiosity, and just curiosity—we learned that poetry is loving the name of anything and prose is the emotional balance of paragraphs the unemotional balance of sentences—we’ve been mulling that over ever since.
And there was the memorable visit of T. S. Eliot in 1948, when hundreds in an overcrowded Goodhart heard him "asked whether, ideally, the poet should place the greater emphasis on music or meaning. He replied that, ideally, there should be an exact balance between the two." To such presences as these, any story of Bryn Mawr should pay tribute.

It is, therefore, a special honor to have the voice of one such extraordinary visitor, Eudora Welty, as our first contribution. Her gift for the telling detail, for sharpening our focus here in the Bryn Mawr scene (as in the great world) where the very plethora of experience might risk a dullness of vision, is both an appropriate end to these general prefatory pages and entrance to the particular commentaries which follow. Commentaries of alumnae, faculty, trustees, they have been loosely grouped as dealing successively with background and ambience; the faculty both in an earlier aspect and in a special moment of wartime tensions; students as undergraduates, graduates, ritualists (and anti-ritualists), feminists (and anti-feminists); the three principal fields of the humanities, sciences, and social sciences; international and intercollegiate relationships; and finally, poetic perceptions.

But, in actuality, all these offerings are individual perceptions and translations of experience, concluded by a translated fragment from Pindar's great ode in honor of the games at Delphi, celebrating, in spite of the briefness of human life, its incandescence.

It remains for me to thank my fellow members of the editorial committee for their careful and helpful criticisms of this collection at its every stage and for their unfailing support and service in bringing it to completion. There is, also, an unseen author in many of these pages: Lucy Fisher West, the College archivist, who has competently and cheerfully sought materials, answered difficult questions, corrected errors, and, together with Caroline Rittenhouse, Teresa Taylor, and some able student assistants, provided the straw with which we have made our bricks. This volume owes much to all of them, and to Helen Laesker who typed the final manuscript, and we are deeply grateful.

In the sections which follow, the brief introductions and the choice of the epigraphs are the editor's. The essays, in all their variety, are the chief contribution, for which the editorial committee here expresses to the authors its warm thanks.

The rest belongs to the reader. As Dr. Rhoads said in his inaugural speech, some one hundred years ago, we give you joy of it.
Eudora Welty's brief words of greeting may raise for many memories of trips in faculty cars, of sojourns in a deanery room graced with exotic furniture, of the curious accessory skills of Bryn Mawr's classicists, of the sense of place, so vivid in Miss Welty's Bryn Mawr recollection, as in all her writing. The case of long friendship she expresses abides for many of us, alumnae and alumni, neighbors and passers-through, some comfortable connection with a community lively of mind and benevolent of disposition (to borrow her terms), a connection forged in seasons of snow or blossom and emblematic of artemian affinities.

— P.H.L.
One place comprehended can make us understand other places better. Sense of place gives equilibrium; extended, it is sense of direction.

EUDORA WELTY

The clear view is what we are all after.

EUDORA WELTY
Bryn Mawr is not my alma mater; nevertheless, a relationship that began in the 1950's exists between the College and myself which is ongoing and dear to me. I think of it as friendship.

Bryn Mawr's benevolence has of course brought it about. The Lucy M. Donnelly Fellowship was the beginning. Miss McBride was president then, and the teachers Bettina Linn and Laurence Stapleton shepherded me into the life of the College. I lived in the old Deanery, for a period in the room atmospheric of world travel that had been Miss Garrett's; I slept in the brass bed from India, worked at the inlaid French writing desk fitted out so completely that a slotted mail box offered itself into which you (or at any rate Miss Garrett) could drop your written letters in a Quaker confidence that they would somehow go. I met with and lived in the College's liveliness of mind, coming to know members of the faculty, a number of the students. The delightful Dr. Samuel Chew took me driving to Valley Forge and told me that he knew how to drive his car the entire way from Bryn Mawr to the Pacific Ocean without once meeting up with a traffic light. I heard Miss Taylor, back from a visit to London, describe the Coronation of the young Queen Elizabeth, which she had attended and of course followed in Latin. Over the years, Bryn Mawr has presented me its two greatest honors, the Donnelly Fellowship and the M. Carey Thomas Award. I owe to Bryn Mawr as well personal friendships formed in the course of my visits there—friendships now nearly thirty years strong. To my pleasure, I've been invited a number of times to read my work to the students. I like to think our relationship has been a reciprocal one. Returning as I have, I've known the beauty of the campus in all its seasons, so I can remember, and look for, the Japanese cherries in spring, the peonies in the deep of summer, the golden fall, the winter
white. On one electrically cold night, Laurence Stapleton, driving me back to Wyndham after a college function, remarked that it was the kind of night when one might expect to see the aurora borealis. That was a phenomenon I'd always longed to see, and it was the one wish Bryn Mawr did not fulfill for this visitor. But it was more than made up for just recently. The Marianne Moore Fund, during the College’s centennial year, brought Seamus Heaney to read at Goodhart. Realizing it was the chance of a lifetime for me to hear this poet whose work means a great deal to me, I wrote in the case of long friendship to ask if I might attend. My wish was granted and more.

When I say thank you to the College for that wonderful evening, I would like to call up the whole abundance of gratitude I feel to Bryn Mawr, have felt to Bryn Mawr over the years, and add the appreciation, the best wishes, the abiding affection of this visiting friend to that of all her other celebrators.
MORE PATENT than the affinities celebrated by Eudora Welty are those reprised by Hanna Holborn Gray in her centennial address of October 18, 1984. The pairing, in Bryn Mawr’s history, of women’s education and the highest levels of scholarly and liberal learning, was anchored in its origins and invoked at previous celebratory milestones, and is here reaffirmed by a scholar herself connective of two great institutions. As President of the University of Chicago, and mindful of Paul Shorey’s earlier professional bridging between the Main Line and the midwest, Hanna Gray defines what Ada Louise Comstock of Radcliffe had called, at the fiftieth anniversary of the college, “its individual potency”:

respect for the individual and for individual differences, willingness to reason, wherever possible, to consensus without disguising or evading problematic complexities, regard for process and for the overriding imperatives of academic freedom . . . the faith that intellect and conscience go hand in hand.

There is here, if not prophecy (which Dr. Gray as an historian eschews) certainly a renewal of mind, an embrace of the future as of the past, a sense of the particular mission of a particular place within the unfolding element of a time as forever present as the sounds of Taylor bell in a collective memory.

PHL
Our central purpose must be to work for the freeing of minds from prejudice, from cant, from the particular ties of the here and now. This freedom, however, is not easily won and it will not be accomplished in a four-year period. In a very real sense all that we can teach you are the tools of learning—in all the rest we are partners in the open-ended search for truth.

MARY PATTERSON MCPHERSON

There is no time simply to bathe in the past. . . . Any celebrating can properly be done only in terms of whatever readiness there is to take part in the future.

BARBARA AUCHINCLOSS THACHER
It is tempting on the occasion of this centennial convocation to say happy one hundredth birthday, declare a celebration, hail Bryn Mawr, and be done. But if Bryn Mawr taught us anything, it is that nothing, not even this seemingly clear and simple subject, is ever really straightforward or uncomplicated. Hence I am compelled, in deference to the spirit of this place, to begin by introducing a qualifying consideration. For we are gathered here in the autumn of 1984, although the twenty-fifth anniversary convocation took place in October 1910, the fiftieth in November 1935, and so on. Sam Goldwyn is reported to have boasted that he could pinpoint precisely an approximate date. I suppose we are celebrating an approximate centennial, and I congratulate us.

In all candor, 1884 was something of a nothing year, except for the purposeful energies that were at work preparing for the opening of Bryn Mawr College. There was of course a presidential campaign in progress; its winner: Grover Cleveland. In 1905, this was the former president who wrote in the Ladies Home Journal that “Sensible and responsible women do not want to vote. The relative positions to be assumed by man and woman in the working out of our civilization were assigned long ago by a higher intelligence than ours.”

In any case, exactly 73 years and 362 days ago Professor Paul Shorey of the University of Chicago spoke as one of some twelve speakers at an afternoon ceremony held to commemorate Bryn Mawr’s twenty-fifth anniversary in the College gymnasium. Actually he was lucky to get to speak at all. Although the next to last orator, described by Miss Thomas as “golden-tongued,” prayed publicly that he not be tempted to indulge the garrulity of old age, and although his plea had been granted without spoiling the rich harvest of rhetorical flowers scattered
before a presumably exhausted audience, some vital parts of the projected program had nonetheless to be scrapped, due to the lateness of the hour. A hymn of Latin verses composed by Shorey could not be sung; the procession of delegates crossing the platform to offer congratulations in person was canceled. Most of M. Carey Thomas’ speech—which, quite properly, would have been the final and longest address—went unspoken (but fortunately not unpublished). The previous night some 350 dinner guests had heard seventeen distinguished speakers attack the theme, “Liberal versus Vocational College Training,” with the majority stacked nicely on the Liberal side. The morning had featured three debates, each with six or more participants, as follows:

**Head Mistresses’ Debate**  
College Entrance Requirements versus Four Years’ High School Course. Do college entrance examinations benefit, or injure work and standards in secondary schools?

**Presidents’ and Deans’ Debate**  
Lay criticism versus College Teaching. Is it justified?  
CONCLUSION: Colleges are in process of reforming themselves from within. Criticism to some extent justified.

**Scientific Professors’ Debate**  
Scientific Courses versus Literary, Historical and Economic Courses in American Colleges. Are they losing ground?  
CONCLUSION: If scientific courses are losing ground, there is no intrinsic reason for it.

The talks which preceded and followed that of Shorey were devoted principally to commending the College, its leaders and faculty, on the founding and growth of an excellent institution dedicated to the education of women and on the triumphant role the College had played in proving women’s capacity for the higher learning and in securing their access to its benefits. President Abbott Lawrence Lowell of Harvard spoke in general about the state of higher education, saying that “the problems that lie before the American college are greater than they have ever been before, because the American college is doing a greater work than it has ever done before.”

These words, like the topics of the earlier debates, have a familiar ring. Lowell’s flight of prophecy, paradoxically, sounds more dated:

I can merely imagine what the future historian of America will say, and I think he will say something like this: “At the end of the 19th century we find among contemporary writers
a great deal of talk about the almighty dollar, and about the materialistic tendencies of the age. . . . At the end of the 20th century we find no such statements at all. The reason at first sight seems hard to find; but when we look for it we discover a force which entered at this period, and that was the rise of colleges for women. The energies of the men were taken up with material things; they had no leisure class, or else such men as possessed the power of leisure devoted little of it to intellectual pursuits; and had it not been for the education of their women, the Americans might have passed into a period in which the light of scholarship would have become well-nigh extinct. This marks the final transition of women from the barbarous period in which she was the drudge and pet of men.”

Paul Shorey spoke as one of Bryn Mawr’s original faculty. The warmth of his remarks reflects the enduring effect of what he and his equally remarkable colleagues had shared, early in their scholarly careers, in shaping a new academic institution of the highest intellectual aspirations:

The mission of the college . . . is not in the narrower and more immediate sense of the words “preparation for life.” It is to establish a higher level of thought and feeling on which to live.

It is not because Bryn Mawr is a college for women that we honor her and pay homage to Miss Thomas today, but because throughout this quarter century of educational unrest she has consistently affirmed and courageously maintained the true ideal by which the American college—for men or women—must stand or fall. Beneath all the waste welter of recent debate about our colleges there is but one real issue. Our great, intelligent, easy-going, “pragmatic” democracy makes a fetish of primary education, and is forced by knocking its head against facts to accept professional and technical training. But it is at heart skeptical of the finest and less obvious values of discipline and culture which the college represents if it represents anything. And the question of the day and hour is: will the colleges have the courage to reaffirm this ideal and win over democracy to the acceptance, if not to the full comprehension, of it, or will they compromise it away in concessions to the play spirit on the one hand and the utilitar-
ian spirit on the other, and so convert themselves into social clubs or technical schools?

Now for 25 years, Bryn Mawr has been far more than a woman’s college, in that she has consistently stood for the right and true ideals on this all-important matter. . . . Throughout the 25 years the keen air of the Bryn Mawr classroom has been somewhat harder to breathe, both for the malingered student and the incompetent instructor, than has the air of any of our great universities. Bryn Mawr’s special work for the higher education of women, her pioneer work . . . is done. That question is settled. She should no longer dissipate her attention or waste her emotions on dead controversies. She enters upon her second quarter of a century not as a girls’ school, but as an equal co-worker, in many respects a leader, in the fellowship of the better American colleges. . . . As a representative of the University of Chicago, I bring here those of a younger pioneer institution, which has also known how to reconcile the necessities of a given situation with the unswerving maintenance of an ideal. . . . Speaking here a year ago, I said that the University of Chicago had endeavored in its final and authoritative tests to maintain the standards of Oxford or Berlin. Your stenographer reported me as saying that the University of Chicago had tried to maintain the standards of Bryn Mawr. I am by no means certain, President Thomas, that the stenographer was not essentially right.

I have dwelt on the twenty-fifth anniversary because of its intrinsic interest and the powerful sense of excitement and accomplishment its proceedings convey; and also because its themes represent something important about the particular character and tradition of this College and about the history of American higher education which framed those approximately twenty-five years of its foundation and evolution. All that should matter to us today, not just by way of reminiscence, but as a means of trying to define the nature and mission of our College, to reflect on where the century has brought us, to consider what lies ahead.

I will not try to persuade you that the problems we face at present are the most critical ever; they always are. As President Eisenhower once strangely remarked, “Things have never been more like the way they are today in history.” Prophecy I shall not attempt, for historians are meant to be prophets of the past. But to think about education, to care
about its substance and its institutions, is necessarily to think about the future, since education has ultimately to do with the continual creation and recreation of the future and its cultural possibilities.

In turning to Bryn Mawr’s part in the history of higher education for women, it must be recognized at once that no such single history exists. The pluralism characteristic of higher education in this country became even more pronounced in the later decades of the nineteenth and in the early twentieth centuries. That era saw both the foundation of many women’s colleges and the spread of coeducation. It saw also the rise and flourishing of the university movement, with its attention to graduate training, research, and scholarship, the growth of land grant universities, and a widespread debate over liberal, scientific, and vocational education. It was an age of academic builders and entrepreneurs in which M. Carey Thomas took her place alongside Gilman of Johns Hopkins and Harper of Chicago. All three bring to mind a passage written by Winston Churchill about himself: “I did not suffer from any desire to be relieved of my responsibilities. All I wanted was compliance with my wishes after reasonable discussion.” In this period the model of the German graduate and research university was joined in a variety of ways to the American collegiate tradition to produce the basis for our system, with all its diversity and contradictions, its major assumptions and approaches, as we define higher education today.

These developments extended and transformed many existing institutions. The traces of that process are still to be seen, for example in the Harvards and Yales, at once colleges and universities. Among the new institutions, some were colleges for the education of women and some were universities, established as such, institutions that did not evolve into universities but were created according to a university idea and plan. The Johns Hopkins University and the University of Chicago are leading examples of such foundations.

What made Bryn Mawr so distinctive, in addition to the distinctive character and spirit that flowed from its association with the Society of Friends and the vision of its founders, lay in the blending of concern for women’s equality and opportunity in higher education with the impulse toward a higher conception and criterion of both liberal and graduate education in the arts and sciences. Bryn Mawr participated at once in the movement for women’s education and in the university movement, adapting the latter to a collegiate scale.

That central fact has shaped the essential nature and mission of our College from the outset. And this, I think, was Paul Shorey’s point. He saw that Bryn Mawr and Chicago, and his own commitment to both, shared an identity of purpose that went beyond the Gothic buildings
which on both campuses were designed to display the dignity, continuity, and depth of learning, of the life of the mind and its enduring heritage.

Bryn Mawr set out not only to prove that women were capable and deserving of higher education and that their education should be at least equal to that of men, but the College aimed from the beginning to be an institution that might elevate the standards of serious intellectual achievement in this country, to speak for the values of that goal and for the abiding worth of learning in the liberal arts.

The attitudes toward education for women that prevailed in or around 1880 were matched by the constrictions surrounding much of higher education itself. One has only to recall the narrow curricula of what were called the liberal arts, the extent to which undergraduate programs and their teachers’ assigned functions more nearly resembled the expectations of preparatory schools (many colleges and universities indeed had large preparatory divisions), and the limited opportunities and support for graduate study. At the same time, prospects for women in higher education were shadowed by the hostility and fear expressed in the belief that health, femininity, and suitability for childbearing would be forever impaired were the gates to be opened.

It comes as something of a shock to recall that not all college women of the earlier twentieth century favored women’s suffrage. That reminds us that over a century ago the goal of educating women might not have meant for all its proponents educating them equally, or in the same way and for the same or equal rights in the social universe. And of course discussion over higher education for women frequently focused on a view of special roles, and hence a special training to fulfill them, that pertained to women as opposed to men. Such roles were seen as ranging from the nurture (and maternal education) of children to decorous accomplishments in what were described as the gentle arts and household economy, and from den mother and enlightened PTA member to those vocations, like teacher or nurse, thought especially appropriate to women. Such views, transferred to education, comprehended at the one extreme a diffuse vocationalism (directed at preparing for “women’s” vocations) that implied an education broad but not deep in nature; and at the other extreme, to a pointed vocationalism, directed at specific certifications. In opposition to such views we hear the voices and see the figures of those who maintained that the same standards and, whatever course of life a woman might follow, the same essential goals and hopes should attach to the education of women as to that of men. And to the ideal of seeking cultivation and enrichment for the individual in both private and civic existence through an education
in the liberal arts was joined the call for women’s access to those professions and options which colleges and universities might help provide.

In the later twentieth century we have seen the strengthening of commitment to equal opportunity and of the conviction that women should possess the freedom to make and pursue their own choices. It is not surprising to note that greater freedom has not relieved its beneficiaries of powerful pressures and conflicts, for freedom carries with it the obligation to make choices, and choices cannot be made in a vacuum, apart from others and detached from one’s own circumstances. They involve, too, choosing what not to do and thereby accepting the limiting impossibility of doing all things equally. These are issues with which we have all to struggle and resolve to live.

In the later twentieth century, too, we have arrived, paradoxically, at a time when women have entered into fuller citizenship in the educational world and are confronted simultaneously by the narrowing of its surrounding assumptions about the utilities and purposes of education. We can perceive the danger that equal opportunity could come to mean equal stereotyping toward false careerism. Were that to happen, we should have failed our intellectual obligation.

Put another way, Bryn Mawr’s steady adherence to the essential connection which lies at the heart of her mission—the blending of women’s education, liberal learning and scholarly quality—remains as important as ever. To say that is not to prescribe the forms by which, in the greatly altered conditions of higher education and coeducation, the College will or should set out its plan for the century to come. It is, however, to say that this college must continue to speak to the objectives of a liberal- and liberating-education.

T. S. Eliot said, “It is . . . a part of the function of education to help us escape, not from our own time—for we are bound by that—but from the intellectual and emotional limitations of our time.” That suggests something of the sense in which education helps us make a connection with what has come before as well as what exists outside ourselves and our experience, to look beyond the narrow confines of the self and its constraints, to imagine and empathize with as well as to appreciate the experience and culture of a larger world and of other people.

So conceived, education must have to do with developing the gift and encouraging the practice and growth of intellectual liberty. It should aim at the acquisition of critical judgment, of knowing how to get at knowledge, of understanding what it is to arrive at heightened perspective and reasoned conclusions, of respecting the canons of scholarly inquiry and research. Above all, it should instill some under-
standing of what it is to see the relatedness of different things, of how an event or issue or idea or method here is related to others elsewhere. It is important to know and respect something of the terrain of human knowledge and its methods, of one’s own cultural heritage and that of others. It is important to develop the capacities of independent analysis, to develop a sense of the context in which things happen and in which judgments are made. All these qualities are needed to bring some wisdom and purposeful direction to the conduct of our individual and social lives for the long term.

There are potent qualities of conviction and practice that characterize liberal education at Bryn Mawr. These have to do with respect for the individual and for individual differences, willingness to reason, wherever possible, to reach consensus without disguising or evading problematic complexities, regard for process and for the overriding imperatives of academic freedom. These values and their expression in the texture of the place give life to those ideals which liberal learning may serve to realize. Bryn Mawr was born in the faith that intellect and conscience go hand in hand. In the words of Romans:

And be not conformed to this world:
but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind.

At the College’s fiftieth anniversary convocation, in 1935, Ada Louise Comstock of Radcliffe talked of higher education and the nature of its institutions:

Every college and university which has existed long enough to feel itself an organism cherishes, I suppose, one further ambition. It would like to develop a personality, something more than the sum of its numerable assets, independent, to some extent, of changes in administration, hard to analyze, but pervasive, and as the years go by, as traceable as the Gulf Stream in the sea. Such an institution affects teachers and students alike. It has something to do with the release of creative power and the shaping of ambition and character; its influence upon alumni may deepen rather than diminish as their lives proceed. Capable of being lost or weakened, by no means indestructible, it is also capable of being extended and enriched. The College we are honoring today has, in her brief fifty years, developed to an extraordinary degree such an individual potency. That she may maintain it and increase it is the birthday wish, and the confident hope, which her sister colleges bring her today.
Now, at the one hundredth anniversary, we can say that Miss Comstock's wish has been fulfilled in these last fifty years as in the first. We can assert no higher or greater hope for Bryn Mawr in its second century. We affirm it with confidence, given not only the record of the past but knowing the strength, the quality, and the leadership that exist to renew the purposes and deepen the personality of this College in the time to come.
MILICENT CAREY MCINTOSH

Heavenly and Earthly Wisdom:
The Quaker Heritage of Bryn Mawr

Much of Bryn Mawr's particularity was due to its Quaker heritage. According to Milicent Carey McIntosh, writing in a 1960 Bryn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin, the Quaker conviction of the primacy of individual conscience, divinely led, had evolved in the late Victorian Quaker liberal mind into two important principles, exemplified by Bryn Mawr: complete justice to women and a stubborn pursuit of excellence. Here, Milicent Carey McIntosh traces the Quaker heritage of the College from Joseph Taylor's Will, transmuted by the powerful and at times un-Quakerly personality of M. Carey Thomas (whose "concern" for the new young College seemed nonetheless of religious strength), up through its successive presidents and present leader.

That "conscience combined with intellect" which Hanna Gray identifies as the pith of a liberal arts education found expression in a number of Bryn Mawr's early ventures: the experimental Phebe Anna Thorne School, the Department of Social Economy and Social Research (ancestor of the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research), and the Summer School for Women Workers in Industry. There were also stands of conscience in more recent decades, resistance to governmental pressures in which the College's leadership among educational institutions was noteworthy. And there has been the evolution, in the Board's composition as in the College's religious activities, from a prescribed Quaker element to a broad representation of persuasion and practice.

—P.H.L.
We emphatically want a Friends' College. We want to spread the Truth by means of this seat of learning in the cultivated lives of the students who may go from it—cultivated of mind based on a pure gospel in the heart.

FRANCIS T. KING

The lofty estimate of the incomparable worth of personality that has been a pervasive aspect of Bryn Mawr is one of the most distinctive features of the Quaker faith. . . . George Fox wrote from his worst prison: "Walk joyfully over the earth, answering that of God in every person."

RUFUS M. JONES
"Know all of whom it may concern that I, Joseph W. Taylor of Woodlands . . . believing it to be right to make legal provision for a wise and just, and useful distribution of the property which a kind Providence has blessed me with . . . do hereby . . . declare this to be my last Will and Testament." So begins a historical document which was to create a new college for women, and to establish the Quaker element in the development of Bryn Mawr.¹

Dr. Taylor’s Will continues with the designation of a group of his Quaker friends who were to act as trustees “for a College or Institution of learning having for its object the advanced education of females as set forth below.” It goes on to provide for the expenditure of

a small portion of the principle in the purchase of suitable ground, chosen with care by them, and the erection thereon of substantial, sightly, and suitable buildings of the most approved construction, for the comfort, advanced education and care of Young Women or girls of the higher and more refined classes of Society . . .

In the admission of Students—other things being equal—preference is to be given to members of the Society of Friends; but in all cases, those should be preferred who are of high moral and religious attainments, and good examples and influences and such as are most advanced in Education. But if not members of the Society of Friends, all must conform to the customs and rules of the institution, and be willing to be educated as Friends, who are admitted, or may be.

¹ This essay owes much of its research to the work of Marjorie Housepian Dobkin and to the indispensable abilities of Lucy Fisher West. To both of them, I wish to express my deep appreciation.
And I further desire that care should be taken to educate young women to fit them to become Teachers of a high order and thus to extend the good influences of this institution far and wide through them.

Dr. Taylor went on to urge the presence of conscientious, highly cultivated and refined Teachers... concerned to guard and protect... [the young women’s] minds and hearts from evil or injurious influences, whether as regards morals, habits, associations, or unprofitable reading. So far as is possible the students should be deeply impressed that true refinement of mind and of manners are essential to complete the female character: and subjection to our Redeemer can alone perfect this.

It is my desire that all having connection with this Institution shall endeavor to instill into the minds and hearts of the students the Doctrines of the New Testament as accepted by Friends... I would further add that the effects of a guarded advanced Christian education of females by expanding mental resources would strengthen character and elevate them above the foolish fashions now so prevalent... to make home the center of interest and attraction, and thus to preserve [their children] from foolish follies or haunts that lead to ruin!

Fortunately, Dr. Taylor added: “Should it be impracticable to carry out any of the above provisions, literally, my executors and Trustees are to use their discretion.” He thus showed one of the most important Quaker convictions: the belief in the importance of concessions in making decisions.

It was therefore with the blessing of this affluent, high-minded Quaker that the infant Bryn Mawr College was born and established in 1885. Throughout its first half-century, Bryn Mawr reflected both the Quaker spirit and Quaker fundamentalism: an uneasy combination of radical faith in the individual as guided by the “inner light” with a religious conservatism which had evolved in the seventeenth century as a protest against hypocrisy and formalism, and continued in restrictions to protect individuals from “worldly” distractions. As the College sought to move beyond the late Victorian milieu in which it was
founded, these two Quaker beliefs often came into conflict, but many resolutions would prove fruitful as well as difficult.

To aid in carrying out Dr. Taylor’s wishes were his trustees, a group of equally high-minded Friends, including Carey Thomas’ father, Dr. James Carey Thomas, Francis T. King, and Dr. James E. Rhoads. Fresh from the University of Zurich with her Ph.D. Summa Cum Laude, Carey Thomas had written from Paris to Dr. Rhoads (then vice-president of the Bryn Mawr Board of Trustees and chairman of its Executive Committee), stating quite frankly her desire to be president of the new college, and then analyzing at length her ideas about its faculty, students, and curriculum. As was to be expected, she had gained through her European study a deep respect for scholarship and for advanced research. And from her experience at Cornell and The Johns Hopkins University, she had acquired an understanding of the important effect a community of scholars has on undergraduate education.

She wrote, “I am anxious that Bryn Mawr should not duplicate other existing colleges. . . . The best undergraduate training can never be given by a college which is not also able to guide advanced students. I should wish Bryn Mawr not to be a competitor [sic] amid the ranks of ordinary colleges . . . but to give America what is lacking there, a place where elementary work is better done than elsewhere and at the same time a place where women may at last be able to pursue advanced studies among women.”

Miss Thomas knew about Dr. Taylor’s Will and his desire to have the new college taught and administered wherever possible by members of the Society of Friends. She wrote: “In the first choice of professors the utmost stress shall be laid on their excellence in their own departments. That of two men equally good, a Friend would be preferred, as a matter of course. . . . Bryn Mawr is to be a Friends’ college, and it is to be at the same time a good college.” She went on to say, “At the opening of the College no professors would be chosen whose influence would be opposed to that of the Society of Friends.” Later on, Carey wrote to Mary Garrett, “I knew I had the Quakers on this for there wasn’t a one of them with a Ph.D.”

Even with Carey Thomas’ academic qualifications and religious affiliation, the trustees evidently did not find her sufficiently mature or experienced to be president of the new college. Certainly her sex was against her in the eyes of the more conservative members of the Board. Her father, an uncle, James Whitall, and her cousin Francis King were undoubtedly sympathetic but unwilling to intervene actively on her behalf. When, however, in August 1883, Dr. Rhoads became president of the college and she was appointed dean, Carey wrote to Dr. Rhoads:
“I received thy cordial letter announcing to me the decision of the Bryn Mawr Trustees. In the talks we have hitherto had, I have felt the true welfare of the college was a subject that lay nearest to both our thoughts, and I feel that in the future it will be a constant pleasure to be able to work with thee in promoting its success.”

In spite of the brave words she had written earlier, Carey was worried about the problem of finding a first-class faculty who would at the same time meet the moral and religious standards required by Dr. Taylor’s Will. Since James Rhoads was entirely without academic experience (he was a medical doctor), it became Carey’s task to find and recruit the first faculty of Bryn Mawr. The academic records of her choices that year, along with a description of their moral and religious qualifications, are described in detail in President Rhoads’ reports to the trustees at their regular meetings. Fortunately, Carey had contacts with President Eliot at Harvard and President Gilman at Johns Hopkins, and it has been said that she skimmed the cream of the Ph.D.’s from both universities.

That Dr. Rhoads and Carey Thomas took Dr. Taylor’s Will very seriously is indicated by this extract from a letter written by Woodrow Wilson in November 1884, to his fiancée Eileen Axson, telling about his interview with Dr. Rhoads: “The Doctor’s object was, not so much to discover what I knew, as to get a key to my character and an insight into my views on certain points which he considered vital. He was glad to find that I believed that the hand of Providence was in all history . . . and was careful to ascertain my views as to personal religion.”

The appointment of Dr. Rhoads as president and Carey Thomas as dean proved to be most fortunate. She was able to travel to find teachers for the new college and he remained at home to work on plans for the first buildings. No one could have been a better interpreter to the trustees of Carey’s ambitions than James E. Rhoads. The confidence she had in him and his judgment, as well as her warm affection for him, are clearly shown in her moving tribute to him at the memorial service held on January 2, 1895: “It was his single-heartedness, with the broad-mindedness that was its corollary, that was the source of his greatest power. He had no thought for self, but only for the cause he served. . . . It was to him as clear as day that the broadest and best possible education was the best gift that could be given to the women of his own sect, and with them to all others. . . . Whenever a professor was to be appointed, the most eminent man or woman in that department was sure to be his choice.”

The harmony between these two quieted the fears of the more orthodox trustees, but the quiet was disturbed when Dr. Rhoads’ failing
health became clear, and the college was faced with the need to appoint a new president. On March 10, 1893, Carey received a letter from James Whitall telling her of Dr. Rhoads’ resignation. Francis R. Cope, Charles Hartshorne, and Howard Comfort were appointed to nominate a successor. Carey was left in a state of prolonged uncertainty, as she realized that the opposition to her succeeding Dr. Rhoads was very strong. Her letters to Mary Garrett reflect the agony of spirit that she went through for many months. Philip Garrett, one of her strongest opponents (he was no relation to Mary Garrett), had taken the chairmanship of the trustees at Francis T. King’s resignation. He and three or four others had determined that Carey should not be made president. They distrusted her as a headstrong woman, and were convinced that she would guide the college away from the principles enunciated in Joseph Taylor’s Will. At a special meeting they passed resolutions reaffirming the doctrinal aspects of the Will, and brought great pressure to bear on appointing Friends as Mistresses of the Halls.

On March 25, 1893, Carey wrote to Mary Garrett a significant paragraph:

I have been all day from 11 to 1 1/2 in Philip Garrett’s private office talking over appointments for next year all of which he agreed to. Then he himself began on the Will & I believe I thoroughly convinced him, routed him thoroughly—then he began to argue with me about going and I for once had it fairly and squarely out—I told him how “abominably” they wd be treating me if they really did put in a cypher as Pres. over my head. He gave me the opportunity and I said everything there was to say. I kept my temper and was absolutely calm (I am thankful to say) but it was such a comfort at last to have him listen, to make him listen. I forced him to say that if he were in my place he would not stay either but he added that is because “I am very imperfect & a man” & still insisted that it was my duty to sacrifice myself for the good of the college.

On April 21st Carey notes that Francis Cope was writing to a Quaker in New York named James Wood to ask whether he would accept the presidency of Bryn Mawr if elected. At the same time, Carey received letters from several trustees asking if she would accept the deanship under a new president. In answer, she wrote a long and remarkable letter to Dr. Rhoads, saying that she was planning to send in her resignation to “take effect with thine.” In this letter she outlined in detail all the work she had done for the college during the nine years since its opening. One wonders when reading this letter how she ever
survived, since she taught classes; found professors (and dismissed them); solved differences between members of departments, heads of halls, and students; wrote and edited the annual program; served as registrar, conducted admissions interviews, entertained students and college guests. Her office hours often were from 8 A.M. to 10 P.M.

On April 25, 1893, Carey writes: “I have taken my letter to Dr. Rhoads to Uncle James. He approves of it and says that if I give him a copy he will see that it is read before any other nomination is voted on.”

Apparently Carey went to visit all the trustees, to explain her determination to resign rather than to serve as dean under what she had called a “cypher president.” It is interesting that the trustee minutes during 1893 give no record of discussion of the problem. But on May 5, 1893, there appears this item: “The committee to nominate a President of the College had hoped to be able at this meeting to present the name of a Friend . . . ; but they have this morning his letter declining the nomination.” They then passed this resolution: “That Dean Thomas is assured of the hearty appreciation of her services to the College by all the members of this Board and earnestly urged to cooperate in the effort to harmonize diverse views in the interest of the College.”

On May 16th, Dr. Rhoads wrote the trustees to say that he would stay for another year but wished to have Dean Thomas assist him by continuing to meet with the Executive Committee “to lay before them items of business and that she may also present business in like manner to the Board of Trustees.” There is no comment in the minutes.

The year dragged on with continued uncertainty for Carey, reflected in her despairing letters to Mary Garrett. Finally, on November 17, 1893, the trustees met to vote on the appointment. Carey began a letter to Miss Garrett in the afternoon: “No news of course yet. . . . I will leave this open until six. . . . It reminds me of our waiting for Med. School votes [presumably refers to the stipulation that there be no discrimination against the admission of women and that all candidates hold the A.B. degree, the terms on which The Johns Hopkins University Medical School trustees finally accepted a large gift from Miss Garrett].” There is a gap in the letter; then the anticlimactic brief statement, “My dear it is all right Elected President.”

So begins the Thomas Era, during which the Quaker ideals of Bryn Mawr’s founder and benefactor often conflicted with the aspirations and combative spirit of its second president. That this conflict clearly existed in her is evidenced by a number of affectionate letters written to Carey by her trustee friends and relations. Dr. Rhoads had always rec-
ognized her need to temper her determination and strong will. On April 13, 1893, he wrote her, "Now thou knows I believe Friends must change a good deal and are prepared to see these changes made, slowly, as the necessity for them appears, yet I also think we are bound to respect the intentions of the Founder of the College and the terms of the charter. . . . Trustees honestly differ in judgment. It requires care not to make such a difference a personal question, but to respect the opinions of others until they can be convinced." Letters have survived also from David Scull, Edward Bettle, Jr., and Albert K. Smiley. Scull acknowledged "The power of a strong will. . . ." but reminded Carey of "the added power springing from. . . . the attractive and constraining influence of self conquest." Edward Bettle wrote: "My advice, however, is to trust in some things, and to make thy work as Head of the College speak for thee. This will open a way before thee."

Fortified by the good will of her trustee friends and filled with energy and idealism, Carey Thomas launched on her exciting new career. Her Quaker upbringing had given her convictions about the importance of individual independence combined with a sense of responsibility for other people. At the same time her experience in the field of education and her worldly wisdom gave her strong beliefs about the procedures Bryn Mawr must follow if it were to attain the eminence of a top-rank college. She knew she must respect the basic principles expressed by Joseph Taylor in his Will, but she did not hesitate to work around or abandon them when she knew they were alien to her main objectives.

Cornelia Meigs gives a vivid account of the early religious life of the college in her book, What Makes a College? She describes the religious meetings, none of them required, and cites James Rhoads' course in Christian ethics as reflecting his own liberal spirit and broad Quaker philosophy. The trustees established a Committee on Religious Life, which in 1960 became the Committee on Religious Life and Student Affairs. More recently, it was named simply the Committee on Student Affairs. Throughout his whole administration President Rhoads carried on weekly meetings conducted on Wednesday evenings in the Quaker pattern. The Class of 1891, after returning from a religious conference at Northfield, founded the Christian Union, which had as its aim promotion of the religious life of the students. In 1904 a more evangelical group of students established the League for the Service of Christ. The two existed side by side until 1910, when after long discussions, the two groups united in the Christian Association. There was no attempt on the part of the Quaker trustees to interfere with these student activities; they held to their conviction that the individual's own "inner light" should reign supreme.
Apparently, the religious life of the young college was very healthy. The following was recorded in a trustee meeting in November 1893:

The voluntary attendance upon the religious exercises of the College and upon meetings conducted by the students themselves on the evening of the first day of the week, has been very good, and a reverent thoughtful spirit has prevailed in the College. The several modes in which the religious activity of the students has found philanthropic expression have been sustained, such as the Missionary Society, the Ramabai Circle, the College Settlement Membership, and the Reform Association. A graduate of the College will have the immediate direction of the College Settlement of Philadelphia and a number of the graduates are active in uplifting agencies.

It was unusual at that time for an educational institution not to require attendance at religious services. Another unusual aspect of the College was the variety of the religious background of its early students. On October 12, 1894, Miss Thomas included the following in her report to the trustees: "The religious denominations of the students on the college rolls are as follows: Friends 20, Presbyterians 63, Episcopalians 73, Unitarians 21, Congregationalists 11, . . . Methodists 17, . . . . Baptists 12, Roman Catholics 4, Jews 4, Swedenborgians 2," and three other denominations, 1 each.

From this early account, it was clear that Bryn Mawr's quiet attempts to fulfill its obligations to its Quaker founder influenced every generation of students. In October, 1904, in the College's literary magazine, *Tipyn o' Bob*, the following passage occurred:

It is only with diffidence, naturally, that the majority of us here, who have not been born into the community of Friends, can speak of what may seem to us, from our scanty knowledge, to be the peculiar turn of the Quaker mind. But our necessary remoteness of outlook . . . may yet show us, perhaps, the Quaker disposition most capable of influencing us. . . . Theirs were ideals of simplicity of living and sobriety of intellect.

Then, nearly 80 years later, the 1982-83 Student Guide put it this way:

Along with the conservatism of a strict curriculum, the nurturing of an independent nature is central to the Bryn Mawr experience. Sometimes the two forces collide. . . . Yet . . .
self worth in its most positive sense is a value the College owes to its Quaker founders.

Student life at Bryn Mawr was not dampened by the serious objectives of Dr. Taylor or the more conservative trustees. The first Student Handbook, published in 1901, mentions that the Music Committee was organized in 1897 and has every year since "arranged for a series of delightful concerts, given in the gymnasium," with artists such as the Kneisel Quartet and Mme. Schumann-Heink. Also, the handbook notes the existence of the Glee and Mandolin Clubs, "instructed by musical directors from Philadelphia. . . . They sing and play on the steps of Taylor Hall in the evenings in the spring." On the other hand, though rules and regulations concerning plays appeared in 1920, and concerning Varsity Dramatics in the spring of 1925, the Varsity Dramatic Club was itself mentioned for the first time under "Clubs" in the 1931 Handbook. In the meantime, the May Day festival had been inaugurated in 1900, to be given every four years, and endless class plays and skits were produced every year.

None of this activity happened with the approval of the conservative trustees. The Society of Friends had, as has been mentioned, taken a stand against the "worldly pleasures" which had dominated English society in the seventeenth century. These included music, the theatre, and dancing. On June 22, 1894, Carey wrote: "David Scull will not approve of having a piano in the chapel and I do not know whether to carry it over his head or not. It is too absurd. . . ." At another time, a trustee (name unknown) said that the college must get rid of the "four-legged monster" in Pembroke (a spinet piano?). As late as 1902, the trustees refused to accept the gift of the proceeds of a performance of Pinafore, sponsored by the Philadelphia alumnae (letter to Miss Garrett, May 16, 1902). Fortunately, the two most rigid Quakers left the scene, John Garrett in 1903, and his brother Philip in 1906.

After the trustees had settled down somewhat from the strains involved in the change in the administration, Carey Thomas was able to make certain that Bryn Mawr was in the forefront of every progressive trend in American higher education. Although not a practicing Quaker, she never escaped from the influence of her forward-looking, socially minded parents, or the atmosphere in which she was brought up.

In 1910 Carey Thomas launched a daring project which was close to her heart and alien to the educational views of the conservative, academic faculty she had so carefully chosen. This was to found an experimental high school in which Bryn Mawr students could be trained to
teach. Carey had closely followed the progress of Teachers College at Columbia, and was an admirer of John Dewey. She must also have had in mind this sentence in Dr. Taylor’s Will: “And I further desire that care should be taken to educate young Women to fit them to become Teachers of a high order and thus to extend the good influences of this institution far and wide through them.

Probably with this thought in mind, Carey established contact with Mr. Samuel Thorne, who had indicated his intention of making a gift in memory of his sister, Phebe Anna Thorne. She had fortunately been greatly interested in early education. In a letter on November 28, 1910, Carey gave him a summary of all the details of a possible school to be opened in Cartref Hall, which had been used as a student residence before the opening of Rockefeller. She estimated the total cost of running the school for sixty high school pupils as $7600. She wrote:

Our Professor of Psychology and Education would talk over with the students the model teaching by the regular teachers and their own teaching in the practice school, and would be able to help them greatly. Such a school as I have outlined exists nowhere in connection with a college for women or indeed in the United States. Our colleges for women are filled with girls who will be teachers, and such a school would enable Bryn Mawr to lead the way for other women’s colleges in the performance of a manifest duty.

Mr. Thorne yielded to persuasion, and designated the sum of $150,000 to be held in trust by the directors and trustees of the College, the interest on the fund to be used for the support of the Phebe Anna Thorne Model School as an adjunct to the Department of Education. Many of us remember with delight the Japanese buildings, with the pink-cheeked teenagers studying outdoors in Eskimo suits, or running lightly clothed and vigorously over the campus. The fact that the school could not survive financially later than 1931 did not vitiate its educational value. It was a perfect example of the Quaker urge to apply the resources of a college to meet the needs of the larger community. And after its capital had yielded enough interest to pay off its debts, the school was reborn in 1952 under Katharine McBride’s presidency, in the Scull property on the west campus, for younger, pre-school children.

Another important venture was the creation of a new kind of graduate department. A devoted alumna of the Class of 1907, Carola Woerishofer, had died in 1912, leaving the large sum of $750,000 to the College. Since Woerishofer’s chosen field of interest both as a student and
as a productive citizen had been in economics and social work, Carey was able to persuade the faculty, and later the trustees, to use her legacy to establish the Graduate Department of Social Economy and Social Research. This was the first such graduate department to be established in any educational institution in the country and must have been achieved against the convictions of many faculty members, who may have felt that such a department was contrary to the liberal arts commitment of the College. That the graduate department became in 1970 a fully established graduate school of Bryn Mawr would be a source of the greatest satisfaction to its founder.

The last, and in ways the most exciting, of Miss Thomas’ innovations was the Summer School for Women Workers in Industry. In the summer of 1919, beginning her sabbatical leave, she visited her cousins in England and had an opportunity to observe the labor colleges conducted by the trade unions. She had been concerned with the problems of women who during the war had taken the places of men in industry, and with the exploitation of these women which seemed to be happening. So when she joined her cousin, Alys Russell, for a trip to Africa and the Sahara Desert, their problems were much on her mind.

In a circular letter to her family she described the caravan trip of nine days over the desert: “At least three quarters of the desert we went through was like a giant, prehistoric ocean of yellow sand with huge waves, 40 to 50 feet high, rolling for miles and miles. . . . No description can give you any idea of the yellow, blue, pink, purple, and silver lights over the desert changing from moment to moment. . . .”

Speaking later to the students in the Summer School, she said,

I was sitting on my golden hilltop one evening thinking that all women would soon become citizens . . . and speculating what the next great social changes would be. Rejoicing that British women had just been enfranchised and American women would soon be politically free, and wondering what would be the next great social advance, . . . suddenly, as in a vision, I saw that out of the hideous world war might come, as a glorious aftermath, international industrial justice and international peace. . . . Then with a glow of delight as radiant as the desert sunset I remembered the passionate interest of the Bryn Mawr College students in fairness and justice and the intense sympathy with girls less fortunate than themselves. . . . In my vision I seemed to see that what might prove to be the next first step might well be taken by college women who were themselves just emerging from the wilder-
ness . . . who had known what it was not to have a square deal in things of the intellect and spirit.

When Carey returned to the college in the autumn of 1920, she discussed the possibility of a summer school with Professor Susan Kingsbury and with Hilda Worthington Smith. Smith had been dean of the college during her absence and was already familiar with industrial women’s problems. So was inaugurated a major experiment which had far-reaching effects in providing leadership for the women’s trade union movement. Its existence was a dramatic proof of the social vision of the directors and trustees of the College.

In 1922, at Miss Thomas’ retirement, Marion Edwards Park, an A.B., M.A., and Ph.D. of Bryn Mawr, became its third president. It seems clear that Marion Park’s inheritance and temperament were well suited to carrying on the Quaker ideas of Bryn Mawr’s founders and early trustees. She herself remarked, at the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the College, on

where the College drew the color and form by which we know it still. From its Quaker fathers: a habit of caution; along with tolerance of new ones, a liking for established ways . . . ; friendliness and simplicity; always respect for the individual. Reflections from certain convictions of the new Dean: her respect for intellect and her basic confidence in it; her confidence in liberty, that only through personal liberty the mature and civilized person develops; her liking for a rich background, the European scene behind the American beautiful surroundings, varied experience. And from the procession of its faculty for fifty years the driving power and the cutting edge.

Miss Park’s administration was characterized by a humane acceptance of these ideals. The faculty was very resistant to change during this period, and jealous of the prerogatives they had won in a battle with Carey Thomas in 1916. But ultimately Miss Park, who knew how to proceed in true Quakerly fashion, brought about the development of a new curriculum which included a four-course plan and an honors system; and later on some coordination of courses and faculty appointments with Haverford, Swarthmore, and the University of Pennsylvania. Her understanding of the student point of view made it possible for her to approve—and to win the approval of the directors for—a
modification of the rule against smoking. "I agree," she wrote in 1925, "that no democracy can keep on its books a regulation . . . that no longer rests solidly on public opinion."

During the dark days of World War II, in the Alumnae Bulletin for July 1940, Miss Park's speech to the Alumnae, "Our Bryn Mawr Inheritance," includes the following important passages:

The Quaker sect which founded us set before its attitude, particularly valuable because it was itself developed in direct reaction to violence: to hateful persecution and contempt . . . .

To the two Quaker principles I can go directly and both have that combination of heavenly and earthly wisdom that marks the Friend. First, in situations of aggression, we recognize their lack of personal hatred, a hard doctrine for Puritan blood like mine, for like Jonah, we often think we do well to be angry. Yet I can see that riddance from hatred is not only the doctrine of the New Testament, but of the modern psychologist. When the Quaker meets violence, emotion does not interfere with the use of judgment, nor with the use of the imagination and the end of a conflict depends heavily on both. And second in times of chaos, they never lose the steadying qualities of objective action; they don't intermit their characteristic good works, they even carry them out for the benefit of the just and unjust alike.

She went on to sum up her understanding of the Quaker tradition and to explain how it had produced a special kind of college: "Bryn Mawr College is built on a few principles:—association and organization of individuals . . . individual liberty, . . . the right of free speech." She indicates the responsibilities that accompany such freedom, for both the students and the graduates of the college, and ends with this sentence, "Let us take sides with the intelligence and courage of our inheritance."

Katharine Elizabeth McBride became president of Bryn Mawr in 1942, and held the office until 1970. Her era spanned the McCarthy years and three separate wars, troubled times when inevitably the Quaker connection could not be stressed.

In 1958, however, the National Defense Education Act presented a test of our Quaker inheritance. It required students applying for loans to sign a non-Communist or "disclaimer" affidavit as to belief in or support of groups advocating the overthrow of our government by
force; and furthermore to swear a loyalty oath to the United States. Following Miss McBride's recommendation to the Board, Bryn Mawr was the first college to decline, on behalf of the undergraduates, to apply for loans under these conditions. Action on graduate funds, following a faculty expression of opinion, was left to the individual conscience of these students.

Bryn Mawr's position resulted in a great deal of publicity for the College; it received editorial comments all over the country, as well as letters from many distinguished people, including Senator John F. Kennedy. Not until after 1962, when government requirements were relaxed, did a faculty committee recommend that the undergraduate loan program be resumed.

In the last year of her presidency, Miss McBride once again recommended that the College decline government scholarship aid. At the peak of student protest on the Vietnam War, institutions of higher education were directed to sign agreements administered by the states committing colleges and universities to report student protesters as a condition of eligibility for government scholarship support. The students claimed they would rather lose state support than have the College accept the role of informer; faculty and alumnae/i raised funds to make up for much of the lost aid.

Bryn Mawr was the only Pennsylvania institution to take this action. Later in an amicus brief, the College supported thirty-one institutions who had signed the Higher Education Agreement but immediately brought suit to declare the law unconstitutional.

From the beginning of his tenure, the newly elected (1970) president of Bryn Mawr, Harris Llewellyn Wofford, an A.B. of the University of Chicago with an LL.B. from Yale and Howard Universities, was very sympathetic with the College's Quaker tradition and with the College's position on this matter. "I had the privilege," he wrote in his President's Report of 1973, "of carrying the College position into the federal court. . . . In due course, the court struck down the provisions to which we most objected, and the aid to Bryn Mawr students was restored—indeed, the court ordered restitution of lost scholarships." Harris Wofford's report continued with further reference to the Quaker tradition:

The College has responded to the recent years of student protest with similar respect for individual rights. On the occasion of the invasion of Cambodia in 1970 when a number of
other colleges closed down, Bryn Mawr’s students and faculty maintained a difficult balance, continuing classes while enabling those engaged in off-campus activity to make up their academic work later. At the 1972 Commencement, a College-wide anti-war resolution which had been proposed by some and agreed to by many was rejected on the grounds that it would inflict majority opinions upon a minority. Instead, it was agreed that every graduating student would be invited to submit his or her individual views to be combined in a notebook to be presented to members of Congress and to President Nixon. Here, too, a Quaker respect for minorities served the College in protecting the rights of dissenting individuals in resisting moral imperialism. The 1907 warning of M. Carey Thomas... “against the tyranny of the opinion of the majority which is felt more strongly by college students than by any other people” is well-taken, though one need not agree with Miss Thomas that “even in college the opinion of the majority is generally wrong.”

Another problem which Harris Wofford described in his first Annual Report was the challenge to the requirement in Joseph Taylor’s Will that the governing body of Bryn Mawr should be thirteen Quaker trustees. He sums this up by stating that

although not a Quaker college, the spirit that gave... [Bryn Mawr] birth is still a creative force. In 1970, when the chairman of the Board of Directors asked for the new president’s opinion of a suggestion by some Quaker trustees that judicial relief be sought from the requirement that all thirteen trustees (constituting a majority of the twenty-five Board members) be members of The Society of Friends, I expressed doubt that a court would find the provision for Quaker trustees unworkable, and said I saw no case for the change: the College seemed secular enough to satisfy any concern about academic freedom, and the ties to Quaker values seemed a good anchor to windward. “Then,” urged the chairman, Judge Edmund B. Spacht, Jr., “let us take care to be appropriately Quaker in administering the trust.”

Dr. Taylor’s requirement had been somewhat modified through the years. In 1966 the Charter was changed to provide for sixteen “directors” without regard to religious affiliation, but including the thirteen Quaker trustees. The Board of Directors in effect was charged with the
duty of running the College, although the thirteen Quaker trustees continued to meet separately to approve certain real estate decisions and other matters. This double-board system resolved the problem of giving representation to alumnae, which was close to President Thomas' heart, as well as making possible the addition of non-Quakers. In 1921 the number of Directors was increased to twenty and subsequently to twenty-five.

The question of the thirteen-trustee Quaker majority, set aside in 1970, was raised again five years later in view of declining numbers in the Society of Friends, the College's non-sectarian stance and its commitment to increasingly far-ranging admissions and operations procedures. Although the shift in practice was an important one for the Board to make, it was not necessary to amend the Charter to accomplish it. This change had been made in 1918 when, in response to a request by the faculty, the Charter was amended to conform to a requirement by the Carnegie Foundation that institutions joining its pension plan not be subject to sectarian restrictions.

In 1976 the Charter was amended to do away with the two-tier structure of the Board. All members became trustees with their number set at "at least twenty-one." The Nominating Committee was charged with the following language: "In recognition of the College's Quaker origin and the stimulus Quaker leaders have given to its development, the Nominating Committee shall have a responsibility to search for qualified Quakers to be considered as trustee candidates for nomination and election."

During Harris Wofford's regime, with the reorganization of the financial structure of the college, the investment program came under severe scrutiny. Professional counsel advised a wide diversification of investments, but some of these investments caused questioning as to their appropriateness for a college with a strong Quaker tradition. Accordingly a Committee on Investment Responsibility was formed, including trustees, faculty, students, alumnae and, later, staff. This committee has regularly recommended to the president and chairman of the Board, or, at present to the whole Board how to vote the College's shares in various shareholder resolutions concerning the environment, war and peace, South Africa and other issues of concern. One might suppose that for a college with Bryn Mawr's traditions, there would be no problem of reaching a consensus about these complex problems. However, the Quaker conviction that minority opinion should be represented in all decisions caused a delay in taking action. This problem was solved for proxy voting when one trustee pointed out that trustees
could register individual preferences in proxy votes and have the trustee’s vote so recorded when the proxies are sent to the companies.

Mary Patterson McPherson, A.B. Smith College, and Ph.D. Bryn Mawr, became president on Harris Wofford’s resignation in 1978. No one could have had a better schooling for the responsibilities she inherited, for after taking her doctorate she taught philosophy, and then became dean, acting as president in 1976-77. By training and by temperament, she has shown a natural understanding of Bryn Mawr’s Quaker founders. She has brought to trustees’ meetings representatives of every part of the College, who give reports and at times join in the discussion. No one worked harder than she to establish a coordinate relationship with Haverford, and to create an academic community where the strengths of both colleges could have the fullest expression. But when Haverford voted to accept its own women undergraduates, she accepted the situation with dignity and grace. Since that time, she has done everything possible to welcome the Haverford women students and continue the close cooperation between the two colleges.

It is not surprising, therefore, that she often refers to what she calls “the Quaker influence” on campus. In fact, she included the following paragraphs in her talk to the Alumnae Dinner marking the regional opening of the Centennial Campaign in Washington, D.C., in January 1983:

I believe that the way this College chooses to do its business which is still much influenced by the spirit of its founders—all Quakers—stands out against much that is wrong in our society and that the particular approach to education valued and practiced here combined with the aspirations the institution has for its graduates perhaps makes it a more valuable institution now, as it faces its second hundred years, than at any time in its interesting and useful history.

Here time is taken, the pleasures of reflection are learned then enjoyed, people in small groups can be drawn out, listened to, differences in point of view can delight—the whole process assumes and therefore instills integrity.

May it always be so.
MABEL L. LANG

Rise to These Responsibilities:
Faculty Powers and How They Grew

More than any of its other constituencies, the faculty of Bryn Mawr has been responsible for the College's superior quality and reputation. "The driving power and the cutting edge" was President Park's apt phrase. That power was not won without a struggle during which the faculty found itself disadvantaged between—in Mabel Lang's words—an authoritarian Board of Trustees and a vociferous student body, not to mention the canny and occasionally manipulative Miss Thomas. Miss Lang tells the story of the faculty's effort to acquire rights and privileges, culminating in their "Great Revolt of 1916" when at last the faculty was granted the responsibilities they had so long sought.

This is the account of a group who, in their rise to responsibility, created out of disparate and sometimes dissonant parts a "spirit of community . . ., of institutional integrity and intramural civility" reflected in a number of other essays. The degree of collegial participation and alliance between faculty and students finds further explication in Emily Vermeule's, Jane Oppenheimer's, and Rosabeth Moss Kanter's essays and is discernible throughout the decades of the College's history, in the affectionate and satiric commentaries of students, in the writings of members of the faculty, in the long friendships and lingering beneficent influence of those unusual and unforgettable teachers. For over one hundred years, the faculty provided accessibility to excellence in generous abundance and variety of shape and style. Several great teachers of the past are recorded in these essays, but many from the earlier or later decades remain unsung. How shall we sufficiently recognize such figures as Samuel Chew, Stephen Joseph Herben, Arthur Sprague,
how adequately acknowledge the influence of a Laurence Stapleton, Germaine Brée, Agnes Michels or Caroline Robbins? Which among us will easily forget Charles David, Charles Fenwick or Roger Wells; James Crenshaw, Mary Gardiner or Walter Michels; Joseph Sloan or Alex Soper; Milton Nahm or Frederica de Laguna (of parents as illustrious as she is); Robert Broughton, Lincoln Dryden or Edward Watson? How shall we hymn appropriately Georgiana Goddard King, Lily Ross Taylor, Charles Mitchell, Berthe Marti, Max and Martha Diez? A true list of honor such as this borders on a Homeric catalogue.

Let these brief tales and those that follow serve as salute to the entire Bryn Mawr faculty whose talent, energy, and sense of adventure have brought them, and the College, to where we are today.

—PHL

Gilman [President of The Johns Hopkins University] says: "Give every professor and teacher a private study room if you have space to spare. Stick them in wherever you can—rooms of 15x20 down to 6x10—wherever you can make them fit."

FRANCIS T. KING

Members of the Faculty, it is not by chance that we find ourselves charged with the duty of more immediately conducting the affairs of this College. You have been chosen with full confidence in your ability, your learning, your aptness to teach, and in your high personal fitness for the task before us. I give you joy of your position and your calling.

JAMES E. RHoads

The faculty is genuinely powerful at Bryn Mawr and power is time consuming.

MARION EDWARDS PARK
And every faculty plays many parts,
Their acts being seven stages. At first new recruits
Molting and toiling on the trustees' terms
And then the patient teachers, in their bondage
And academic zeal, pleading with the Board
For some authority. And then as rebels
Raging like a torrent, with explosive letters
Sent to the Public Ledger. Then the victors
Full of new pride, hastening back to work,
Jealous in honor, sudden and quick in debate,
Seeking the bubble Publication. . . .

A faculty, springing full-armed upon the campus and being both
more and less than flesh and blood, is not subject to such natural
processes as birth and death, but still it shares with poor mortals the
possibility of growth and change even without their imperative decline
and fall. The ways in which the Bryn Mawr College faculty came of
age during its first thirty years reflect both the times and the peculiar
nature of the institution, founded in the Quaker spirit of enlightened
service and attended by young women of unusual courage and deter-
mination. Between these two irresistible forces stood the first faculty,
six young men and three young women, all highly trained in their spe-
cialties and with advanced degrees from Johns Hopkins, Princeton,
London, Leipzig, Munich, and Zurich, but for the most part new to
teaching and full of ideas.

It was perhaps only logical that the trustees who built the College,
hired its faculty, devised its program, set its admission requirements,
and established its curriculum should in the early years continue to con-
trol every aspect of the College's life, using the faculty like other em-
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ployees, as agents carrying out their mandate. Thus, for example, faculty members could ask for particular books and journals to be available in the library, but the management of the library was in the hands of the trustees.

Almost a year before the College opened, the minutes of the trustees’ Executive Committee (11/14/84) note that: “An outline of the Courses of Study for the College has been prepared, and submitted to members of the Faculty already appointed, for their advice and suggestions.” (No later minutes record any such additions or changes. Did the faculty members have any advice or suggestions? Or were they rejected out of hand?) The amount of work to be taken by the students was specified as fifteen class-hours weekly, for four years, with not more than nine hours of study daily. In consequence, what the faculty found to do in its first faculty meeting (9/19/85) was largely implementation of this program: setting the Monday–Friday lecture schedule, the amount of the student preparation for each class, the grading policy, and criteria for the award of graduate fellowships. Not competent to make changes or grant exceptions to the trustees’ program, the faculty was obliged to seek approval from the Executive Committee in even comparatively minor and academic matters. Thus in the Executive Committee minutes (4/13/88) “the recommendation of the Faculty that Mabel Clark be allowed to substitute one year and a half of Latin already studied by her for one year of required History, with the reasons therefor, was considered and approved.” By the following fall when the faculty was obliged to send on a student petition asking permission to graduate without the sixtieth hour because of a professor’s illness, daring greatly they also moved (10/5/88) “to petition the Trustees to delegate to the Faculty the power of making such alterations as seem good to the Faculty in regard to the scheme laid down by the Trustees insofar as such changes do not radically affect the plan of studies intended by the Trustees.” The modesty of the faculty’s expectations is indicated by their rejection of a proposed amendment: “that the Trustees be petitioned to define the powers they wish to delegate to the Faculty.”

The deliberations of the trustees concerning faculty powers are somewhat muted in the minutes of both Executive Committee and Board, but James Rhoads, as both trustee and president and therefore both sitting with the trustees and presiding over the faculty, had a particular concern and wrote later that same month in his annual report: “As it is very difficult to define the powers to be granted to the Faculty, a body deeply interested in the College, yet liable to continual change, I would suggest that the subject be referred to a Committee, perhaps the Executive Committee, who may have opportunity to give it defi-
nite consideration, and report at a future time." The Executive Com-
mittee did discuss and floated various resolutions during November
and December, and we get a glimpse of one trustee's attitude from a
letter (1/3/89) written by James Whitall to his niece, then Dean
Thomas, who had apparently been worried about her own place in the
chain of command:

Thine of 1st is rec'd. The history of those resolutions has been
a very curious one from the start. As finally shaped, they offer
the Faculty no power whatever. The Faculty may say "Thank
you for nothing. We asked bread and you give us a stone." We
have got on well for three and a half years without any such
rules, the Faculty receiving their powers from the authorities
above them, resident at the College; and this is the right
source for them to derive their powers from. . . . Thy exer-
cise of various powers has grown up by an unwritten consti-
tution, which is the best kind for thee. I doubt very much
whether the Trustees will pass on any resolutions. . . .

The trustees did pass a resolution, more like a stone than bread:

That the Faculty shall have power to carry into effect the plan
for admission, instruction and examination of students em-
-bodied in the program for 1888 in harmony with the present
general organization and management of the College. If par-
ticular cases arise in which modification of this plan seem nec-
essary, the Faculty may make modifications of it, subject to
the approval of the President, who shall report such action to
the Executive Committee; but any changes that would alter
the general scheme must be submitted to the Executive Com-
mittee. In any case of doubt arising under these rules,
whether a subject shall be submitted to the Executive Com-
mittee or not, the President, or in his absence, the Dean shall
decide.

The resulting weakness of the faculty's position became clear some
three months later (3/89) when the Class of 1889 petitioned for exemp-
tion from the French and German examinations required for gradu-
ation. When the president ruled that the faculty was not competent to
act, faculty members appointed a committee to urge on the trustees the
abandonment of the special degree examinations in French and Ger-
man. The trustees resolved (3/8/89) that "while the Trustees desire al-
ways to give respectful, and as far as their judgment will allow, favor-
able consideration to any recommendation of the Faculty, they are not
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prepared at present to accede to the request of the students and the recommendation of the Faculty respecting it."

Battle lines had thus been drawn before the College was five years old, with the faculty squarely in the middle between an authoritarian Board and a vociferous student body. The Board’s power was unlimited in still another area, that of faculty appointments and tenure. Of one appointee in 1888 the minutes (6/8/88) read: “He has been informed of the religious position of the College, and the attitude of the Trustees towards the subjects of war and peace, and has signified his general concurrence with them.” Already in 1885 the Executive Committee of the Board was firm in enforcing the College’s contractual rights (12/5/85):

A request was laid before the Committee by Dr. Edmund B. Wilson to be released from his engagement as Associate Professor of Biology, in order to accept a position as Director of a private laboratory of biological research and the editorship of a new journal of Biology. . . . After careful consideration the Committee decided to recommend to the Board of Trustees that in view of the importance of maintaining intact the Faculty to the College, and the injurious results which might flow from the precedent of releasing Dr. Wilson from his contract, his request be respectfully declined.

It was so voted by the trustees, but when almost six years later Edmund Wilson wrote resigning to take up a professorship at Columbia, the trustees accepted the resignation, perhaps because as a full professor he had no fixed term. Later, Woodrow Wilson’s demand to be released from his contract in July, 1888, on the ground that the College had not fulfilled its part was met with a vote of the trustees (7/6/88) “that it is the unanimous opinion of the Board that the contract between Dr. Woodrow Wilson and the Trustees is binding on both parties; but inasmuch as Dr. Wilson entertains a doubt as to the validity of the agreement, the Trustees acquiesce in his withdrawal from the College.”

Gradually, as time went on, the Board granted faculty members more consideration, while still keeping a tight grip on the reins (3/14/92): “In view of the fact that Dr. Herbert W. Smyth has received a call to a university with very advantageous conditions attached to it, [the Executive Committee] voted to recommend that the Trustees advance Dr. H. W. Smyth’s salary from $1700 a year to $2500 a year, and that his title be Professor of Greek.” They were also to consider the possibility of relieving him of elementary Greek and giving him a larger house. Then when in 1900 this same Professor Smyth sought release
from his contract to take up a position at a salary of $4000, the Board minutes read (12/21/00): "After careful consideration, it was the judgment of the Board that, in the interests of the College, his request to be released from his agreement could not be granted, but it was decided that the salary of Professor Smyth should be increased to $4000, per annum, beginning with the College year 1901-02." When a few weeks later Smyth wrote that he had been offered a full professorship at Harvard, the trustees accepted his resignation (3/01/01) "with profound regret and directed the President of the College to convey to Professor Smyth the sincere thanks of the Trustees of Bryn Mawr College for his twelve years of faithful and successful service . . . and their cordial appreciation of the scholarly reputation he has won for himself and for the Greek Department of the College during this time."

Some relaxation on the academic front as well appears in the nineties, perhaps because the press of business resulting from a rapidly expanding college made continual faculty applications for permission and approval of exceptions and changes too burdensome. So in a faculty meeting (4/27/92),

the President informed the Faculty of the resolution of the Board of Trustees appointing an Academic Council, the object of which shall be that the President and Dean may consult the members of the Council upon the organization of the general courses of study, the general running of the College and the welfare of the students, especially as to their progress in their College studies and their fitness to become candidates for a degree.

Members of the Council were to be appointed by the Board, just as all faculty committees but one were regularly appointed by the president. The exception was the Committee for the Supervision of Entrance Examinations, which was appointed when first established (11/29/98) at the request of the trustees on account of public criticism of the entrance papers, but soon thereafter (11/26/00) the faculty voted to elect one member of the Academic Council each fall.

In 1892 when the faculty was thus granted limited power to advise and consent in curricular matters and degree requirements, the trustees recognized the right of the newly-formed student Society for Self-Government to legislate in matters of student life and conduct. The contrast must have struck many faculty members as ironic, that those whom they professed to guide should take the lead in the exercise of autonomy.

When Dean Thomas took over the presidency in 1894, little appeared
to change in the role of the faculty vis-à-vis that of the trustees. But since she then became chief spokesman for the trustees to the faculty, communication between the two bodies appeared to change in subtle ways. Thus, when President Thomas presented to the trustees an Undergraduate Association petition, forwarded by the Faculty Petitions Committee, that written examinations in French and German be substituted for the “orals,” the minutes note that “the subject was referred to the President with power to act.” (11/18/98) Her way of exercising that power was cavalier; she reported to the faculty that the trustees had voted to reject the petition.

The faculty continued to busy itself with a variety of rulings and the establishment of new committees, so that the first edition of Faculty Rules in 1894 was rapidly superseded by those of 1896 and 1899. The introduction of the new 1903 edition says it contains “such additions as the legislative zeal of the Faculty has made imperative.” For example, the faculty minutes for the first years of the new century show a variety of subjects on which both trustees and faculty took action; faculty nominated graduate fellows for trustee approval; trustees organized a course on law, and the faculty considered its role in the curriculum; trustees introduced graded fees for graduate courses, and a faculty committee recommended a formula of equivalence for lecture and laboratory hours; faculty studied and ruled on the acceptance of College Entrance Examination Board tests for admission, and the trustees gave approval.

Student-faculty relations during these years were perhaps more controversial. When in 1903 the faculty introduced new rules to tighten up the proctoring system for examinations, student indignation led to the formulation of a proposal for an academic honor system which the faculty promptly turned down but which had the desired effect from the students’ point of view of causing the faculty to rescind the new proctor legislation.

Petitions from two students who failed to graduate because of the operation of the Merit Law (half the work for graduation must be the equivalent of 70 or above, with various special provisions for particular programs) came first to the faculty, which rejected them, and then to the trustees, who refused to hear one of them (10/24/05): “as the rules governing the granting of our degrees are adopted and enforced by our Faculty.” The Board did, however, urge the faculty to see to the clarification of “the rules and conditions under which degrees, in course, are granted at Bryn Mawr College.” In connection with these two cases Miss Thomas wrote a long letter to Howard Comfort, the then Chair-
man of the Executive Committee, which is important for its view of the faculty and its powers (5/26/06):

We have as is well-known and recognized everywhere a faculty of very unusual ability. If we except the great universities of the country such as The Johns Hopkins, Harvard, and Columbia it is not overstating the case to say that the present and former professors of Bryn Mawr have contributed more to American scholarship than the faculty of any other college in the United States. . . . The first remark made to me by young Mr. Rockefeller in our first interview was that he would like me to explain why Bryn Mawr being a small college with a very small endowment not to add a college for women was able to attract a faculty whose reputation was known throughout the United States. . . .

Our faculty enjoys a great deal of real academic freedom. There is scarcely any red tape. Our professors do not have to waste time in miserable petty little details which can be done equally well if not better by a secretary at one thousand or twelve hundred dollars a year. . . . But much more important than this is the fact that up to the present time the functions of the faculty and Trustees have never clashed and really wonderful harmony has been preserved for the past twenty-one years. The faculty has performed its duties without interference and among these duties has always recommended to the Trustees students qualified for degrees and whenever in their opinion—and there have been many such cases—students did not fulfill the requirements for a degree adopted by the faculty and trustees jointly they have not received the degree. . . . When [the two students] appealed their cases to the trustees there was absolute confidence on the part of the faculty that the trustees would not consider for a moment the possibility of reversing the decision of the faculty unless a clear case of injustice under the rules of the college could be proved. . . .

I now come to the matter which causes me so much anxiety. It is perfectly clear to me from the attitude of the faculty at the last faculty meeting and from the conversation of individual members that if the Trustees were to discredit the faculty in the eyes of the students and those of the alumnae . . ., the effect on the faculty would be a very serious one. We already pay such small salaries that it would be impossible to hold our faculty if we put them in a position not occupied by
any other first class faculty in the United States, the position of not being considered by the Board of Trustees qualified to act on requirements for a degree.

The faculty too wrote to the Board:

Resolved, therefore, that it is the sense of the Faculty that all petitions relating to such requirements shall be addressed to the Faculty, until the Faculty shall have been formally notified by the Trustees that on account of injustice shown by the Faculty in performing the duties entrusted to it, or for other cause, this prerogative has been taken away.

A further petition to the Board by one of the two students was turned down, and the trustees noted (5/18/06): “that all petitions in reference to degrees should be made directly to the Faculty of the College.”

Even though they were upheld in their jurisdiction by the trustees and protected by the president from responsibilities above and beyond their teaching and research, the faculty might have felt the slight when with the change of the College’s charter in 1906 giving the control of academic matters to the newly organized Board of Directors distinct from the Corporation, the Alumnae Association was given representation on that Board. They carried on, however, as the College continued to flourish under Miss Thomas’ brilliant and progressive leadership. The College was already ten times its original size and had added five new residence halls, a science building, a library, a new gymnasium, and a central heating plant, as well as a variety of faculty residences and athletic facilities. At the celebration of the College’s twenty-fifth anniversary notable educators from an impressive array of institutions paid tribute to the high standards achieved by that indomitable, if not always harmonious, quartet: careful trustees, a rigorous faculty, resolute students, and Miss Thomas.

A new power struggle between faculty and students erupted in the fall of 1914 when the faculty, distressed by the number of students cutting classes and by the casual attitude toward attendance, introduced a rule which involved grade reductions of varying severity for all unexcused cuts. One wonders on reading the following petition of the Undergraduate Association whether the faculty was as surprised and shocked at the student reaction as the students had been startled and offended by the faculty action:

Whereas a rule regarding the regulation of attendance at lectures has lately been imposed upon the undergraduates; and

Whereas the undergraduates feel that this rule was brought on
by an undue amount of cutting, owing to a misunderstanding on the part of the students as to the Faculty point of view regarding cutting; and Whereas the undergraduates feel that the statistics on which the cut rule is based misrepresent the actual number of unexcused cuts taken, since owing to the aforesaid misunderstanding many cuts which might have been excused were taken as unexcused cuts; and Whereas the undergraduates feel that, knowing the Faculty attitude as they now do, they will themselves be able to regulate cutting accordingly . . . ; Therefore, the Undergraduate Association of Bryn Mawr College respectfully petitions the Faculty of Bryn Mawr (1) that the rule regarding attendance at lectures be repealed; (2) that a period of probation be granted, during which the students may have the opportunity to convince the Faculty of the College that, with the present understanding of the Faculty attitude, cutting can be regulated as satisfactorily by the undergraduates as by a rule regarding attendance at lectures; (3) that the period of probation include the remainder of the year 1914-15.

After long discussion the faculty passed a revised rule. Their reply to the students was: “The Faculty, after carefully considering the petition of the Undergraduate Association continues of the opinion that it is inexpedient to leave the regulation of attendance at classes to the student body.” The faculty, however, modified its rule for the year 1914-15 to read that there would be no stated penalty for the first eight unexcused cuts in a semester, but that there would be grade-reduction penalties for additional cuts. The faculty expressed “the hope that no large percentage of the undergraduate body will avail itself of the number of cuts mentioned.” The undergraduate response was not only a query as to the meaning of the ominous “no stated penalty” but also an expression of the feeling “that the sense of individual responsibility which freedom from rules at Bryn Mawr has always fostered should be maintained” and that they “could not regard the rule as altered as a solution of the question” and that they thought it right to ask for reasons why the faculty “thought it inexpedient to leave the regulation of attendance at classes to the student body.” The answer given by the faculty was that the action they had taken was final and there would be no further communication on the subject. So, of course, the students sent an even more elaborate petition to the Board which was signed by 354 of the 365 undergraduates. The Board, careful and wise as ever, referred it to the faculty. What mood and atmosphere prevailed on cam-
pus for the next six months is not recorded in any minutes, but after at least two stormy sessions, the faculty ruled (6/1/15) that class attendance should be the concern of the individual instructor to handle as he deemed best, after announcing his expectations and policy to the class. The undergraduates graciously resolved "that the Faculty be informed that the Undergraduate Association considers the recent action of the Faculty in regard to the rule for attendance at lectures an adequate solution of the difficulty of regulating attendance. . . ."

The timing of this full-scale confrontation and effort to exercise the faculty's authority is perhaps significant since the restiveness which led to the Great Revolt of 1916 must have been growing for some time and finding various less drastic outlets of this sort. In general, the beginnings and growth of acute faculty discontent with their powerlessness are obscure, partly because so many of its manifestations were privately or orally expressed and partly because evidence thereof which surfaced during the outbreak itself may often have been based on less than impartial memory. So in the informal discussions (4/1/16) among president, deans, and full professors following the professors' request for improvement in their situation, Miss Thomas stated that she was herself in hearty accord with such reform, and had for five years desired that the government of the College might be made more democratic. She questioned how far the Directors would be willing to go. She herself is probably more radical as to these matters than the Directors."

And in the notes added by the professor who kept the minutes of that discussion we read: "President Thomas' statement that for five years she had desired that the government of the College might become more democratic should be considered in conjunction with a conversation Professor Barton had with her in April, 1912, in which he urged that the Senate or a Committee of Professors be given a voice in determining questions which affected the personal liberty of professors, such as prohibiting summer teaching. She then declared it would never do to give a man's colleagues a voice in such matters."

As far as concerns more objective evidence of the circumstances that led to the active outbreak, perhaps the first item is the publication in early 1916 by the American Association of University Professors of recommendations concerning faculty rights and responsibilities. It was apparently as a result of the Executive Committee's study of these that on January 21, 1916, the Board adopted a series of form letters defining faculty appointments in detail, including a slightly relaxed version of the no-teaching-in-summer-school rule. That the faculty was equally moved by the AAUP recommendations and even emboldened for the
first time formally to ask for action is clear from the March 29th letter signed by thirteen full professors:

Dear Miss Thomas,

The present method of making and terminating appointments of members of the teaching staff at Bryn Mawr College has for several years excited much unfavorable comment which has been detrimental to the best interests of the college. It seems to us that some remedy is needed, and that this would in some measure be provided if we might adopt the "Practical Proposals" approved on January 1, 1916, by the American Association of University Professors and printed on pp. 40-2 of its Bulletin. In particular, we believe it highly desirable that a standing committee of five senior professors, to be elected by the professors and associate professors, be consulted before any official action is taken on the reappointment or refusal of reappointment of members of the teaching staff, and that no action be taken contrary to a four-fifths vote of this committee. We also believe it very desirable that representatives of the faculty, to be nominated by the professors and associate professors, be given a seat and a vote on the Board of Directors.

The explanation for what appears to be slowness to act on the part of the professors may be the kind of deliberation that tends to characterize the dispatch of academic business. What seems finally to have galvanized them into action at this particular time was the need to make their move before the press anticipated it, since around March 16 the Public Ledger of Philadelphia sent to various Bryn Mawr alumnae, faculty members, and others a letter seeking confirmation and increased knowledge of what it called "a state of intimidation in the college in which no one ventures to speak in protest, and [in which] members feel that their opportunities for a wholesome, untrammeled, sound and progressive academic career is menaced." The letter instanced in some detail the way in which an associate professor of Romance Languages had failed to win promotion or even to be assured of continuing employment despite a distinguished scholarly reputation and a fine teaching record. Other similar cases were outlined. Taking a high moral tone, the Public Ledger urged a public inquiry:

Questions might be framed to evoke from the President and Trustees of Bryn Mawr a statement as to whether they regard it as a purely private and proprietary institution or one "af-
fected with a public use,” and subject to public scrutiny. Questions might elicit a statement as to whether the President and Trustees should accord to members of the Faculty full freedom of speech in criticism of what they believe to be autocratic methods.

That the Public Ledger received a large response to its letters is evident from the two articles that appeared prominently on April 12 and 13. The first used the Board of Directors’ meeting on March 30 and its appointment of a committee to formulate a response to the March 29th letter as a peg on which to hang their exposé, which was fueled by alumnae answers to, and expansions of, the “fishing” letters of mid-March. In the interest of fairness, or the appearance thereof, the article concluded with a statement from Miss Thomas, to whom the proof of the article had been shown:

It is the old story of the autocratic and arbitrary college president, over whose devoted head break all the storms of abuse of successive generations of discontented alumnae who wish the college in which they studied happily twenty or thirty years ago to remain forever unchanged; of discontented students who are forever insisting on change; of discontented professors whose teaching is not appreciated and whose salaries do not equal their own opinion of their merits. Whatever is done or left undone, it is the poor college president who is blamed for it. . . . And so we college presidents all have to take our turn in the pillory—President Jordan, of Leland Stanford, Jr. University; President Van Hise, of Wisconsin; President Butler, of Columbia; not to mention some of my confreres in Pennsylvania institutions nearer home. . . . The whole system is radically wrong. Professors should be made to share our burden with us. Trustees and college presidents should no longer shoulder alone the responsibility of maintaining the teaching and research of any given college at the highest possible level. Pedagogues who cannot teach and lazy scholars who have gone to seed have no place in a live college. Let their fellow professors help to turn such misfits into less harmful activities. I confidently believe that the college professors of the country would rise to these responsibilities if they were placed on them. It is my hope that at Bryn Mawr we shall be able to solve this most difficult problem of all college administrations in a way adapted to our individual needs.
The second Public Ledger article quoted letters from seven professors in various institutions who had complaints about the treatment they had received at Bryn Mawr. No letters from current members of the Bryn Mawr faculty were printed, presumably because although the Ledger found them useful in filling out the details of their story it eschewed their publication to avoid giving the lie to the charge of intimidation.

In the meantime the Board committee was working quietly, meeting various individuals and groups of faculty members and alumnae, and consulting elsewhere. Although most of the charges which had been made were against “the arbitrary and dictatorial conduct” of Miss Thomas, members of the Board may have been spurred to resolute action in order to erase any impression that they were not fully in control. Of the committee’s work only the masterly results survive; they recommended (5/19/16) to the Board three principles: “1. Faculty representation at meetings of the Board of Directors; 2. A committee elected by the Faculty to make recommendations to the Directors as to reappointments and terminations of appointments; 3. Provisions safeguarding the tenure of office of full professors after a certain number of years of service.” Their formulation of the Plan of Government which incorporated these principles was introduced thus: “The Board of Directors of Bryn Mawr College, recognizing the primary responsibility of the Faculty in academic matters and in the maintenance of high professional standards among its members, and wishing to emphasize this responsibility as well as to promote closer cooperation between the Directors, the President and Faculty, have adopted the following plan for the government of the College.”

The whole plan, as passed by the Board, was reported in the Public Ledger the next day, together with some faculty reaction. According to the minutes of the faculty meetings, during the following days the plan was debated, amended in minor ways with the approval of the Board, and accepted with dignified alacrity. And to judge from Miss Thomas’ remarks at Commencement on June 2, hers was a peaceable quiescence once again:

During the past four years Bryn Mawr has been busily setting its house in order and like all thorough house-cleaning the process has been somewhat unpleasant for those of us who live in the house. Indeed some of our linen that we ourselves did not know was dirty has been washed on the housetops and for us a wilderness of skeletons that we did not know were housed in our many college closets have been persuaded to
stalk abroad horribly clanking their chains. But after all the only thing that really matters for the college is to have our sheets clean and smelling of lavender and our closets full of sun and air. And that is, I believe, what has been accomplished during these four years.

She proceeded then to set the Great Revolt in a context of other changes, in the undergraduate curriculum, in the addition of two new graduate professional departments, and in the new student sense of responsibility arising out of the student-faculty confrontation over class attendance. Obviously, it was as if all these changes had been meant from the foundation and every change was for the best in the best of all possible colleges. And surprisingly, this seems in large part to have been true. Not only has the 1916 Plan of Government with its built-in flexibility proved equal to the needs of the College as it quadrupled in size but also it has fostered the spirit of community that characterizes interrelations and activities both within and between the College’s various constituent parts. On the ripeness-is-all principle perhaps the very length of time it took for the Bryn Mawr faculty and Board to come to terms and mutual understanding has made their alliance so productive of both institutional integrity and intramural civility.

Although the Public Ledger’s June 2, 1916, editorial may have been written in self-congratulation on the power of the press, it has proved prophetic as well:

The housecleaning, President Thomas intimates, puts the institution in a leading position in the government of American colleges. The example of Bryn Mawr’s reform... could not but be salutary in numerous cases of other colleges which the American Association of University Professors was and is investigating. We sincerely trust that this institution for young women, which a great woman has built up and bowed her spirit in submission to strengthen, will continue in the forefront of the nation’s progress.

How in the next sixty-plus years Bryn Mawr College did so continue not only in matters academic but also in its achievement of democratic government can be most quickly and dramatically demonstrated by a survey of the ways in which successive presidents were chosen. After the Great Revolt, unilateral Board action as with the selection of Dr. Rhoads and Miss Thomas was obviously no longer possible. In 1921 when the Board expressed its willingness “to meet in conference either the Faculty Representatives to the Board or a committee of three specially appointed by the Faculty,” the faculty re-
quested its representatives to ask the Board to define exactly the nature of its “constitutional participation in the selection of Administrative officers.” After much consideration the Board voted (4/15/21) that it was “inadvisable for the Faculty of the College to be given authority in the matter of the selection of administrative officers.” The faculty was to be consulted; that was enough. How the faculty responded to Miss Thomas’ inclusion on the committee appointed to choose her successor is not recorded.

By 1939, when again it was necessary to seek a new president, the Board selection committee invited the faculty to form a committee with which it might confer. That the gesture was somewhat tentative is suggested by a statement made at the end of the successful search (11/28/41): “What began as a rather experimental procedure developed into a close and harmonious partnership.” So the faculty won a measure of control over the future leadership of the College and in this matter reversed the order in which power had been granted in the early days first to students, then to alumnae, and only later to the faculty. For it was only in 1968 that a presidential search committee included alumnae and students as well as faculty and Board members. Moreover, there was no longer any question of either separate or merely joint action; all members met and worked together, and all votes were equal.

Finally in 1977 the new presidential search committee co-opted a member from the only remaining sector of the College community, the Staff Association, which all employees of the College other than faculty were eligible to join. With six Board members, five faculty members, four students, six alumnae, and one staff member making up the committee, democracy was rampant, and the future could bring only questions about the proportions of representation and the extent to which the committee’s recommendation should be submitted not only to the Board for final action but also to all other bodies represented on the committee as well. That even these questions will be worked out peaceably, but volubly and at length, is most likely from Bryn Mawr’s fortunate combination of small size, intramural habits of easy communication, and regard for reason and fairness.

In any event, Bryn Mawr’s hundred-year power struggle, mostly polite and not always simply academic, is typical of much that has occurred in many American educational institutions, where faculties have gained almost complete control over educational aspects and left to boards only difficult matters like funding and external relations. Having won such power, these faculties will be wise to heed words spoken to the Bryn Mawr faculty by Miss Park shortly before her retirement (10/14/41): “You who can aim the monkey wrench so deftly must never use it.”
Desirable Elements: Refugee Professors at Bryn Mawr in the Thirties and Forties

From the start, Bryn Mawr had international connections. Two of its first faculty were imported from abroad: the distinguished mathematician from England, Charlotte Angas Scott, and Jean Jacques Stürzinger from Switzerland. Hermann Collitz, from Germany, joined the faculty as Professor of German in 1886. Almost every member of the first faculty had studied abroad. Scholarship cannot be other than a multi-lingual, multi-national endeavor, and those who represent it necessarily partake of a community whose boundaries, where they exist, are of other kinds than geographical.

There was, however, in the thirties and forties of this century, and somewhat later as well, a sharp challenge to the mutual responsibility of this community. The Fascist and Nazi persecution of those whom they represented as "undesirable elements" in an Aryan world led to a concerted effort on the part of American educators and philanthropists to accommodate and to welcome refugee scholars. Felix Gilbert, himself a representative of the extraordinary men and women who came to this country at that time, recounts the role which Bryn Mawr played in this effort, the vision and courage of President Park, the corresponding courage and contributions of the emigré faculty who then so enriched the college with their teaching and presence. Those who heard the unforgettable lectures of the philosopher, Erich Frank, who studied sociology with Hertha Kraus, or mathematics with Emmy Noether, or art history with Richard Bernheimer, to mention only a few, knew themselves fortunate that Europe's nightmare should bring such unusual opportunity into their classrooms. For the students, it was a widening of intellectual parameters perhaps best summed up by the Class
of 1947's appreciative yearbook comment on the author of this essay: "Dr. Gilbert's omniscience provides us with a universal outlook, not unenlivened by biographical anecdotes of the world's great."

So many themes, as well as personalities, are background to the story that Felix Gilbert tells: the availability of the Flexner lectureship to introduce Erich Frank to the community, to give the chance to Erwin Panofsky to formulate one of his most brilliant works on Renaissance art; the Quaker ethic, active in the establishment of a home in Haverford for European refugees; the attraction provided by Bryn Mawr's graduate school for European faculty used to higher-level and more specialized instruction; the undergraduate and alumnae energies and appreciation which supported administrative negotiations with foreign scholars and paralleled them in raising funds for student refugees; the flexibility and conniving of individual departments within the college and the cooperation with neighboring institutions to employ, to everyone's benefit, these unusual academic persons; above all, the ability of a small college to make its foreign faculty an integral part of the community, restoring them to that commonwealth of culture to which they truly belonged.

—PHL

She liked walking in the country so we started across an open field behind the college. I soon realized that we were heading straight for a rail fence. Miss Noether was immersed in a mathematical discussion and went merrily along, all of us walking at a good clip. . . . On we marched right up to the fence and without missing a word in her argument she climbed between the rails and on we went.

EMMY NOETHER AT BRYN MAWR

In the judgement of the most competent living mathematicians, Fräulein Noether was the most significant creative mathematical genius thus far produced since the higher education of women began.

ALBERT EINSTEIN
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M ost of the schol ars driven out of Germany by the Nazi regime for political and racial reasons emigrated to the United States. The distance of America from Europe, over which the threatening shadow of Hitler was spreading, made the United States psychologically attractive. Moreover, there were many compelling reasons for scholars to believe that their best chances for continuing an academic career existed in the United States. Since the times of Woodrow Wilson and the First World War, the United States was thought to be the principal protagonist of democracy, and as such, naturally antagonistic to the Nazi dictatorship. The idea of academic freedom in the sense of freedom from outside pressure was highly prized in higher education in the United States. Furthermore, the feeling that all scholars belonged to a single community was strong in the United States, at least stronger than in European countries, where the distinct national character had traditionally impressed itself on the development of academic disciplines. European universities had formed the pattern according to which, in the later part of the nineteenth century, the religiously endowed American colleges and universities became transformed into modern universities with graduate schools. Indeed, in the second part of the nineteenth and the early years of the twentieth century, a number of European scholars, many from Great Britain, but also from the European continent, had come to the States and held chairs at American universities. The composition of the faculties of American academic institutions was much more international than that of most European universities.

But the United States appeared as a possible asylum to German academics escaping the Nazi regime for practical reasons as well. In contrast to Europe, with its relatively few institutions of higher education, the United States had a large number of universities and colleges. And
in contrast to most European universities where each field generally has only one representative on the faculty—the full professor—and who as such has the only salaried tenure position in the area of his specialization, the faculties of American colleges and universities with their gradations of rank—assistant, lecturer, professor—allow flexibility and can offer the possibility of temporary employment.

Unfortunately, the prospects of academic employment in the United States in the 1930s were not as great as they might have seemed from Europe. When the Nazi policy of removing “undesirable elements” from academic life began, the United States was still feeling the effects of the economic collapse of 1929. Young American scholars had difficulties in obtaining academic employment, and it was clear that the influx of academic refugees whose absorption under normal circumstances might have caused no insuperable difficulties now represented a serious problem. There were simply not enough jobs for well-qualified people. To find positions for European refugees required systematic organization with financial support of foundations. So, under the sponsorship of the Institute of International Education in New York, an Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Scholars was formed in May of 1933, and received from a variety of foundations, particularly from the Rockefeller Foundation, financial support for placing German refugee scholars in American academic institutions. From the outset Marion Park, the President of Bryn Mawr College, served on the General Committee of this organization.¹

The traditions of Bryn Mawr College made administration and faculty sensitive to the plight of academic refugees. M. Carey Thomas had strongly supported the American women’s movement and under her presidency Bryn Mawr gained a progressive outlook which remained dominant under following presidents. Marion Park, in speeches which she made in the 1930s, emphasized the need for maintaining democracy in the threatened contemporary world: “Out of Bryn Mawr should go in each graduate a thoughtful but a prompt and persistent fighter for democracy.”² As part of this liberal progressive outlook, along with the Quaker tradition, Bryn Mawr was free from the covert anti-Semitism which existed at other academic institutions. Moreover, Bryn Mawr,

² For Miss Park’s speech on the need to maintain democracy, see her address delivered at the opening of the College, October, 1938.
with a graduate school established after European, notably German, models, was inclined to regard scholarship as a common enterprise of all nations, and had always a great number of scholars trained in European countries. In the college calendar for the academic year 1933/34, i.e., the year when Hitler came to power, there were, in a faculty of sixty, ten with degrees acquired abroad, and sixteen with long experiences of study abroad.

Of course, the tight financial situation set limits for what could be done at Bryn Mawr for German scholars seeking refuge in the United States. The possibilities of finding places for them at Bryn Mawr encountered other obstacles. Such were well indicated in a letter which, on January 31, 1939, Miss Park wrote to the President of Columbia University, Nicholas Murray Butler. He had sent to her a “declaration of principles” on which a number of university presidents had agreed. It stated that in making additions to a faculty, quality ought to be the decisive criterion, but under the present circumstances in cases in which the merits of two candidates—the one an American, the other a German refugee—were equal, the position ought to be given to the American. Temporary appointments, however, might be suitable for refugee scholars because they might give them the possibility to become acquainted with the United States and find appropriate positions somewhere in the country. The impression Miss Park’s answer left is that, although she was in general agreement with the declaration of principle, she considered it as somewhat remote from reality and illusionistic: “In the small college such as Bryn Mawr, where there is less room for the specialist and where members of the faculty most often teach at several levels of instruction, the problem of permanent addition to the staff is always difficult, and that of the refugee particularly so. I should greatly welcome such a plan as you present if it can be financed for any length of time. I do not need to say that one of the toughest problems has been the disposition of a visiting professor whose stipend expires and who cannot be absorbed in the teaching staff.” 1 These sentences reflect something of Bryn Mawr’s experiences with the German refugee scholars who had joined the faculty.

In the decades which followed Hitler’s rise to power, Bryn Mawr College had on its faculty three German scholars recognized as leaders in their fields: Emmy Noether, Eva Fiesel, Erich Frank.

1 Quotations from Miss Park’s letters come from her papers in the Archives of Bryn Mawr College.
The first, and also the greatest, German refugee scholar who joined the Bryn Mawr faculty was Emmy Noether. She was Visiting Professor of Mathematics at Bryn Mawr for two academic years, 1933/34 and 1934/35; she died in April 1935, before the second year had ended. The obituary notice in the faculty minutes said that "in her chosen field in mathematics she was surpassed by none. To her chiefly is due the development of modern abstract algebra which is assuming such an important role in modern mathematics." This view of Emmy Noether's importance was amply confirmed in the memorial address which Hermann Weyl, one of the greatest mathematicians of the twentieth century, delivered in Goodhart Hall on April 26, 1935. He ended with a comparison between Emmy Noether and Sonya Kovalevskaya, "the other woman mathematician of world renown." "Emmy Noether without doubt possessed by far the greater power, the greater scientific talent. . . . Two traits determined above all her nature: first the native productive power of her mathematical genius. . . . Second, her heart knew no malice. She did not believe in evil—indeed it never entered her mind that it could play a role among men."

Emmy Noether was one of the very few women who had attained professorial rank in Germany. She taught at the University of Göttingen, world-famous for its mathematicians; she was well-known when, dismissed by the Nazi government, she came to United States. Professor Lefschetz of Princeton University turned to Professor Anna Wheeler, Chairman of the Bryn Mawr Mathematics Department, suggesting that Miss Noether should be invited to Bryn Mawr. Financial difficulties were quickly overcome when the Emergency Committee offered for her salary $2000 and indicated that another $2000 would be forthcoming from the Rockefeller Foundation. It was not expected that Emmy Noether would do any undergraduate teaching during her first year. But she might advise students and teach a mathematics seminar for graduate students of Bryn Mawr and of the University of Pennsylvania. In her second year she offered a graduate course in her particular field, algebra.

Emmy Noether's coming to Bryn Mawr is revealing for a number of reasons. First of all it shows that if it had been difficult for women to attain a university position in Germany, the situation in the United States also had its complications. The best-known private universities

---


5 The suggestion by Professor Lefschetz that Bryn Mawr employ Emmy Noether may be found in a letter from Miss Park to E. R. Murrow of the Institute of International Education, July 11, 1933.
in the United States were educating male undergraduates and the faculties of these institutions were exclusively male, even if a few female students were admitted to their graduate schools. And with the exception of Bryn Mawr College, the most important women’s colleges had no graduate schools; it was clear, however, that the few women scholars who had succeeded in becoming members of the faculties of German universities could become fully useful only if they could teach on an advanced level.

It was natural, therefore, that mathematicians like Professor Lefschetz turned to Bryn Mawr in their search for a position for Miss Noether. But it was also obvious that at least in her first year Miss Noether’s teaching was primarily on the graduate level and therefore in the general context of the college curriculum of restricted usefulness. After two years, when the financial support which Miss Noether had received from the Emergency Committee and the Rockefeller Foundation had ended, Miss Park tried to find further financial support so that Miss Noether could remain at Bryn Mawr; she explained in a letter of December 27, 1934, that, as much as possible, the available resources for graduate scholarships had been concentrated on students who would work with Miss Noether and she stated that Miss Noether had had five students in her seminar on mathematical theory. She also explained why Bryn Mawr needed financial support to keep Miss Noether: “Under ordinary circumstances the college itself could have set aside from its budget, if not all, at least a good part of the salary of so remarkable a woman teacher. Much as I wish to I cannot in good conscience offer to do this in a year when the percentage of every college salary is being (I hope temporarily) withheld in order to keep within the budget.” It had been possible to secure a certain amount of Miss Noether’s salary from private sources and a new application to the Emergency Committee was pending when she died in April 1935.

Two months before Miss Noether’s death Miss Park had received a letter, dated February 12, 1935, from Professor Prokosch of Yale University in which he explained that in that same year, Dr. Eva Fiesel had come as a research assistant to the Linguistics Department of Yale University “to continue her extremely valuable studies in Etruscan.” During the preceding year the general education board of the Rockefeller Foundation had financed her research in the British Museum and in Italy and shared in the salary which she received from the Yale Linguistics Department, but the administration of Yale University felt unable to continue supporting Eva Fiesel’s work, and the members of the Linguistics Department were eager “to help her to find a position elsewhere.” Professor Prokosch explained that “Mrs. Fiesel possesses the
most complete collection of Etruscan inscriptions in existence. . . .

There is indeed a strong probability that she may at least solve the riddle of the Etruscan language. In addition to that she is a thoroughly trained Indo-European linguist and also has had very good training in the field of German literature. . . Dr. Fiesel looks entirely Aryan to use the unpleasant jargon of present-day German politics. She is, however, on one side of her family, non-Aryan, and this caused her dismissal from the faculty of the University of Munich." Professor Prokosch added that he had been assured that the Emergency Fund would pay her salary for two years.

Miss Park's answer was not encouraging. Professor Prokosch's letter had arrived when Bryn Mawr was applying to the Emergency Committee for renewing the financial support for Miss Noether and at the moment this had to be Bryn Mawr's foremost concern. Moreover, the "Bryn Mawr library is not equipped for any such work as Dr. Fiesel wishes to do and we have not even a room to put at her disposal." However, in the course of the following months various members of the Bryn Mawr Classics Department were in touch with colleagues at Yale and had become convinced that the acquisition of Dr. Fiesel for the Bryn Mawr faculty was highly desirable. Thus, one year later, in February 1936, Miss Park wrote to Dr. Stevens of the Rockefeller Foundation that "the members of several departments of Bryn Mawr College (Latin, Greek, and Classical Archaeology) have asked me to communicate with the Emergency Committee in regard to the possibility of a grant from the Committee which would make possible the residence of Dr. Eva Fiesel at Bryn Mawr. . . . We have, as you may guess, no Department of Linguistics and the students who would work with Dr. Fiesel would undoubtedly be members of the faculty. Professor Carpenter and Professor Swindler of the Department of Archaeology, and Professor Taylor of the Latin Department have already signified this intention. We should notify the faculties and graduate students of neighboring institutions, especially the University of Pennsylvania, of her residency at Bryn Mawr and make her work available for other persons as well."

This application for funds was successful; Dr. Fiesel came to Bryn Mawr as "visiting professor of Archaeology and Linguistics." She offered a Latin seminar and a seminar on Etruscan inscriptions attended by five Bryn Mawr faculty members, one from Haverford, and one from the University of Pennsylvania. Alas, Dr. Fiesel died before this seminar was completed. Scholars in Etruscan studies today still regularly refer to Dr. Fiesel's work, although a solution of the Etruscan puzzle has not been found and new avenues are now being tried. In addi-
tion to Dr. Fiesel's support from the Emergency Committee, her stay at Bryn Mawr was financed by private donors, many of whom had been her colleagues during her stay at Yale. A fund for a Chair of Linguistics at Bryn Mawr was started, evidently with the aim of keeping Dr. Fiesel at Bryn Mawr. As Miss Parks said in her 1936/37 report: "If Dr. Fiesel had lived I think her position at Bryn Mawr would have been a permanent one."

Next to Emmy Noether and Eva Fiesel there was another German refugee who became a member of the Bryn Mawr faculty in the early 1930s: Richard Bernheimer. He was a young Ph.D. who had not yet attained an academic position in Germany when the Nazis came to power and for a number of years his salary at Bryn Mawr was paid by private donors. The situation of art history was very different from that in mathematics and linguistics, and the addition of Bernheimer to the Art History Department encountered no difficulty. In the 1930s, partly under the influence of German refugee scholars like Erwin Panofsky, art history had received a great impetus in American higher education. And with Richard Bernheimer's coming to Bryn Mawr, Bryn Mawr's art history department participated in this development. Although Bernheimer's position as lecturer was changed into an Assistant Professorship on Bryn Mawr's regular budget only in 1939, his position from the beginning was secure.

Whereas Bernheimer's academic future offered no great problems, the situation, as we have seen, was difficult in the cases of Emmy Noether and Eva Fiesel. Considering the difficulties almost all women scholars encountered in American academic life, Bryn Mawr was the appropriate place for these two eminent women scholars. But there was no compelling need to add these two highly specialized scholars to the Bryn Mawr faculty. Nevertheless, it is clear that the intention of the administration and of the faculty was to keep these two scholars permanently at Bryn Mawr; whether these efforts would have been successful one cannot say, because both died while these efforts had just gotten underway.

By the late 1930s the Nazi government had "purged" the German universities and the number of new arrivals of academic refugees shrank. Nevertheless, a number of German academic refugees served on the Bryn Mawr faculty, teaching on a part-time basis when temporary vacancies had occurred. Moreover, the German Department made use of some younger refugees for teaching German language and literature.6

6 Among the German academic refugees serving at Bryn Mawr in tempo-
However, in this later period one older, well-known German refugee scholar came to Bryn Mawr and his appointment came about in a very special way, different even from the manner in which the appointment of similar refugees had been handled in the early 1930s. Erich Frank, together with Jaspers and Husserl, had played an important role in the development of existentialist philosophy. Until 1933 he had taught at the University at Marburg where he had been the successor of Heidegger, and he continued to live there after his dismissal by the Hitler government. He came to the United States at the end of the 1930s, and from 1939 to 1942 he was a research associate at Harvard with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. With the help of the American Philosophical Association of whose Committee in Aid of Exiled Scholars Paul Weiss of the Bryn Mawr Philosophy Department was a member, Frank was invited to Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore for the second semester of the academic year 1939/40. In the first half of this semester he was to be in Bryn Mawr; in the second half in Swarthmore. During his stay in Bryn Mawr he gave a seminar on Aristotle and four public lectures. The success of the seminar, and still more, of the public lectures, was immense. Miss Park described in letters that the audience of the lectures grew from lecture to lecture so that at the end they had to be held in Goodhart Hall. Miss Park tried to persuade the neighboring academic institutions to collect a fund from which a salary for Professor Frank could be paid so that he would be able to settle in the Philadelphia area; she failed. Frank was then invited to give the Flexner Lectures in 1942/43; his topic was philosophy and religion, and these lectures were later published under the title Philosophical Understanding and Religious Truth (1945). Again Frank was a great success and he was then asked to stay in Bryn Mawr as lecturer in Greek, and from 1945 to his death in 1951.
1948, he was visiting professor of philosophy simultaneously at Bryn Mawr College and at the University of Pennsylvania, certainly one of the most popular and beloved teachers at Bryn Mawr during these years. The 1948 Yearbook was dedicated to him.

The story of Erich Frank’s appointment shows that, next to faculty and administration, a third element played a role in the invitation of German refugees to Bryn Mawr: the student body. As Miss Park’s addresses at the openings of the college year show, concern with public affairs was expected from Bryn Mawr undergraduates. It was clear that with the political tension in Europe increasing, with the confrontation between the democratic and Fascist powers in the Spanish Civil War, and with Hitler occupying the Rhineland and Austria, concern about the international situation grew among the students. The particular problem of the German refugees was brought to their attention also by visits of eminent German refugees; Leo Spitzer, an influential Romance Languages scholar who had become professor in Johns Hopkins, gave a seminar in the Bryn Mawr French Department, and Erwin Panofsky was in 1937/38 the Flexner Lecturer and presented to the Bryn Mawr audience the outline of one of his best-known books, Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance (1939). Political excitement then reached a high point with the Czech crisis in September 1938 which almost led to war. When a few weeks later the assassination of a German diplomat in the Paris Embassy by a Jew triggered the so-called Crystal Night in which the synagogues in Germany went up in flames, apartments and stores belonging to Jews were pillaged, and many Jews were killed and imprisoned, sympathy for the victims of Nazi despotism resulted in action; a group of students decided that they ought to give concrete proof of their concern for the fate of their contemporaries in Nazi-dominated Europe. On November 17, 1938, at a meeting of students and faculty, an appeal was made to raise scholarships for two or three German refugee students who could enter Bryn Mawr immediately.7

Miss Park stated that this appeal had her and the administration’s full sympathy. The College would donate the tuition of the students, but scholarships were necessary to cover living expenses. Miss Park promised to give one further scholarship which then was described in the Alumnae Bulletin as a “scholarship for a German exile given by President Park in honor of Josephine Goldmark,” and was intended to be a

7 The College News, November 30, 1938.
graduate scholarship. Miss Park stressed in her speech that, of course, the admission of two or three students was of limited significance considering the size of the problem but had its importance as an expression of opinion on the part of the students of the United States. Within twenty-four hours $1,400—more than necessary for two scholarships—was collected and two German refugee students began to study at Bryn Mawr the same year.

This scholarship program was nationwide. The New York Times reported that it had started in Harvard, but Miss Park, in a letter to President Conant of Harvard University, wrote that the plan had originated in discussions between a Harvard student, Robert Lane, a Bryn Mawr student, Helen Cobb, and was worked out by them together. President Conant answered somewhat coolly that the refugee scholarship scheme "originated either at Bryn Mawr or at Harvard."  

The growing interest of the student body in international affairs is clearly reflected in the Alumnae Bulletin. The "Undergraduate Notes" in the Alumnae Bulletin of January 1939 state: "The interest in current affairs has been developing throughout the year at what seems to us an unprecedented rate," and one year later, in February 1940, we read in the Alumnae Bulletin: "Students at Bryn Mawr are keenly interested in these plans for visiting lectureships by distinguished foreign scholars and are also very active in work on behalf of fellow students and other young people whose lives have been seriously affected by political events in their native lands."

The Josephine Goldmark Graduate Fellowship ended in 1943, the last of the German undergraduates who studied in Bryn Mawr on a refugee scholarship graduated in 1944, and the Emergency Committee formally disbanded on June 1, 1945. With the outbreak of the war in Europe and then with the participation of the United States in this war, the problem of the German academic refugees became swallowed up in the wider problem of those numerous refugees from all countries which the Nazi advance through Europe had created. The various organizations which had helped the academic refugees terminated their activities because, when the war ended, universities and colleges became overcrowded and needed to enlarge their faculties. There was no longer reason to fear that the employment of foreign scholars would prevent young American scholars from being employed. Moreover,

---

3 President Park's letter to President Conant is dated January 9, 1939. Conant's answer is dated February 20, 1939.
those foreign-born scholars who then entered American academic life belonged to a younger generation; they were refugees in the sense that they had left Europe and had come to the United States in order to escape the Nazi regime, but many of them had gone to school in the United States, had studied at American colleges, had served in the army or had had some experiences at American educational institutions. An example of this new situation is Ernst Berliner, who came to Bryn Mawr in February 1944 from Harvard, where he had been a postdoctoral fellow doing war work on anti-malarials.

However, if the problem of the refugees from Germany and Austria waned after the war, there was one European country, Spain, which even after the defeat of Hitler and Mussolini, remained Fascist and in which suppression of intellectual freedom continued. The Bryn Mawr Spanish Department profited from the presence of a number of Spanish intellectuals: José Ferrater Mora came from Chile to the States with a Guggenheim Fellowship and joined the Bryn Mawr faculty in 1930 as lecturer in Spanish and philosophy; from 1933 on, he was only a member of the Philosophy Department; Juan Marichal, who had been a graduate student at Princeton, began teaching at Bryn Mawr in the Spanish Department and then taught in the History Department. Both of these scholars may have come to Bryn Mawr through the encouragement of Pedro Salinas, a famous poet and refugee himself, professor at The Johns Hopkins University, who was a visiting professor at Bryn Mawr in 1948-49, teaching a seminar in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. One might regard these and some other appointments as an indication of the continued existence of an attitude which had been strong and dominant in Bryn Mawr from the beginnings of the college: the combination of a progressive political outlook with the view that scholarship is an enterprise reaching far beyond national borders and based on cooperation of all nations. One might perhaps say that the refugee problem which the Nazi policy had brought about was a test of these convictions and Bryn Mawr's record was good.

Of course, what was done at Bryn Mawr was less than what Harvard, Columbia, Berkeley or Chicago were able to do, but was exceptional compared to Princeton, Duke, Cornell, Brown, or Wisconsin. Miss Park in the letter quoted above emphasized that a small college like Bryn Mawr had only very limited resources for helping the refugees. The difficulties she mentioned—teaching on different levels, the limited usefulness of very specialized courses, and the lack of a scholarly library for such courses—are undeniable. But the letter fails to mention one of the great advantages a small college has, that a member of the faculty is immediately involved in all aspects of college life: de-
partmental meetings, committees, faculty meetings. A faculty member takes part in decisions on all levels; opinions are asked and can be expressed. Every newcomer immediately becomes part of the college in the full sense of the word. It is quite impressive to learn how those who knew Emmy Noether, Eva Fiesel, and Erich Frank intimately all emphasize that these three felt entirely at home at Bryn Mawr and considered their work at Bryn Mawr one of their happiest experiences. That those who joined the Bryn Mawr faculty as refugees found security and satisfaction in their work was in the best of the Bryn Mawr tradition, and the warm feelings which all the refugee scholars who taught at Bryn Mawr had for the College was proof that the College’s high reputation was justified.
KATHARINE HOUGHTON HEPBURN

To Leap

IN KATHARINE HOUGHTON HEPBURN’S POEM, more than in any other offering in this collection, the family is present. It is an important reminder that the bonding between faculty and student is often predicated on the trust and affection known in the earlier community of the home. Nor does the courage to leap begin at college, although encouragement there can be decisive.

This Kate’s mother, the first Katharine Houghton Hepburn, Class of 1899, was, in her own way, as outstanding a woman as her more famous daughter. For the Silver Jubilee Book of her class, the first Kate recounted how she was fulfilling her stated intention to “raise Hell with established customs.” The subsequent account chronicled “her success in woman suffrage” and “her activity . . . as a member of the Executive Board of National Birth Control. . . . And yet she has found time to renew her youth in her golf, her figure skating, driving and dancing.”

The poem that follows is, therefore, really about two Bryn Mawr women. It is also a reminder that artists can use a good education to advantage. Not all artists will go Katharine Hepburn’s route, nor can her extraordinary style be typical—as it may once have been in the popular mind—of the variety Bryn Mawr women represent today. But this Kate’s inherited “zest and zing for life,” demonstrated in a Bryn Mawr career that included the swimming team in her Freshman year and other exploits, as well as in her distinguished career in movies and the theatre, is surely an appropriate note to strike in celebrating the very multiplicity of Bryn Mawr women’s possible roles and the College’s part in their enactment.

—PHL
I have parents who gave me an enormous amount of confidence and they gave me a sort of freedom from fear. They had a great zest and zing for life, and some new ideas on things, and a belief in and enthusiasm for what I was doing. So I was sent out into the world with a tremendous amount of confidence; I was very, very lucky there.

KATHARINE HOUGHTON HEPBURN

QUESTION: “What was drama like when you were here?”

ANSWER: “It was very good, naturally. I played a young man and I had long hair, straight as all of yours. I wore a man’s costume and I went and took the train to the Academy of Music one night in this costume. So I reached in to get the change out of my pocket and I put my hand in my pocket and sat down and I couldn’t get my hand back out. We had some very good actors; I was not, I think, one of them.”

KATHARINE HOUGHTON HEPBURN

88
What does Bryn Mawr mean to you?
What did Bryn Mawr do for you?
    Well—let me see—you understand—
    Bryn Mawr is my college.
    Bryn Mawr was my mother’s college.
To me it stands for:
    THE BEST
    THE MOST
    THE NOTHING IS TOO MUCH TROUBLE
    THE HIGH AIM
    THE DON’T SETTLE FOR LESS
    THE LEARN TO THINK FOR YOURSELF
    THE LEARN TO TALK ENGLISH WITH STYLE
    THEN—DO IT.

President M. Carey Thomas set the pace. Like the truth—it still stands.
I had been tutored for the several years before I went to college.
I lived at home.
I was still simply the second of six children.
Then Bryn Mawr.
I was terrified to find myself among girls of my own age.
I had to fight myself to keep my balance.
    Can I? Should I? Will I?
Now I look back—
    What did Bryn Mawr do for me?
    Oh yes—I can answer that.
It was my springboard into adult life.
Slowly you work your way to the end of the board. You begin to get your balance. You’re getting set for the spring—the leap—the . . .

Oh thank you Dr. Leuba—Miss Donnelly
Dr. and Mrs. Schraeder—Dr. and Mrs. de Laguna
and Dr. Gray—and Samuel Arthur King.
Not to forget Helen Taft Manning and Miss Park.

Good bye . . . I’ve got it . . . I’ve got my balance . . .
Here I go.

And you jump. With some hope of landing on your feet.
COOPERATIVE ACTION in the face of an outside threat, an integrated community achieved by common dedication and shared curiosity—these aspects of Bryn Mawr College as presented by Felix Gilbert and Mabel Lang have shown the student body as a vigorous and vocal part of the institution. But the sense of cooperation among the students themselves was achieved only gradually, as was their sense of connection with the other parts of the collegiate body.

At first, the students were a group apart. Separated from their instructors by their student status, by their age, by their presumable awe, they were also distinguished and protected in their sex from the male majority of their teachers by stringent rules prohibiting any form of association outside the classroom. Time was to mitigate, then abrogate, these rules, and almost every other. But the change in mores and morals is less the focus in Anne Hobson Freeman’s essay than is the actual evolution of the experiment in self-government.

That experiment, not yet concluded, reflects the duality of the College’s character: a cohesive society, an anarchic state. No achievement of self-government was without its concomitant problems of apathy and “the cynic laugh.” Yet the achievements—the chief of which is continuity—are there. Here follows the story of an idea-become-organization, still in process, still an experiment.

—PHL
When, twenty-four years ago, the students of the Bryn Mawr College inaugurated Self-Government their attitude was one of enthusiastic devotion hard to realize today. To them Self-Government stood for freedom and democracy, the watchwords of progress, the special charge of enlightened college women. There are no college women nowadays. We, who have inherited their scheme, are a generation of girls—euphemistically, "students"—with no very high thoughts of civilization or the responsibility of privilege; we regard Self-Government with easy familiarity, as who should say—"our foible!"... Our foremost enemy has been the cynic laugh.

_TIPYN O' BOB_

Bloomers of gymnasium suits or bloomers of equal fullness may be worn without a skirt by a student only when going directly to the Athletic Fields or Gymnasium and returning directly to her Hall of Residence... No men's clothing or bathing caps shall be worn by the students on campus or in public parts of the halls without being covered... Stockings may not be worn rolled down... Students must not lie on the upper campus.

_BRYN MAWR STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT 1922-23_

It will be surprising to those who have been fed on stories of this sort to know that in the last three years less than half a dozen of the 8,300 girls in the seven colleges have been expelled because of sexual immorality—surely a remarkably low percentage in this cavorting old world.

.NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE, 1929
T he forty-four students who entered Bryn Mawr College in 1885 went through their college years with no formal social rules at all. The community was small, and they were serious young women, stunned with gratitude for the chance to pursue a course of study as rigorous as any offered to men.

At the end of the first session, President Rhoads reported: “the conduct of the students has been marked by earnest devotion to study, regular attendance upon class exercises, zest in intellectual pursuits and a cheerful compliance with the few regulations necessary for the comfort of associate life.”

Within six years, however, that compliance had begun to collapse under the strain of increased numbers (169 by the fall of 1891) and a change in the nature of the students. On the whole, they were younger than their predecessors in what they now saw as “The Golden Age” . . . when Bryn Mawr students seemed “nearer the gods” and clearly “cared more for the pleasures of Parnassus, than the fleshpots of Egypt.”

In June of 1891, just before Commencement, Dean Thomas called together the students planning to return and announced that the College would have to start imposing restrictions on their conduct.

“There was consternation in the ranks,” one of those students reported later. “We were aware that we had been unfaithful to the trust imposed in us, but to have the trust withdrawn hurt our pride. We talked over the situation tête-à-tête and in groups and the idea of self-government began to take shape.” Susan Walker of the Class of 1893, who is generally acknowledged as the founder of Self-Government, went back to talk to Miss Thomas and “found cordial sympathy and readiness to cooperate” with what was then a daring idea.
During the summer Miss Walker sent out a round robin proposing that a Self-Government Association be initiated through the existing Undergraduate Association. "We have always taken our stand as capable and desirous of self-government," she wrote, "and it would be extremely humiliating to admit that now, after six years trial, we are forced to give up the attempt and content ourselves with being ruled by an outside power. We must set to work at once with energy."

A great deal of energy was required in the autumn when the whole student body met again and again, endorsing the idea of self-rule at once, but wrangling endlessly over practical details. In the process Anne Crosby Emery, 1892, was chosen as the first president of Self-Government, "due to an accident of office," she confesses in the Alumnae Quarterly of November 1909. "I happened to be president of the Undergraduate Association and the students were too much absorbed in the issues and involved in the experiment of self-government to care how the machinery was run. To save time, they appointed me president of the new association, which seemed to be superseding the old, and asked me to appoint the Executive Board provided for in the Constitution."

There is a legend that the students locked Nan Emery in her room for eighteen hours until she emerged with a set of resolutions to present to the trustees. She herself reports "that the students of Merion Hall used to say that they had never been disturbed by noise until the Executive Board held midnight meetings in my room to discuss the necessity of 'quiet hours'."

While the students were drafting their proposal to the trustees, "Miss Thomas talked over the resolutions with us," writes Miss Emery, "but left us perfectly free to do as we chose." When the proposal was finally finished, President Rhoads presented it to the Board, still composed entirely of Quakers, and he and Miss Thomas argued for its adoption. The Board was willing to take the risk and early in 1892 granted the students a charter giving them total responsibility for the regulation of their conduct outside the classroom.

All that was left was to have the students ratify the charter. But then, as now, there were almost as many opinions as there were students at Bryn Mawr. "Our real difficulty," Nan Emery writes,

lay in defections within our own body. Some of the cleverest girls in college disapproved of the principle of self-government and began to express their opposition. One of them at a stormy meeting argued that law-making should be left to Miss Thomas and shocked our less daring intelligences by an-
nouncing, "I prefer monarchy to democracy—nor need it be a constitutional monarchy." Against philosophy like this our only weapons were an unbewildered piety and a militant faith.

The final crisis came on the day in midwinter when the charter of our liberties, from the Trustees, was presented to the students. Skepticism showed a Gorgon Face. Lethargy seemed to prevail. A supporter of the cause saved the day by an audacious experiment. Leaping to her feet, she called out, "I move that self-government be abandoned." The Chair put the question with assumed indifference. No voice answered the request for votes "in favor of the motion." To the request for opposing votes came a "No" that filled the chapel and was heard on the campus. In it was the fervor of a modern hockey "yell," and by it Self-Government was finally established.

I doubt if any Bryn Mawr undergraduates have been more gallantly young than we were when, with chivalric seriousness, we pledged ourselves to an idea.

Thus the first truly independent student association for self-government was launched at Bryn Mawr College. Modified versions followed fairly quickly, particularly in the other women's colleges, though President Eliot of Harvard, after discovering that Bryn Mawr students were allowed to sign themselves out of the dormitories whenever they wanted to, predicted that the college would be forced to close within two years.

Despite all the work that had gone into the charter, there were still some crucial questions unresolved. The second president of Self-Government was Susan Franklin, a graduate student working for her Ph.D. (It was not until 1914 that the graduate students petitioned to form their own separate association.) Fortunately, Nan Emery had stayed on campus after graduation as a secretary in the college office. "I could not have done without her," Miss Franklin writes. "We used to sit up nights, drinking tea out of the nose of the tea pot, planning and writing appealing speeches to try to rouse enthusiasm among the students. The rock on which we were almost wrecked was the question of reporting on other students. It was finally agreed that if a girl found another breaking a rule she should first go to the student and urge confession. If this failed, she must then report the offense to the Executive Committee."

After President Rhoads retired in 1894 and Dean Thomas became President Thomas, she continued to work in "constant conference with
the Executive Committee of the Self-Government Association." In fact, in 1907, when the office of dean was reestablished at the request of the students, Miss Thomas urged the Board to amend the charter to assure that those conferences, which she considered "the central point of contact between the College and the Self-Government Association," would continue to be held with the "president" as well as "the dean," as originally drafted.

"As thee will remember," M. Carey Thomas explains in a statement to the trustees dated October 18, 1907,

from the very beginning of the College, Dr. Rhoads refused to have anything to do with the discipline or daily conduct of the students, feeling that it was not suitable for a man to be in charge of the discipline of young women. [So he asked] me to take entire charge of this side of the College. . . .

Before the College opened I spent a number of weeks in residence at the different colleges for women, and I studied especially the system of discipline in vogue there, and decided, with Dr. Rhoads' approval, to introduce none of them at Bryn Mawr College, but to work out in the College, with the assistance of the students themselves, a system of student self-government.

There were never any formal rules made for the conduct of the students, but from 1885 to 1892, the students themselves managed the government with frequent, sometimes daily, conferences with me and almost all the important self-government regulations of today go back to the experience of those early years. . . .

In 1892 the College had grown so large that it was very difficult to manage matters in this informal way, and it was agreed between the older students and Dr. Rhoads and myself that a formal charter should be granted the student body, entrusting to them formally the control of the individual conduct of the students. This charter embodied what had always been the case up to that time.

She went on to explain that Clause 4 of the 1892 Charter requiring conferences between herself (still defined as "dean") and the Executive Board

has been especially useful in cases where it was a question of expelling students, because these are the cases in which it is often questioned whether the Self-Government Association
or the College should act. In all cases where the Self-Govern­
ment Association recommends the expulsion or the serious
discipline of a student, the President of the College, as the ex­
cutive officer appointed by the Trustees, must take action,
and where this action has been taken through the recommenda­
tion of the Self-Government Association I have had to see
the parents and the lawyers and to bear the whole brunt of the
unpleasantness. Once, indeed, I was followed to New York
by a lawyer who threatened to put me in prison unless I
changed my attitude, and as I happened to be by myself in a
New York hotel, and as he became very violent during the in­
terview in my sitting room, I was somewhat alarmed.

The trustees amended the charter as requested, with protest from
one member who thought the amendment undercut the authority of
the new dean, and President Thomas, or "P.T." as the students called
her, continued to work closely with the Self-Government Boards for
the next fifteen years. Her relationship with them, like her character,
was filled with idealism, spice and contradictions.

Unquestionably, M. Carey Thomas had a natural talent for autoc­
racy, and it peppers her correspondence with the presidents of Self-
Government over thirty years. For example, just one week after a
sweeping statement in 1898 that "in every case where I act at the request
of your board I expect to maintain its authority and to refuse to con­sider
the possibility of a reconsideration of the case," she pens a terse
addendum: "but I can't comply with the request of the Executive Board
in regard to Miss X."

Eventually Miss Thomas did comply with that request and every
other decision the students made in the touchy matter of suspensions
and expulsions—whether she agreed with those decisions or not.

Today, the offenses that gave rise to some of those decisions seem
venial, if not ludicrous. In February 1910, for example, a senior was
suspended from lectures for twenty-four working days and from resi­
dence for the rest of the year because she wanted so much to hear Eu­
gene Debs speak that she defied a Self-Government ban on travel into
Philadelphia during a street-car strike. The next morning she dutifully
reported herself to the Executive Board, then accepted her punishment
with a "fine spirit," and still managed to win the European Fellowship,
although the dinner at which the award was announced had to be post­
poned until she was allowed back on campus.

In 1912 a mischievous junior was suspended for thirty-one days be­cause she "took her brother, a Yale student and about twenty-one years
of age, to the Merion students' sitting room and dressed him in women's clothes and she then took him, so dressed, into the gymnasium and out on the running track in full view of the students who were having a costume party." Though this girl exercised her right to appeal to the whole association to have her case reconsidered, the appeal was not sustained. In 1916 four girls were expelled for sleeping out of doors near Kennedy's stable before an early morning ride, then lying to the Board to protect one of their group.

During World War I and the early 1920s, there was an undercurrent of rebellion against Self-Government rules which may have been shockingly liberal at the turn of the century, but were rapidly becoming anachronistic. "But you're punishing me for getting caught," wailed one girl in 1922 on the eve of her expulsion for drinking too much wine from her escort's flask, implying what several members of that college generation have confirmed, that by that time the old rules against all forms of drinking or smoking within twenty-five miles of the campus or driving after dark in motor cars without a chaperon were being frequently, if not flagrantly, disregarded.

During the last six years of her administration, President Thomas struggled against the liberalizing tide, sometimes leaning fairly heavily on the leaders of Self-Government to discourage the "baby penalties" they might otherwise have meted out for offenses she considered serious.

Yet it is also clear that in the early days, especially, the students' experiment in self-government would never have survived without Miss Thomas' constant and often courageous support.

After Anne Crosby Emery had helped organize Bryn Mawr's undergraduates for self-rule in 1891-92, she went on to serve as dean at Wisconsin, then at Brown University. The more experience she gained, the more she came to marvel at Miss Thomas' willingness, from the day that Susan Walker came to her with her plan, "to entrust the reputation of the College, for which she, not we, would be responsible, to our inexperience."

The faculty was less supportive. As Mabel Lang points out, it was not until their Great Revolt of 1916 that the faculty managed to achieve a modicum of self-rule for themselves; and they must have found the autonomy offered so freely to the students more than a little bit ironic. Also, they could hardly have been flattered by Self-Government's famous resolution prohibiting students from having any kind of "social engagement" with male members of the faculty—a resolution Miss Thomas supported with a vigor that nowadays seems neurotic.

In a later interview, Helen Taft Manning, Class of 1912, who served
as acting president when Miss Thomas was on leave in 1920, described
the social atmosphere Miss Thomas encouraged and her attitude to-
ward the young men who might divert Bryn Mawr undergraduates
from their studies:

The total absence of men, alcoholic beverages and tobacco
on the Bryn Mawr campus could be taken for granted even in
my day. That was the way P.T. wanted it to be. Henry Cad-
bury, the last time I heard him speak, recalled the fire which
almost destroyed Denbigh Hall, when all the Haverford Col-
lege students helped to put out the blaze. According to Mr.
Cadbury some of the Haverford students were much im-
pressed by the warmth of the gratitude manifested by the
Bryn Mawr students and showed every inclination to visit
Bryn Mawr more frequently than they had in the past: so
much so that Miss Thomas wrote to President Sharpless to
say that she would prefer that Haverford students should not
make so free with the Bryn Mawr campus. Then she added a
postscript to say that this did not mean that the Bryn Mawr
dormitories should not continue to receive milk from the
Haverford College cows. But she never gave permission for
dances at Bryn Mawr, even at Commencement time, and in
general she hoped that students would defer any love affairs
or thoughts of marriage until after they had finished their ed-
ucation.

We supposed, and probably correctly, that these arrange-
ments for our protection or segregation on the Bryn Mawr
 campus were a matter of convenience and not of any real de-
sire that we should remain forever virgins, and certainly no
expectations that we would do so.

When Miss Thomas retired in 1922, her successor, Marion Edwards
Park, adopted a more relaxed attitude toward the workings of Self-
Government, even though, or perhaps because, she had been a Self-
Government president herself and had experienced Miss Thomas' fer-
vor directly.

Mrs. Manning, who served as dean during Miss Park's administra-
tion as well as Miss Thomas', recalls that there was

more trouble with Self-Government being too strict than
there was with their being too lenient. . . . Perhaps Miss
Thomas had got them trained that way. . . .

[Miss Park] always upheld their decisions. She took them
very seriously. Miss Thomas would have talked them round into doing something different, I think, if she wanted. . . . Miss Thomas had the art of persuasion very much at her fingertips. She could really buffalo them into doing what she wanted. But Miss Park didn’t believe in that. She believed in letting the students do what they thought best.

In 1925, President Park drew comment from newspapers all over the country for her “extraordinary conduct” in supporting a long overdue petition from the students to repeal a smoking rule from 1897 and “to permit smoking at Bryn Mawr under certain restrictions and in certain quarters of the College.”

An editorial in The New York World paraphrases Miss Park’s explanation to reporters

that the conduct of students at Bryn Mawr has always been in the hands of the Self-Government Association; that the regulations of the Association have been based on the public opinion of the moment; that times change and opinion changes with it; and that if a regulation prohibiting anything “can no longer depend upon the authority of conscience and conventions which make up public opinion” then it is no longer effective and there is no health in it.

Over the first image of the Bryn Mawr girl as a solemn, bespectacled scholar was now imposed that of the idiosyncratically independent and socially liberated girl James Thurber depicts kicking up her heels at a party, while a more dignified rival says: “She’s all I know about Bryn Mawr. And she’s all I have to know.”

The word “social” has always had two meanings and at Bryn Mawr the broader one led to the formation in 1921 of the Summer School for Women Workers in Industry. When serious problems of discipline arose in the Summer School, its director, Hilda Smith, a member of the Class of 1910 and a former president of Self-Government, suggested that the women work out for themselves a plan of self-government.

That experiment was a resounding success. In an interview conducted by Ashley Doherty in 1971, Miss Smith says:

We had one hundred factory workers from all over the country on scholarships here for eight weeks. . . . Half of them were union people; half were non-union. The union group split up. The garment workers were at sword’s point. There were girls from the South who’d had their first shoes when they went down into the mill, the textile mill, working eleven
hours a night on a night shift. . . And so we had a difficult question: how to organize this school so that self-government would be just as real to those factory workers as it was to the College. And we put it up to them. They decided to adopt it, and they worked out their own by-laws and . . . elected their own officers.

Those first meetings were so stormy that they appointed sergeants-at-arms to walk up and down the corridors to keep people in order in this warring body of one hundred students. They worked out a plan that was very good. . . .

The thing that made it work, I always thought later, was that it was real.

In the regular sessions of the College, enthusiasm for the Self-Government Association and its rules continued to dwindle. By 1926-27 the President, Minna Lee Jones, and her Executive Board felt they were trying “to run a machine for which there was no fuel” and threatened to resign unless the whole Association undertook a complete revision of its constitution.

Once again, when faced with the alternative to self-government, i.e., rule “by an outside power,” the students rallied. After an exhausting se-
ries of mass meetings in which they examined and discussed every single regulation, discarding some outdated ones and revising others, they produced the amended Constitution of 1927. In it, they also provided for a review of the system, “during every student’s college life,” to keep the system up to date.

Campusing and fines, ranging from one to ten dollars, began to be imposed for offenses that in earlier days would have drawn suspension—for example, smoking in the rooms, signing out to the wrong address, or entering the halls through windows late at night. This Bryn Mawr version of In-And-Out-The- Windows became so widespread in the early ’30s that Dean Manning ended one Faculty Show by climbing through a stage window in an evening dress with a long train, then collapsing on a sofa with a melodramatic sigh of relief, while the audience of undergraduates roared.

A month before her death in 1935, President Emerita M. Carey Thomas put the granting of the Charter to the Students’ Association for Self-Government at the head of the list of “what Bryn Mawr did first” which she read to an audience of educators and friends who had gathered to celebrate Bryn Mawr’s fiftieth anniversary. “I believe,” she said that day, “that it was and still is the only completely independent system in existence... [and] it is working well, after forty-three years.”

Less than a decade later, it was in jeopardy again. World War II had brought such sudden, sweeping changes in the patterns of young women’s lives that the democratic machinery of Self-Government was unable to respond quickly enough. An editorial in a 1944 Lantern warns that

minor resentment of Self-Government is becoming more general even to the point of cases of open rebellion. We propose as the only cure individual keys [to the dormitories] and individual responsibility... Since rules are being broken on principle, introducing a more effective police system or making minor amendments to the constitution will certainly not quell the unrest and will probably not reduce the misdemeanors... [T]he only efficacious solution is adjustment of the rules to the demands of the situation as it exists.

The writer then goes on to say that smoking ought to be allowed in the rooms, as it was allowed in the men’s colleges, that “only women have been so lethargic as to submit to [such a] privation” in order to save the College from paying a higher price for fire insurance. Drinking, too,
should be permitted, “since the empirical fact is that we drink.” In fact, the time had come, she thought, to get rid of all the rules.

We feel that it is important to point out that this is evolutionary and not revolutionary. It is obvious that in time a change of this sort is inevitable; general trends for the last few decades have been towards more liberality and . . . most of our generation has had placed upon it more responsibility than any preceding generation has been called upon to assume.

Before her demands were taken up by the majority of students, World War II had ended, and with it, the adventurous spirit it engendered in young women. It was replaced by the relative complacency of the generation of the 1950s. In 1955-56 there was a routine four-year review of the Self-Government system, but all it produced were a few cosmetic changes.

Two years earlier, however, in 1954, a major change had been accomplished when a formal statement on the Academic Honor System was added to the Constitution of the Self-Government Association. Until then, although the integrity of her academic work was obviously considered the responsibility of each student, it was the faculty through their Senate, not the students, who dealt with academic offenses. In 1954 that responsibility was shifted to an Administrative Board composed of officers of the Self-Government Association, as well as representatives from the faculty and the administration.

Anyone who sifts through the records of Self-Government in the Archives in Canaday Library, particularly the records from the 1960s and the early '70s, can see the manners and the mores of young women in the twentieth century relaxing—and in the case of chaperonage and that now archaic concept of in loco parentis actually evaporating.

The sea change in the attitude toward authority predicted in that Lantern editorial of 1944 does not seem to have come to Bryn Mawr in earnest until the 1960s. As late as 1959, the Executive Board was concerned with disciplining a senior who gave a piano bench from the Pembroke West showcase to a fraternity at Penn. Four years later, in October 1962, the mood suddenly darkened as the Board responded to a note from Charlotte Howe, Director of Halls, expressing concern over “the bombs in Rhoads” and asking them, when they met with the students involved, to “see that any explosive material is given to the warden who will arrange to have it removed from the hall.”

In the last years of her presidency, Katharine McBride must have had to summon all the strength she had to cope with the newly aggressive and in a few cases actually revolutionary students. One Undergraduate
Association president from the mid-sixties reports that when she came back to the campus for a class reunion, she was greeted by Miss McBride sadly as “the last polite President of Undergrad.”

In 1966 and 1967, the Self-Government Association presented a formal request to the Board of the College to abolish parietal rules. The Board deliberated long and hard, for if they were to deny the petition it would be the first time they had failed to support the students’ right to manage their own lives.

The week before the College was to open in 1967, the matter still had not been resolved. Since Judge Spaeth, Chairman of the Student Affairs Committee, was attending a judicial conference in Atlantic City, student leaders, senior administrators and the other Board members met with him there.

Ironically, the Bryn Mawr group, the judicial conference, and the contestants in that year’s Miss America beauty contest were staying in the same hotel. And so it happened that while the Bryn Mawr contingent quietly worked out resolutions that recognized the right of college-age women to take responsibility for their sexual lives, picketers outside the hotel waved burning brassieres to protest against the demeaning implications of the Miss America contest—a demonstration which some social historians see as the beginning of mid-century feminism.

The sixties passed into the seventies, Miss McBride retired, and under the administration of Harris Wofford, as president, and Mary Patterson McPherson, as dean, the students’ anger simmered down at Bryn Mawr as it did throughout the country. Meanwhile the Self-Government Association went through a series of changes which make it almost unrecognizable as a separate entity today.

In 1971 the students voted to combine the Self-Government and Undergraduate Associations into a single organization. In response to their request, in March, 1971, the Board of Trustees amended the original charter of 1892 to entrust the “full authority—formerly granted to the Self-Government Association—to the Honor Board of the Student Government Association of the Undergraduate School of Bryn Mawr College.”

Today the name had changed back from “Student Government” to “Self-Government,” although the smaller Honor Board, as a branch of the larger organization, has inherited most of the responsibilities that used to be Self-Government’s.

How is the system working in the 1980s? During the winter of 1984, the Head of Honor Board, Raka Ray, talked to me about the problems
she was dealing with that week. And as I listened, I kept hearing echoes from the past.

On a day-to-day level, there is the problem of controlling noise in the hall: (“Will the president define what is meant by noise?” shouted a student at a mass meeting back in 1891. “Noise,” said Nan Emery, “is what disturbs other people.”) There is also petty “thieving,” as Miss Thomas would have put it; laundry had been taken from the dryers and a birthday cake was stolen from a dormitory pantry. And there is drinking which is seen as a problem today, not because it is an infringement of the rules, but because it is a habit that can be destructive to a student’s personality and performance.

At what point do you have the right “to step into another person’s life?” Raka Ray and her Board kept asking themselves. They came up with the consensus that has been consistent through the years: “Only when the behavior of that person is injurious to herself or to the people living with her.”

Defining the extent of one student’s obligation to report the offenses of another is still “debatable ground.” Though heavy words like “confrontation” and “mediation” have been added to the Constitution in an attempt to deal with it, under those words is the same old “rock” (to borrow a metaphor from Susan Franklin, 1893) on which the whole system may any year, or any day, be “wrecked.”

Student apathy combined with rampant individuality is as much a problem today as it was a hundred years ago. Early in the 1980s student government leaders rewrote the Constitution to bring it up to date, but they could not get a quorum at Plenary—the modern word for mass meetings of the whole Association—to vote on it. Nor could they get a quorum at a more informal dinner vote in the halls. And for a while there was some talk of “scraping the whole system.”

Finally, the student leaders came up with the idea of drafting an amendment to reduce the number required for a quorum, then they went from door to door in the halls to get the votes to pass it. In the spring of 1985, they held another Plenary and the new Constitution was approved.

Once again, as in 1892 and 1927, the industry and ingenuity of a relatively small group of student leaders had saved the unique system of self-government that is still evolving at Bryn Mawr.
WHILE SELF-GOVERNMENT sought to provide a structure for and experience in group life, the traditions of Bryn Mawr served a similar purpose through ritual observance. Francine du Plessix Gray reviews her own changed response to those practices so familiar still to the Bryn Mawr community: May Day, Lantern Night, step-singing. For her, these rites, like the rites in societies of other times and places, are a form of transcendence, preserving human values in need of strengthening, and here in particular, securing the bonds between women engaged in serious enterprise.

In her doctoral dissertation on “Bryn Mawr College Traditions: Women’s Rituals as Expressive Behavior” (University of Pennsylvania, 1981), Virginia Woolf Briscoe has portrayed the origin of Bryn Mawr’s traditionalism as a conservative response to the sceptical world, a world which, according to a 1901 Lantern, was not “willing as yet to take us quite seriously.” According to this anthropological view, Bryn Mawr was a “beleaguered institution” whose “ultimate success and very survival depended on a clearly articulated and strongly shared sense of purpose.” Traditions became, therefore, a statement of mutuality and interdependence and served as partial antidote to the competitive academic individualism remarked upon elsewhere.

But traditions may confirm the individual as well as submerge her. The 1973 Senior Class Comedy put it this way: “You may ask, how did this tradition get started? I’ll tell you—I don’t know! But because of our traditions everyone knows who she is.”

—PHL
The college seemed to have chosen all sorts of curious amusements we had never considered. . . . They chose a special night to give the Freshmen their lanterns instead of between acts of the Sophomore play, singing a solemn little lantern song and then handing the lanterns with difficulty over that curious little wedge-shaped affair which makes our stage.

So we pour our libations to our traditions after they have ceased to mean what once they did. Piety, as piety should, preserves the symbol, in the hope that it may seem precious in proportion as, its content disappearing, it provides those ineffabilities which the heart demands.

If you live in a rural area, please, please, inquire about oxen of any color (but preferably white) which could be rented, and brought to Bryn Mawr for a reasonable fee.
ON THE MORNING of May 1, 1949, I was said to be the only member of the Bryn Mawr freshman class who refused to dance around the Maypole. It is not that I overslept. Quite the contrary. I was up at five A.M. in a state of indignation, staring at the preparations for May Day with the disdain of an agnostic British colonel observing, in New Delhi, some archaic ceremonial of the Indian religion. Surrounded by nostalgically preserved Wallace-for-President buttons, I paced my room muttering Wordsworth’s line about “a pagan suckled in a creed outworn,” feeling proud of being an emancipated woman, some kind of vague Marxist, a Freudian, and thus a predestined anti-Maypoler. Having read The Future of an Illusion (just once) with enthusiasm unbounded I then looked upon any ritual that savored even faintly of the mythic or the liturgical as vestiges of humanity’s childhood, institutions which it was our duty to dismantle as rapidly as possible to speed the progress of mankind. I may have been excessive in the virulence of my disapproval, but I was hardly an anomaly. For I belonged to that last generation which could still believe blindly in the Enlightenment myth that salvation lay only in an accelerated rationalization and secularization of society, in the hastened improvement of scientific method.

There is another, more subtle way in which I had been indoctrinated against the Maypole by the ethos of the past two centuries. The efficient propaganda machine of the male ruling class had brainwashed me into looking upon all exclusively female rites as trivial, petty, faintly comic. Quite as deplorable as the Maypole were baby showers, garden clubs, pie-baking contests, the sight of women knitting together, and numerous other nurturing civilities which effect deeper bonding among women. In fact, what frightens me most about Francine du Plessix in
1949 is the extent to which she respected and envied most male cults of bonding (short of football, the hunt, or the military life); the way she reverently participated, whenever allowed, in such male rites as poker games, poolrooms, backgammon tournaments at the Harvard Club, Saturday-night drinking fests. Suffice it to say that if I were to encounter today that young woman who refused to celebrate the resurrected spring in May of 1949, I would look upon her as a hopelessly outdated relic of early twentieth-century materialism, a kind of mastodon. For the past several decades have made it abundantly clear that our society has been secularized and deritualized beyond forbearance; that the Enlightenment’s promise of salvation through technology has radically failed; that in the great debate between Freud and Jung concerning the transience or permanence of religious ritual, Jung’s view has clearly been the prophetic one. Our expressions of love, joy, sorrow, hope, and particularly our need to honor some form of transcendence will always seek ritual channels if our psychic balance is to survive. Thus, it is more important than ever to stress the historic role women have played as preservers of the secular and sacred rituals for which we are presently so famished. It is crucial to confront the problems we may face in the next decades if we wish to remain the custodian of these traditions.

I remember already being annoyed, in the 1940s, by the many sly allegations concerning the phallic symbolism of the Maypole. Tomboy that I was, if I had believed them I might well have been the first to lead the dance. But even then they struck me as part of that vulgate Freudianism which interprets as phallic every tree, knife, pencil, waterfall, or fountain pen in sight. The Maypole ritual, on the contrary, bothered me then for many of the reasons I honor it now—I see it as a profoundly female ceremony with rather sacred overtones. It is a celebration of the regenerative forces of nature, a vestige of the tree worship which has thrived in every corner of the globe since the beginning of ritual consciousness. Throughout the Mediterranean culture which was the matrix of our own, the tree was a prevalent embodiment of the Mother Goddess; more exultantly than any other object in nature, it has symbolized for millennia the glory of the resurrected year. And Bryn Mawr’s tenaciously preserved Maypole ritual seems to descend directly from this venerable cult of the tree as a symbol of fructification and immortality. To quote Sir James Frazer, in a passage which remains uncontested: “In spring or early summer it is still a custom in many parts of Europe to cut down a tree and bring it into the village, where it is set
up amid general rejoicings. . . . The Maypole consists of a tall and straight spruce tree stripped of its branches, from top to bottom ornamented with flowers and slips of various cloths. . . . The decoration of the Maypole, which is done by village maidens, is an affair of much ceremony, the people flock to it from all quarters and dance about it in a great ring.

By keeping such primeval tradition alive throughout those materialistic decades when skeptics such as I saw it as an archaic eccentricity, Bryn Mawr has been more prophetic than any other academic community I can think of. For, by the end of the Vietnam years, the massive exodus of our youth to Oriental sects, our renewed fascination for the mythic and the occult, evidenced our nostalgia for some golden past in which our lives were still structured by the authority of ritual observance. However sympathetic we may be with such archaic longings, we must remain wary of their excesses. Most cultural regressions to past forms tend to bastardization and barbarism. A craving for unduly authoritarian modes of religious observance can lead to the shabby travesties of the Reverend Sun Myung Moon, or to the tragedy of Jonestown, Guyana.

There might be only one domain of experience in which our renewed thirst for authority and tradition can readily be expressed. That is on the tribal level, in those ritual observances of the home and the community which have to do with the secular and sacred core of human affections: with our need to civilize the young, tend to the ill, the aged and the dying, to maintain strong family ties, to preserve the religious rituals of our own native traditions. It is more important than ever to stress that most of these rites have customarily been performed and preserved by women. For until very recently, the human family has been traditionally divided into the opposite models of Penelope and Odysseus, or, more subtly, of Antigone and Creon. Woman as tender of the hearth, custodian of most ethnic rituals and religious customs, safeguarder of tribal memory, as against man the explorer, innovator, technocrat who in his nomadic obsession for power and control tends to neglect many time-honored traditions. This division between cultic woman and secular man is poignantly expressed in a letter written by Cicero to his wife in the year 58 B.C.: "I truly desire to see you as soon as possible, my dear, and to die in your arms, since neither the gods whom you have piously worshipped nor the men whom I have always served have shown us any thanks."

Women's historic role as guardian of rituals has been exalted by some as it has been condemned by others. Henry Adams, for instance, sees woman's cultic nature as the very glue of civilization, a felicitously con-
servative power which “has preserved the customs of civility, supplied the intelligence, and dictated the taste.” In the same vein, C. J. Jung considers the “retarding ideal” of the female principle as more natural and moral because it keeps faith with the most ancient laws and traditions. Freud, on the contrary, sees it as a perniciously reactionary force which tends to curb the progress of mankind. And popular folklore divides the sexes into woman the rememberer and man the forgetter, as evidenced by the female chorus that weeps as the husband comes home from the office, “Today is my birthday,” or “You forgot our anniversary for the third year in a row.”

These judgments deal with stereotypes of humankind while overlooking the following issue: What is the particular effect of ritual on women’s lives? I sense that our so-called “conservative” guardianship of tribal memory can be a paradoxically radical and liberating force, and that our fidelity to ancient observances has often been an effective way of achieving autonomy from male society. It is in this context that I would like to talk about a few of the more ritualistic women in legend and history, beginning with the inevitable example of Antigone.

Antigone commits civil disobedience against her uncle Creon, King of Argos, by giving her brother the burial rites that are a central feature of the Greek religion, the only rites that assure a peaceful passage from this life into the next. Creon has denied Antigone’s brother these rites because he has sinned against the state. Since the essence of tragedy is to oppose two different but equal levels of justice, it is important to stress that Creon is not necessarily a tyrant, simply an efficient bureaucrat, le politicien moyen sensuel. One of the striking aspects of this play is the manner in which Antigone transcends the sex roles traditional to her society. She is profoundly female in her fanatic guardianship of religious rites. Yet she has rejected the warning of her sister, Ismene, that women were not born to contest any law prescribed by the male order; she is being very masculine in her disobedience of male authority. Antigone’s androgynous behavior throws Creon into a state of great confusion. Although he keeps accusing Antigone and her followers of excessive femaleness for upholding the sanctity of religious rites, he simultaneously attacks her for her repugnantly masculine behavior. And in the latter part of the play he keeps referring to her in the male gender. Creon’s confusion is understandable, for Antigone indeed fuses the male and female principles as few heroines ever have. Having acted in a militantly virile manner by contesting male authority, she reverts to the most traditional female instincts as she is taken to her death, lamenting that she will die a virgin, unwed and childless: “He has taken me away before my nuptials, having never known either married joy or
tender motherhood.” Antigone embodies a quality most precious to contemporary women, a spiritual androgyny which might enable us to contest and contend in a man’s world while retaining the richness of our female instincts. Creon’s insistence on transient man-made law, as we know, brings doom upon every member of his family. And the entire tragedy is a fable on the dangers of male technocratic principles when they attempt to suppress female instincts, when they transgress on our reverence to family ties and to sacred tradition.

I turn next to another kind of woman who has preserved her autonomy and power through rigid observance of ritual tradition—the Roman Catholic nun. While attacking the undeniable sexism of the general medieval ethos, most feminist historians are overlooking the liberating power of one of its principal institutions—the monastic enclosure. Even though she might have to pay fealty in times of crisis to a male hierarchy of bishops, the nun’s vow of obedience was to the superior of her women’s order; and monastic communities created the greatest semblance of equality offered in the middle ages. Here were women saying no to the expectations of a highly misogynous society, choosing celibacy rather than entering into prearranged marriages that would enslave them in the cycle of childbearing, pioneering enclaves of peace and learning in the chaos of barbaric forests, often defying princes, founding great colonies in which the habitual hierarchies of sexual dominance were overturned. The medieval nuns were women who said, not unlike Antigone, my ultimate allegiance is to a transcendent immutable order which is superior to the fluctuating laws of any secular male state. And like Antigone, they often served as the most prophetic critics of their male peers; they obtained their power by being radical upholders of the more ancient traditional modes. It was Catherine of Siena and St. Bridget of Sweden who first told Pope Urban VII to get out of Avignon and back to Rome where he belonged. It was Teresa of Avila who helped reform monastic life, both in men’s and women’s communities, by resuscitating the finest elements of the Carmelite tradition, and who became the spiritual mentor of St. John of the Cross. And even in our century, it is the nuns who in many parts of the world have remained the most civilizing force of an educational system. Their excellence as guardians of intellectual tradition is not being underrated by American parents. As the quality of our public schools continues to decline, and our private schools’ tuition fees grow increasingly exorbitant, thousands of non-Catholic families are sending their children to parochial schools, which until recently were predominantly staffed by nuns. They now offer, in many communities, the finest education available. Consider then the following irony: the
very women who have preserved the most ancient and rigid rituals of worship in the West have also helped to preserve the civilities of syntax in the jungle of contemporary education.

“The proper study of mankind is woman.” Words not written by Kate Millet or Germaine Greer, but by Henry Adams in the 1880s. If I were to describe the decline in quality of life enjoyed by women in the West I would say that it decreased in proportion to their loss of role as preservers of meaningful rituals. I would stress that the quality of life enjoyed by the community at large decreased at an analogous pace. And I would trace the most accelerated rate of decline to late nineteenth-century Protestant America.

What was left to us at the turn of the century? Not only were we deprived of the sumptuous ritual life of the Roman matron, who, alongside her directorship of a veritable factory of domestic crafts, took part in a number of sacred rites reserved exclusively for women; we did not begin to have the financial independence offered by law to all classes of Roman women, nor the sexual freedom they enjoyed in the upper reaches of their society. The Reformation had deprived us of the choice of celibacy offered by the Catholic nunnery, had confined us to that domain of *Kinder, Küche, Kirche* which Luther intended for us. In the strictly secular realm, the Industrial Revolution had robbed us of the considerable pride and power we enjoyed for centuries by helping to run small family-owned enterprises. We were considerably more estranged from the company of men than women in many European cultures. Even in the upper classes of America, the ritual of the literary salon—through which generations of French women played an immense role in refining the manners and literature of their nation—was made barely possible by the segregationist misogyny of the American Protestant ethos. So we nursed and preserved the modest rituals left to us, our quilting bees, our sewing circles, our reading circles, our church fairs, activities often derided by our men, rites whose richness we have only recently begun to appreciate as we emancipate ourselves, thanks to the women’s movement, from the more aggressive models of male rituals.

What else did we go on to lose? The dehumanizing efficiency of science now makes it increasingly hard for us to experience the intimacy of childbirth, to preserve our ancient roles as comforters of the ill and the aged. Our isolation deepens with the decades in this immense continent; we are increasingly separated from kinsmen, siblings, parents. The rituals of the extended family are growing most infrequent.

The most grievous loss of all we have endured since mid-century is caused by the tyranny of the media, which deprive us of our most cen-
tral and precious role as civilizers of the young, as educators of our own children. This is indeed the nadir of women’s history, the idle and lonely housewife surrounded by kitchen appliances who increasingly resorts, as medical figures show, to tranquilizers and alcohol and the equally drugging effects of daytime television to relieve her feeling of powerlessness and isolation. This sense of void is stunningly expressed in Betty Friedan’s *The Feminine Mystique*, in which she describes the submerged discontent women suffered in mid-century America even though they had more, *materially* speaking, than at any other time of their history. “As she made the beds,” Friedan writes, “shopped for groceries, matched slipcover materials, ate peanut butter sandwiches, chauffeured Cub Scouts and Brownies, lay beside her husband at night, she was afraid to ask even of herself the silent question: ‘Is this all?’ ” And so I offer the following conclusion, which might meet with considerable disapproval from both Freudians and Marxists: I believe that the women’s movement which surfaced in America shortly after mid-century was in some part caused by the fact that women’s lives had been more severely deritualized—and therefore made more meaningless—than at any other time of human history.

My concluding thoughts return to the issue of what significant ritual is about and deal with how we might salvage the few important rites and rituals left to us at a time when our society is so famished for them.

In its deepest, most spiritual sense, ritual is a sequence of gestures which repeats a primordial act, such as the Christian rite of communion which symbolizes our brotherhood and sisterhood in sharing the body of the Godhead, or the rite of Passover which symbolizes the miraculous survival of the Jewish people. Significant rituals are also those which fulfill our equally sacred need to reinfuse a family or a community with greater harmony and love. In either case, ritual is a rigidly structured sequence of actions that brings us a heightened sense of our own identity and meaningfulness. Yet as we have noted before, the historic guardians of most traditional rites—women—are leaving home by the millions to seek finally the self-fulfillment they deserve. For even in those periods when the female principle was at its most dominant—when the colonizing of Greece was pursued according to the advice of female oracles, and the extinction of the Vestal Virgin’s fire would spell doom for the Roman state—even then there was a crucial freedom denied us: we were never allowed to be the wanderers, the explorers, the inventors we might have wished to be; we preserved the rituals of the tribe from the enclaves of our homes. Now, even this last obstacle is being overcome.

Throughout this essay, I have avoided such contemporary terms as
“role models,” which along with “lifestyle” and “relating” should be reserved as names for domestic pets. I would rather describe our present situation as the Odysseizing of women, the Penelopizing of men. Many women will be working the night shift at the hospital, or pleading a case in court at ten P.M.; many will face the painful choice of accepting a teaching post at Stanford while the men they love prefer to keep their teaching appointments at Bryn Mawr or Amherst. And if there are children from such a union, who will be there to preserve that most basic unit of the ritual life which is the family meal? Perhaps my French origins make me focus unduly on this particular aspect of cultic behavior. Yet I cannot think of any institution more laden with civilizing force. The act of nutrition is not a purely physiological event. It remains, in its more civilized form, a form of communion. The family meal is a formality which can begin to cultivate in us, from earliest age, a curb of natural greed, a capacity for sharing, generosity, thoughtfulness, a talent for civilized conversation. It is a custom that can enrich our knowledge of our historic roots by carefully prepared food of our own ethnic tradition, which can enlarge our love of literature by readings of poetry or prose gracefully adaptable to the beginning or the end of a meal. Can our men be Penelopized enough to carry out such fundamental rituals as thoroughly as we have for millennia? Or are women formidable enough to take on the double tasks of Odysseus and Penelope? It is up to the coming generations of women to resolve this dilemma.

In recent years I was made aware of the most lugubrious example I have found to date of our renewed thirst for cult and ceremony. It seems that all over the nation communities of teenagers and young adults were gathering at midnight on Saturdays to view a film called *The Rocky Horror Picture Show*. They chanted litanic responses to the sound track, they held lit candles in their hand, and some of them were seeing the film for the sixtieth, eightieth time in a row. In their desperate search for liturgical behavior they were resorting to the most mechanical elements of ritual—mnemonic repetitions of sounds and gestures no more transcendent than disco dancing. *The Rocky Horror Picture Show* was one of the many cultic fads which prove how easily rite and ritual can be debased into mere rote in a society deprived of genuine ceremonials. And I surmise that this refuge in rote was being engaged in by persons whose childhoods were both deprived of adequate liturgy and of the sacred time of the family meal. Neither are they the kind of Americans who have a tradition as courageously primordial as the Maypole to look forward to, or to remember.

I stress the word courage because I see this trait of character as central
to anyone who wishes to preserve a quality of life—and by that I mean a life imbued with meaningful rituals—in the late twentieth century. Particularly in America, the cult of novelty accelerates at a vertiginous pace, constantly seducing us into the vortex of historical, cultural and tribal amnesia. And I honor Bryn Mawr for having refused, more adamantly than any other college I can think of, to capitulate to the siren call of the so-called “new.” Society at large once told Bryn Mawr it was fashionable to go co-ed? It adamantly maintained its traditional role as an institution of women. A generation of positivists such as mine takes it to task for its archaic customs? Watch what happens: through fidelity to its tradition as an all-women’s college and to such rituals as the Maypole it emerges, two decades later, as one of our most prophetic communities. And also, ironically, as eminently fashionable. And so I send my message to the undergraduates of the future: carry on the immutable female traditionalism of this College now, and later in your own lives. Let Bryn Mawr continue to inspire you to say no to the caprices of transient fashion. And take heed of that Jewish proverb which says “Today’s news wraps tomorrow’s fish.” By our fidelity to the historic female need to safeguard the past, we will wrap the tomorrow of tomorrow, we will preserve the quality of quality.¹

¹ Earlier versions of this essay have been published in the Bryn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin, Fall 1980, and Vogue, September 1980. Copyright 1980 by Francine du Plessix Gray.
Given Two Bridge-Builders, a Man and a Woman: Feminism at Bryn Mawr

IN ONE OF THE MANY serious or satiric questionnaires that may be found in the publications of the College are these queries from the Class Book of 1932:

Do you think marriage and May Day are compatible?  
If choice were necessary, would you put marriage ahead of May Day?

However mocking the tone, the pitting of the College’s most famous ritual against the expected matrimonial end for young women indicates that the collegial self might well be distinct from the social self, and the discovery of a new female persona at Bryn Mawr might give pause, or secondary status, to whatever it replaced.

Feminism at Bryn Mawr took many forms. It is the purpose of the following essay to survey this protean concept as it manifested—and continues to manifest—itself during the College’s first one hundred years. appended to it, part prophecy, part envoi, is a poetic “Essay on Feminism” written in 1914 by Helen Taft, later Helen Taft Manning, Class of 1912, A.B. 1915.

—PHL
Given two bridge-builders, a man and a woman, given a certain bridge to be built, and given as always the unchangeable laws of mechanics in accordance with which this special bridge and all other bridges must be built, it is simply inconceivable that the preliminary instruction given to the two bridge-builders should differ in quantity, quality, or method of presentation because while the bridge is building one will wear knickerbockers and the other a rainy-day skirt.

M. CAREY THOMAS

Some problems, the solution of which we have been taking for granted, are still before the court. Nor can we entirely resist the suspicion that for the women of today—even for those whose feminism is most thorough-going, any immoderate elation of spirit, any parading with banners in the market-place, in anticipation of the glories of the new era, would be, like the crowing of the cock before midnight, distinctly premature, an error of taste as well as judgment.

FLORENCE LEFTWICH RAVENAL '95

As for Sexism—we didn't think of ourselves as oppressed. We did know that we were expected to use our brains, we were expected to tackle hard jobs and to succeed, and while the odds against women might be great we were expected not just to curse them but to surmount them. It was only the lecturer on Hygiene who tried to make us freshmen understand we were sex objects, but frankly we didn't believe her.

MARGARET BAILEY SPEER '22

Never before have I had such a high regard for my own sex, never before have I had the privilege of being with so many truly admirable women. More importantly, Bryn Mawr has led me to feel very secure about myself as an intelligent human being—regardless of my sex.

KATHY ROTH '86
WHAT DID SUCH WORDS AS "feminism" AND "feminist" MEAN IN THE HISTORY OF BRYN MAWR? THE YEAR 1914 SEEMS TO HAVE MARKED A HIGH POINT OF INTEREST IN THIS MATTER. TIPYN O'B dib commented in its March 1, 1914, issue that

Bryn Mawr's proverbial lack of interest in great movements in progress outside its own circumscribed limits has certainly been done away, in the case of Feminism, and has given place to open-mindedness and eager curiosity. Never in our time at Bryn Mawr have so many of us seized the opportunity to inform ourselves upon any question. Those who have never before known what it was to wander from the path of "required reading," now sit by the hour in the Carola Woerishoffer Room, with "Love and Marriage" or the "Education of the Child." At dinner, "The House of Bondage" is a subject for more heated argument than was ever raised over even such vital questions as "registered exercise." There is something salutary in this awakening.

A feminist of today might well find such interest curiously confined. The books cited with such reverence now appear rather conservative manuals which stress the glories and duties of maternity, gentleness in childrearing, and a bathetic tale about a fallen woman and the white-slave trade.

Certainly the suffragist movement had its Bryn Mawr adherents from the first. Some members of the Class of 1889 were active in its cause; one reported later that Alys Russell, (Class of 1890, M. Carey Thomas' first cousin, and Bertrand Russell's first wife) "marched from Brighton to London last summer in the Suffrage Parade and prefers Suffrage marching to golf, or any other form of exercise." Another,
Ella Riegel, wrote in 1914 that she had toured the entire United States on behalf of the Federal Suffrage Amendment, and she had picketed her former Professor of Politics at Bryn Mawr College, then become President Woodrow Wilson, by holding before the White House a banner inscribed with a quotation from one of his books: “I don’t wish to sit down and let any man take care of me without my having at least a voice in it and if he doesn’t listen to my advice, I am going to make it as unpleasant for him as I can.” Woodrow Wilson, The New Freedom, p. 227. Many things one learns at College come in useful at quite unexpected moments!

Here, as elsewhere, M. Carey Thomas was in the forefront. The New York Times wrote that she was the first head of a woman’s college to come out publicly for women’s suffrage, in 1896, and that for sixteen years thereafter she was president of the National Collegiate Equal Suffrage League. She saw to the establishment of a Bryn Mawr chapter of the College Equal Suffrage League in 1907, and she brought feminist leaders and famous suffragist speakers, among them Anna Howard Shaw, Susan B. Anthony, Jane Addams, Carrie Chapman Catt, Emmeline Pankhurst, and Charlotte Perkins Gilman, to the College. But student activities on the campus were sporadic and student opinion divided. An editorial in the November 1909 Bryn Mawr Alumnae Quarterly entitled “The Futility of Much Argument” opined that “there is no fundamental reason why women should have a higher education, cast a ballot, or hold political office. There is equally no reason why they should not.” Was it such a sense of distance and detachment that led The Lantern in 1915 to complain about the discouraging attendance at suffragist lectures and attribute it to a lack of vitalizing opposition?

Others have perceived in the suffragist history of the College an early example of the primary preoccupation of Bryn Mawr women with what they might achieve individually as educated women, rather than with a restructuring of society or of the means by which they might reach their goals. The writer who found suffragist arguments futile herself suggested such a program:

Prove by a thousand small activities the value of woman’s participation in the affairs of the community; increase by training and experience the efficiency of women in affairs outside the domestic circle and not only will legislation follow the social necessity but the exercise of the suffrage by women will be freed from some of the disgraceful conditions that accompany the exercise of masculine suffrage today. There is no
other argument than this that is worthy of woman's slightest consideration.

Nevertheless, the arguments continued, nowhere more colorfully exemplified than in a straw vote cast in the presidential election of 1910 which created "a scene of wild and enthusiastic disorder." The suffragist faction paraded in their best evening dresses (was this by way of reassuring others that they were at least sartorially conservative?), alongside an anti-suffrage party wearing caps and aprons as signs of domesticity. These two groups were joined by anarchists blowing violently on trumpets, socialists clad in red, prohibitionists wearing mackintoshes and carrying umbrellas with "keep dry" painted on them, and Independents in yellow and white, bearing empty dinner pails which they rattled as they shouted for "yellow journalism." "The whole air was loud with our noise, and the echoes of our songs came back to us from the sleeping hills. Only overhead the quiet stars looked down."

March 8 is the International Day of the Woman. Throughout next week, films, lectures and other events have been planned at Bryn Mawr and Haverford to commemorate the day. A calendar of events can be found in both The News as well as The College News.

This is a combined effort on the part of the organizations listed below. We urge the community to support us by participating in our activities as well as those planned by the Bryn Mawr history department for National Women's History Week. We need your help to make this a success.

Women's Alliance
Third World
International Students' Association
Islamic Union
Baby Feminism Group
Faculty-Student Committee for Central America
Coalition for Action in Women's Issues (CAWS)
Minority Coalition
Hillel
Jewish Feminist Group
Peace Action Project
Lesbian Support Group
The Feminist Group

—The Bryn Mawr-Haverford College News,
March 3, 1984
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Attendance at Women’s Alliance meetings has declined this semester as the number of other Bryn Mawr groups dealing with feminism has increased.

—The Bryn Mawr-Haverford College News, November 30, 1984

Feminism at Bryn Mawr has never spoken with a single voice. But it has also never been silent and most often has it rested upon a double conviction: that women could and must learn from one another and that a world awaited their reformation. The first required iteration, for it was not axiomatic, one hundred years ago, that women should be exposed to one another in large groups. An anonymous conservative writer, using the pseudonym Ouida in The North American Review of 1894, considered that “the perpetual contact of men with other men may be good for them, but the perpetual contact of women with other women is very far from good. The publicity of a college must be odious to a young girl of refined and delicate feeling.” Let men, the author stated, be prepared for the world by jostling and the “rough destruction of personal conceit; . . . for women it can only be hardening and deforming.” So it was in the most tentative terms that The Lantern, in 1895, suggested an alternative view:

We have seen that the mere acquisition of knowledge is not the chief benefit of university life for men, and to argue from analogy, we must think that there are certain benefits to be derived by women also from living in community. It is too soon to say that women reap no advantages from living together. . . . The experiment has been tried for much less than one-half a century.

Miss Thomas, of course, knew precisely what she was about. She had already tested the efficacy of women in groups outside of Bryn Mawr on her native ground of Baltimore. There, with four other women, Mary Elizabeth Garrett, Mary Gwinn, Elizabeth King, and Julia Rogers, she had founded and raised an endowment for the Bryn Mawr School in Baltimore. A few years later, during the early 1890s, this same group formed a Women’s Medical Fund Committee, raising $500,000 for the opening of a medical school which, they stipulated, must admit women on equal terms with men and set rigorous standards for admission. Their conditions were accepted along with their cash and The Johns Hopkins School of Medicine opened in October of 1893. (Two of these women, Mary Garrett and Mary Gwinn were also to play significant supportive roles at Bryn Mawr.) So Miss Thomas
could speak with confidence some ten years later, in 1904, about the strength women might gain from each other:

The woman living in an academic community learns to assess herself in light of others. . . . She learns to cooperate and how to influence others, powers that enlarge enormously . . . one's value to the community.

Self-assessment, cooperation, influence, empowerment: to these objectives Jane Addams, in her Commencement Address in 1912, added another: the ability "to care for impersonal ends," a lack of which higher education was filling by "giving women experience in disinterested group life. Here at Bryn Mawr," she said, "it adds to that the training in self-government which means group direction and conscious group control."

There were, by the time of Jane Addams' address, all sorts of groups beside that of Self-Government. A number of clubs within the College brought students together, and a quantity of plays—whose importance is attested by the pictures and reminiscences of countless classbooks—were helping to develop those powers M. Carey Thomas had invoked. There was also a growing network of connections around the "seven sisters," as the women's colleges of the northeast came to be called. Tentative and even unsuccessful at the outset, such efforts to form broader bonds eventually issued in intercollegiate athletic ties, Self-Government conferences, and an association of collegiate alumnae.

Beyond college, beyond intercollegiate activities, there was the larger society of women to be reached, and through the women, a world to be remade. "Goldilocks has gone forever," said Miss Thomas in 1913. "Women and men together as comrades are going down into the marketplace to make it fit for their children, the happy children of the feminist future, to live in." But the marketplace, the Senate chamber, the public centers of control were closed to those who could bring no pressures to bear through the ballot. "Backstairs influence," Mrs. Parkhurst warned her Bryn Mawr audience in 1911, was irresponsible and ineffective. That women's ballot achieved in 1920, there was so much still to accomplish. "Our different women's outlook must be written large into the law and life of all civilized nations," said Miss Thomas in 1921. Peace, prohibition, the end of prostitution were what she had in mind, and students reckoned, along with their leader, that the millennium was within reach. "Can't you remember," recalled an alumna of the Class of 1907 at her fifty-fifth reunion, "how we believed that we
should get the vote, would drive corruption out of city government, 
would abolish the white slave trade, eliminate venereal disease, estab-
lish a single standard of sexual behavior? How many midnight discus-
sions . . . did you spend on these topics?"

There was something almost sacred about that feminist reformatory 
fervor. The first club at Bryn Mawr, the Reform Club, established in 
1886, was an outgrowth of prayer meeting. The Quaker “concerns” 
and Christian commitments to charity were vigorous in the early de-
cades. The Missionary Society supported, along with other religious or-
ganizations on campus, missions in India and Japan. There was the Ra-
mahai Circle, founded by Pandita Ramabai who visited Philadelphia in 
1886, which prayed and worked for the salvation of India’s twenty-
three millions of widows in a country where widowhood was regarded 
as punishment for crimes committed by the woman in her former ex-
istence on earth. There was the Temperance Society. The Maids’ Com-
mmittee coordinated a night school for the maids in English, arithmetic, 
reading, writing and psychology. The Junk Committee collected cast-
off clothes which were “sent mostly to the southern colored schools 
where little boys go to classes in Bryn Mawr bathing suits.” The Col-
lege Settlement Association, of which Bryn Mawr was one of the four 
original founders in 1890, met in “cosy, pleasant weekly meetings,” 
where such matters were discussed “as the duty of the ardent social re-
former when Twenty-second and Twenty-third Streets refuse to speak 
even when on common ground, and how to manage a model dance on 
a dubious pier.” The Consumer’s League sought to combat the perilous 
working conditions of women and children and provided pledge cards 
with their chief tenets, “viz: early Christmas shopping, exclusive pa-
tronage of white-list stores [i.e. those conforming to the Consumer’s 
League ‘Standard of a Fair House’] and demand for label goods.” For 
several decades two groups, The Christian Union and The League for 
the Service of Christ (later described respectively and inaccurately as 
works without faith and faith without works), competed in prayer and 
eleemosynary undertakings until, with ceremonies and language wor-
thy of the ecumenical rapprochement between the Roman Catholic and 
Protestant churches, they achieved a joint metamorphosis into the 
Christian Association in 1910.

Indeed, so multiple and importunate were the forms of associative 
endeavor that an editorial in Tippy o’ Bob in 1904 cautioned against “im-
pairing the virtue of the old” activities with the excessive “busyness” of 
the new, and The Lantern in 1915 deplored “fictitious obligations” 
which diverted Bryn Mawr women from the primary intellectual and 
contemplative purpose of their education. Yet these groups served a
larger purpose alongside their ostensible and praiseworthy ends: they were training-grounds, gateways, platforms, and springboards for a new kind of woman, one increasingly at ease in the larger world she was so industriously reforming.

Many went on to continue work which they may have begun in college. Some few went into politics and the law. Frances Anne Keay, Class of 1899, wrote a series of articles on the “Conditions Among the Seamen of Philadelphia” for Charities. According to the “Alumnae Notes” in a Tipyn o’ Bob of April 1908, “these were written as a result of her investigation as holder of the joint Bryn Mawr and College Settlements Fellowships for the past and present year.” Most notably, there was Carola Woeishoffer, Class of 1907, a skilled swimmer (a “team in herself” she was called), active debater, dedicated reformer, treasurer and secretary of the College Settlement Association, who after college provided bail for young strikers in the garment industry, worked in sweatshops, became treasurer for the Women’s Trade Union League and was appointed to the Bureau of Industries and Immigration. Her bequest to Bryn Mawr College following her tragically early death led to the creation of the Department of Social Economy and Social Research, later the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research, whose story is told elsewhere in this volume.

For women such as these, there was no betrayal of a Bryn Mawr contemplative ideal, but rather a fulfillment of the implicit obligation to society which Bryn Mawr had always acknowledged. Among the earliest curricula of the College were courses such as “Charities and Corrections” under the rubric of political science. In 1904, the Chicago branch of The Association of Collegiate Alumnae, in an effort to widen opportunities for women beyond the vocation of teaching, “instructed its Employment Committee, which had been appointed to co-operate with a similar committee from the Philadelphia Branch, to make a study of opportunities afforded women in Chicago for public and private social service and to prepare a statement of the courses offered by the different colleges in the Association which students might take as preliminary professional training.” The committee’s report was published as a pamphlet and the Bryn Mawr College courses listed therein: “Theoretical Economics; Applied Economics; Theories of Society; Labor and Capital; Economic Problems; Labor Problems; The Dynamics of Distribution.” Social work was being professionalized, and Bryn Mawr women were active in that process, both within and beyond college, as faculty and as graduate and undergraduate students. An article in a Bryn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin of 1909 stressed the importance of schools of philanthropy in the training of women: “efficient training
only is necessary before women can venture forth into the large fields of municipal activity that await them, and they must restrain their natural inclination to practice charity until they have some knowledge of the subject." In that same year, Marion Parris of the Bryn Mawr faculty addressed the Association of Collegiate Alumnae on "Non-Teaching Positions open to Students of Economics, Politics, and Sociology." In 1937, The College News urged students "to gather their forces behind the movement for extending the Social Economy Department as a major course to undergraduates." By the following year, the undergraduates had a new major. A member of the first class to enjoy such a major was to study labor and industry in the nearby town of Conshohocken and write her senior thesis on unemployment compensation.

Alongside the professionalization of social work with its curricular consequences, a number of interesting ventures marked Bryn Mawr's effort to be socially effective in women's causes within its own boundaries. In 1912, the recently formed Christian Association organized a summer camp for working girls. Less than a decade later, Miss Thomas' vision of extending a sororial hand to less fortunate women was realized in the Summer School for Women Workers in Industry, described later in this volume. "You have now and then to fall to the earth when you are in the realms of scholarship and this will be our method of approach to the world," said Miss Thomas in 1921. "I cannot think it can do anything but strengthen our scholarship and the vision of the students of Bryn Mawr."

Yet alongside the intention of a newly felt sisterhood to remake the world and the preparation of a new kind of woman to do so, there was some resistance. To many, the "new woman" was anathema. The term itself was much in print around the turn of the century, used to characterize at best "the energetic, independent woman of culture" and at worst one who appeared "advanced, loud, coarse, slangy, mannish." Articles and opinions abounded, mostly critical, accusing "Novisima," as one anonymous critic named this new woman, of unbounded self-satisfaction and oblivion to her feminine obligations of gentleness, modesty, and child-bearing. So vigorous a controversy had its echoes at Bryn Mawr. In 1905, Charles Joseph Bonaparte, a grandson of Jerome Bonaparte and a prominent Baltimore lawyer, addressed the College on this issue. His message was fully recorded by a reporter in Tipyn o' Bob. "There is," he said, "no new woman. Eve may have said to Adam, 'I'm the new woman.' " With such wit Mr. Bonaparte dismissed the controversy as superficial, reassured his audience that "a woman will know in her heart that she is, after all, like her mother or
her daughter," digressed to explain that "the meaning of college life . . . is that it teaches men to be like gentlemen and . . . [women] like ladies," and concluded "with a climax, its subject being women's dress."

There is, he affirmed, no subject in which physicians or moralists have made such little progress. Dress to look well is indeed his advice to us, nor can he see why we insist upon dressing like other ladies, or being always in fashion, for to him every woman ought to look pleasing, feeling as he does that her beauty is like other powers, a way to be used as the source of happiness and righteousness. To look well is indeed, in Mr. Bonaparte's opinion, a part of our duty, for our duty is to console human life; to care for the wounded and the sick; to cheer each man, for he declares that a man after he has seen all day selfish and sordid faces, needs to see graceful forms, needs to find relaxation, that all may not be to him vanity and vexation of spirit. We are, as Mr. Bonaparte stated with much certainty, trained for this at college. As we fulfill such obligations, he concluded, so will we be judged. And feeling deeply the importance of such a duty, he urged us to dress carefully, thoughtfully, in perfect charity to our neighbours, and with the fear of God before our eyes.

One has to wonder what effect, if any, such lectures had on Bryn Mawr undergraduates. That the Bryn Mawr graduate should be a Christian lady was entirely compatible with the purpose of a classical education as defined since the Renaissance, and to see her fulfillment in consoling a besieged humanity was simply to fit her into the long-accepted view of female virtue. So the increasing presence of these highly educated minds could best be tolerated by assuming that, because of them, there would be and should be no change in society at large.

To some extent that was so. One has the impression that the "new" and the "old" woman lived comfortably and agreeably together, lion and lamb, enjoying their opportunities while resisting conformity of every sort. Some years later, in 1914, a Tipyn o' Bob acknowledged that "the new woman has not quite arrived in Bryn Mawr. Her suffrage and feminist parts are here, but what other parts there are,—alas! they are still on the old model. For example, her cooking part we find intact!" The article goes on to praise the tea-party tradition of the college. And much later, a member of the same Class of 1907 which had so uncritically listened to Mr. Bonaparte's recommendations was to recall another incident at her fifty-fifth reunion in 1962. "The old girls" she said, "were not as naive as they seemed."
When I was a young warden, Miss Thomas, probably both alarmed and excited by a little Freudian reading, engaged a well-known woman M.D. to give a course on Social Hygiene, and required all seniors to attend. This worthy had apparently swallowed the Great Viennese whole, and, before digestion had occurred, lectured to the students on the over-stimulating effect on the male animal of seeing the female clad in red, and she stressed particularly the evil effect of red shoes, which were calculated to drive him nearly mad. The day after this lecture every pair of red shoes in Philadelphia was ordered sent to Bryn Mawr College, and a large proportion of the Senior Class appeared at dinner in bright red dresses. No men, however, were around.

There was no question that the lack of men, except for faculty and visitors, was an important ingredient in the atmosphere of the Bryn Mawr community. Until relatively recently, such a situation was a given, not to be challenged by any thoughts of converting the college to coeducation, but rather defended as a positive aspect of undergraduate experience, having much to do with the sense of individuality and personality which so marked the lives of Bryn Mawr women. So it was expressed in 1900:

It gives one a feeling of very superior knowledge to realize that people in the world at large look upon a college class of girls merely as a collection of young feminine creatures, when really it is an assemblage of personages; not a "Ladies' Club for Ensemble Singing," but a startling troupe of stars. If Socrates or Caesar or Walt Whitman had happened to be members of my class, they would have had no more individuality and separateness for my mind than had some of those wonderful beings, my classmates. Indeed, I am extremely glad that Socrates and those others were not in my class, for that would have involved co-education, and where co-education is there can be no triumph of personality. A person who is being co-educated is always more or less one of the boys or one of the girls, and of course that spoils it all.

Eight decades later, some would still agree.

Conviction and merriment were not, however, the lot of all. Some felt impelled by the warnings and criticism to define their own type of feminism, to distinguish their positions from those they considered
immorally ambitious or socially unpalatable. E. Lee Fanshawe, Class of 1899, bravely expressed her desire that “women should know, value, and uphold the worth that is theirs and only theirs” but concluded with a demurral: “I speak of qualities of mind and of nature. It is not a disapproval of humility or a demand for women’s rights.” M. Carey Thomas’ assumption of equal ability in her two hypothesized bridge-builders was not uniformly shared, even by her students, and a more typical note was struck by the writer of a Lantern article in June, 1895, who warned her readers that “in talking about the beauties of collegiate education for women there is always danger of falling into a common error, and exalting too high their brains and capabilities.” The excessively extrovert and unloosed woman which a college education such as Bryn Mawr might produce was to be caricatured in a number of New Yorker cartoons over the decades, and a triennial respondent of the Class of 1905 averred that “college can develop some tendencies not so admirable. Many girls become too aggressive, self-assertive, boisterous.” But the vast majority, it seems, were able to combine their learning with sufficient modesty and their feminist convictions with sufficient decorum so as to exercise, with public approval, their trained abilities along a spectrum of endeavors which bore witness—albeit often quietly—to the scholarship and vision of their undergraduate years.

Scholarship and vision: whatever else the activities of Bryn Mawr women during and after their college years, these remained and continued to remain the paramount emphases of the College. Some critics have faulted such aims, which are essentially individual and idealistic, as quietistic and conformist attempts to win masculine honors in a masculinized society, when Bryn Mawr women’s efforts, these critics say, should be coordinated in a concerted attempt to reshape that society through resistance and rebellion. But if institutions have characters, then the ethos of Bryn Mawr is what it is, and though it has bred rebels, recognizable in every class and era, it has more generally encouraged the “individual potency” one observer noted, and that potency, refracted through the prisms of the separate personalities, has been felt in ways too many to summarize, too varied for categories, too certain to dismiss. For some, the enclosed cloister remained the more important symbol; for others, the buttresses of Goodhart with their soaring and connective energies. If there was, to the Napoleonic descendant of one of Europe’s most famous men, “no new woman,” later generations of Bryn Mawr women have effectively replied and indicated that they were all new women, in continuous and unpredictable formation, a
“startling troupe of stars,” a chorus, perhaps a cacophony, some excellent in their eccentricities, some finding it sufficiently original to lead reasonably ordinary lives, at ease with the unfamiliar, responsible to the privileges they have enjoyed, generally at work in good causes and surprisingly able to demonstrate, class by class, they were and remained feminists, each in her own way.
Essay on Feminism

What sweeping changes this new age may dare
In old age pensions or in ladies' hair
My muse might sing; yet must this feeble verse
On one, the noblest change, alone converse;
Let "Feminism" be her martial cry,
And may the echoes "Feminism" sigh.
Whether it be the right to wield the vote,
Or wear a pocket in her petticoat,
To bear a child, or earn a living wage,
Or e'en the partner for a dance engage,
Woman shall hold them all; nor brook the shame
To change her own for some slight consort's name.
No longer shall she cook three meals a day,
Nor with the needle wear her hours away;
But she shall early to the office hie
In all professions there with her to vie.
She shall be doctor, lawyer, financier,
An architect, or e'en an engineer;
She'll down the bosses and reform police,
Cure social evils and make wars to cease.
And she shall choose her own eugenic mate,
The commonwealth full fast to populate;
(Sh'e'll need not care her puling child to tend;
A female specialist her aid shall lend.)
She'll be a wife, yet capital create,
A mother, she shall also guide the State;
Till yon vain man, stricken with awe, shall cry:
"I could not do all that: not even I."

—Helen Taft, *Tipyn o' Bob*, June 1914
"TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL," said Miss Park in 1925, "Bryn Mawr largely owes what it has of international connection and reputation, and its relation with American universities." The importance of a graduate school—later, the two graduate schools—to Bryn Mawr's standing in the academic community cannot be exaggerated, nor in the two retrospective essays which describe the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research should the continuity of their high standing be forgotten. Rankings of graduate departments over the decades have placed a number of Bryn Mawr's among the top ten, a remarkable achievement for a small liberal arts college.

The evolution and vicissitudes of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences are here recounted by Barbara Bradfield Taft, herself a product of that training. Whether or not the graduate presence always aroused that "spirit of earnestness" in the undergraduates which President Rhoads invoked, it was a presence felt from the start to be necessary. Nor was there ever any doubt that a distinguished faculty deserved graduate students who—since 1931— included men, with whom they might share "to the full their stores of information," that the presence of the one strengthened the presence of the other, or that the College as a whole was the true beneficiary.

—PHL
Welcome to this curious and uncommon college that is also a small university.

HARRIS L. WOFFORD

Looking back now—with hindsight, which is the only perfect science—I think of my years on this campus mainly as time, a long and generous expanse of it, time invested in me by others and time that I have stolen from other pursuits . . . , time to stare out the window a lot, to feel the loneliness of scholarship and the community of it . . . , time to ponder what the seemingly selfish pleasures of seminar reports and footnotes might have to do with the needs of other people in this everywhere real and unreal world . . . , time to consider the forests of paper that we are all transforming laboriously here into clearer insights into the nature of this earth and our own species . . . , time to think, to mourn . . . , to feel the perplexity that Socrates saw as the precondition of learning, time to ask and to listen and gradually to work less out of proving things and more out of love.

MARGARET E. HOLLEY, PH.D. '83

It is the graduate student, at least in part, who makes Bryn Mawr co-ed. For the graduate schools are the door through which Bryn Mawr admits its own men. Apart from the countless and wondrous intellectual merits of this arrangement, for us and as well for them, there is one advantage of having men at Bryn Mawr which may go unremarked. I suspect that Bryn Mawr's male graduate students are the secret reason for the improvement of the College's athletic facilities. We are a fairly sporty group, and have instigated more than one impromptu game of touch football . . . on the third floor of Canaday Library in which many undergraduates took part.

JOSEPH PATRICK ARCHIE, PH.D. '85
"A college without graduate students never occurred to us." Such was the certainty of M. Carey Thomas. In 1883 she wrote to Dr. James Rhoads from Paris, proposing herself as a candidate for president of the new college and urging the establishment of fellowships for post-graduate study. Beyond the benefit to the fellows, she contended that their presence would "raise the standard of undergraduate work, aid in college discipline, incite professors under whom they study to original research and ... draw other post-graduates to the college." In the spring of 1884 Miss Thomas was named Dean of the Faculty under President Rhoads, who six months later announced that five fellowships had been established to carry out Dr. Taylor's desire that the College he endowed "educate teachers of a high order." How much Miss Thomas had to do with this interpretation may be imagined.

The fellowships were the first offered to women in the United States—though the legend that graduate study for higher degrees was not available to women in this country until Bryn Mawr opened in 1885 has no validity. Jane Bancroft, the first fellow named in history, held a Ph.D. in modern history from Syracuse University and had been Professor of French at Southwestern University in Evanston since 1877. Miss Bancroft's stay at Bryn Mawr was brief: she arrived in January 1886, left no record of work pursued, and within the year was in residence at the University of Zurich. Why she came to Bryn Mawr at all is a small mystery. The History and Political Science Department consisted of one so-called "associate," Woodrow Wilson. Wilson had been appointed as one of the promising young scholars recruited by Miss Thomas, but, however talented he was as a scholar, his limitations as a teacher of promising young women were well described by the second history fellow, Lucy Salmon.
Miss Salmon—who had two degrees from the University of Michigan where all degrees were open to women—came to Bryn Mawr because she received a fellowship. One of her Michigan professors warned her that it was unlikely that Wilson “knows nearly so much history as you do; but if you remember that it is more blessed to give than to receive you will have no reason to be unhappy.” How much Miss Salmon gave to Wilson is not known. How little he gave to her is clear. “He was,” she subsequently wrote, “singularly ill-adapted to teaching women . . . assumed that women were quite different from men and that, therefore, they would not interest him.” In 1887 Lucy Salmon departed for a teaching post at Vassar, where she pursued a distinguished career without benefit of the “tip-top highest” degree, as she described the Ph.D. She had enjoyed many aspects of her fellowship year, and though she later remarked that Bryn Mawr’s attempt to emulate a university was “as unnecessary as are two tails to a cat,” she conceded that the superiority of Bryn Mawr’s faculty compared to Vassar’s was evident from “the fact that other institutions call their professors but nobody ever calls ours!” Sound graduate training encourages accurate conclusions from available evidence.

Early fellows in biology, Greek and mathematics, taught by such rare scholars as Edmund Wilson, E. W. Hopkins, Paul Shorey, and Charlotte Angas Scott, almost certainly had more satisfactory experiences than the pioneer fellows in history; the first fellow in English, Mary Gwinn, received her Ph.D. in 1888—one of two degrees conferred by the College that year. Miss Thomas, the only member of the English department and the only full professor among the original faculty of nine, must have examined Miss Gwinn, who had accompanied Miss Thomas to Leipzig and Zurich and had assisted her with the 1883 letter to Dr. Rhoads. For many the situation would have been more than a little delicate. Miss Thomas undoubtedly was able for it.

Twenty years after the small but bold beginning the faculty had more than tripled and the Graduate School counted three European and two residential research fellows, as well as seven departmental fellowships and sixty additional graduate students, many of whom held scholarships. Special opportunities were offered to women from abroad and the interesting “mix” of foreign graduates was well begun. In an address to the Association of Collegiate Alumnae in 1907, Miss Thomas noted that of the forty-one universities conferring the Ph.D. Bryn Mawr ranked nineteenth in the number of degrees conferred, though thirty-seven institutions now admitted women. Bryn Mawr remained the only women’s college that offered the highest degree, and it provided, believed Miss Thomas, a peculiarly favorable environment
for the fullest development of women's scholarly and scientific qualities.

The introduction of two professional departments that had no undergraduate counterparts was only less innovative than a small college's establishment of graduate programs in arts and sciences. Miss Thomas expressed early interest in "a purely graduate school of education" to equip holders of bachelor's degrees for careers in secondary school teaching. In 1913 the Department of Education opened with the Phebe Anna Thorne Model School under its direction. Subsequently entitled the Department of Education and Child Development (1957) and in 1984 changed to the Department of Human Development, the department has emphasized study of the child rather than traditional courses in "method." It has proved increasingly attractive to highly qualified applicants and has trained a range of leaders in their fields: professors; school principals, counselors and psychologists; mental health specialists; and directors of childhood centers.

In 1915 a second professional department, the Carola Woerishoffer Graduate Department of Social Economy and Social Research, was established "to prepare women for paid and unpaid positions in social service." Highly experimental at its beginning, the department so grew and developed that fifty-five years later it split off as an independent Graduate School.

Shortly before Miss Thomas surrendered her scepter the M.A. degree was opened to graduates of institutions other than Bryn Mawr. Until 1921 this had been denied on the assumption that those who held alien degrees could not rectify their presumed deficiencies in a single year of graduate work. The Academic Committee of the Alumnae Association pressed for a change, the Academic Council of the Faculty agreed, and stiff requirements were specified. One may wonder if the change could have been accomplished if Miss Thomas had not been away on her year long journey around the world.

When Miss Park began her presidency in 1922 the Graduate School appeared to be entrenched and flourishing. In addition to the three European and two additional named fellowships, eleven departments had fellows; five of these had two fellows and Social Economy and Social Research had four. In a student body totaling 497, 103 were graduate students. The School's value to those who attended was not questioned and many recognized that women who held Bryn Mawr's higher degrees were the College's distinguished representatives in the wider academic world. But the Graduate School was expensive. Fellowships and scholarships drew down the College's limited funds; professors expended much time on a few students; the library and laboratories were
necessarily more extensive than those of exclusively undergraduate colleges. Money was urgently needed to expand an undergraduate curriculum that was narrow and rigid. The Graduate School was an obvious target of many who looked for places to retrench. There had been murmurings among the alumnae for some time. Few held Bryn Mawr degrees beyond the A.B.; many wondered whether, with the ever-increasing availability of graduate education for women, a small college could justify the expense. In 1927 the Graduate Committee of the Alumnae Association released its Report on the Graduate School—thirty-four well packed pages of history, statistics and analysis—and concluded with a resounding affirmation of the School’s value to the entire College. As Miss Thomas had anticipated more than forty years before, graduate study made an invaluable contribution to undergraduates. They were stimulated by a faculty that could not have been secured or retained without it. At the same time, in the words of Miss Park, the interests and demands of graduate research “blow down the whole of any undergraduate college into the very remotest recesses of the freshman year—a breath of a pricking, a stimulating breath of ardor, of the desire to follow into the paths of learning.”

Happily for those of us who came thereafter, in 1929 Miss Park appointed the first dean of the Graduate School, Eunice Morgan Schenck, Bryn Mawr College Class of 1907, Ph.D. 1913, and professor in the French department since 1917. A year later Miss Schenck brought Doris Sill Carlland into the Graduate School office. For fifty years, as secretary and later administrative assistant, she ably assisted deans and acting deans, dealt skillfully with concerns of the faculty, and gave counsel and comfort to hundreds of graduate students.

Miss Schenck, who had done most of the research for the 1927 Report, inaugurated major changes in the structure and curriculum of the Graduate School. The transformation of Radnor into a graduate hall provided cohesive living quarters and an intellectual center for students in various disciplines. Cooperation with nearby institutions was begun, and the dean’s “broodings,” as Miss Park described them, cleared the way to the Ph.D. of “some bombast and more red tape.” Rigorous examinations—written and oral—replaced an accumulation of credits tested by course examinations. The reform of M.A. requirements released candidates from other institutions from the demand that they complete courses for the Bryn Mawr A.B. that they had not pursued as undergraduates. Chemists and biologists were freed from irritating hours in Latin classes. Students in Greek and French no longer spent resentful hours completing a laboratory science course. The changes in
both programs opened paths that led “more directly if somewhat more steeply to the heights of scholarship.”

The last years of Miss Schenck’s administration were darkened by the Great Depression, the rise of totalitarian regimes abroad, and, finally, by war. Slender budgets were stretched to assist scholars forced to flee to a newer world, but College resources were very low. During one bleak period Miss Park confided to Dean Manning that the Graduate School might have to be closed—“at least temporarily.” Economic depression ended with the war in Europe, and by the time Miss McBride succeeded Miss Park, the United States, too, was a nation at war.

Dean Lily Ross Taylor, steady amid the convulsions of wartime, can only have enjoyed the pleasant problems of peace. Graduate enrollment increased steadily and the Graduate Residence Center moved to the old Wright School building, though by choice and necessity ever more students lived off campus. By 1952, when Eleanor Bliss moved into the dean’s office, the configuration of the student body was changing rapidly. More were married; more students were older; there were many more men. Men had been admitted since the first applied in 1931, but not until 1960 would they constitute 20 percent of the registration, and Bryn Mawr fellowships were not open to them until 1967—though since the war outside support, especially from the federal government, had eased the way for both men and women. By 1962 nearly half the students were taking advantage of the College’s long-standing encouragement of part-time study, which lightened the pressures for women with families and assisted men and women who held teaching or research jobs in the area. During Miss Bliss’ fourteen years as dean, enrollment more than doubled and twenty-five programs were taught at the graduate level.

The last twenty years have witnessed the best of times and some of the most worrisome. The Graduate School acquired its first full-time dean with the arrival of Elizabeth Read Foster in 1966. In 1970 the Department of Social Work and Social Research became a separate Graduate School with its own rules, faculty and dean. As dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Mrs. Foster continued to enhance Bryn Mawr’s influence and reputation in the national Council of Graduate Schools and other corridors of educational power. On campus, the creation of the Graduate Student Council instituted the first inclusive organization of graduate students and enabled them to articulate common concerns to the administration and directors when they gained representation on the Board in 1971. War in Vietnam and the concurrent “student movement” disrupted campuses across the land, but
prosperity, a plethora of students and a booming job market made the sixties a golden age for education.

Inflation, reduced endowments, and ever fewer openings for academic appointments were a distant prospect when Harris Wofford began his presidency of the College in 1970. From a high of 472 students in 1973, enrollment in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences sank for a decade and several years of deficit budgets triggered new questions about extensive—and expensive—graduate programs. The faculty Committee on Academic Planning considered each department: its curriculum, contribution to its discipline, and effect on the College as a whole. Some argued that the expense of graduate work robbed undergraduates of faculty time and needed resources. Many more contended that the graduate programs gave Bryn Mawr its undeniable distinction among women’s colleges and were essential to its continuance in the first rank of all colleges and universities. A survey of recent and current students elicited praise for the small seminars, close relationship between student and teacher, and the supportive ambiance—the latter remarked upon particularly by women in the sciences. At the same time many respondents expressed uncertainty about the future of graduate education in a declining job market. Yet the students persevered; so did the faculty, the administration and the alumnae. Strongly supported by the trustees, they never surrendered their belief that, somehow, the College would find the way.

Light was near if not yet visible. Phyllis Pray Bober had few highs during her seven years in the dean’s office, but she held fast to her convictions as she went forth to do battle for outside sources of support. By the time Barbara McLaughlin Kreutz became dean in 1980 the College budget was no longer in the red and the Graduate Center was making its move to the attractive milieu of Glenmede, a nearby estate that the College acquired with the help of a grant from the Pew Memorial Trust. In 1983 the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils ranked four Bryn Mawr graduate departments—art history, classical and near eastern archaeology, Greek, and Latin—among the ten best in the nation. Graduate enrollment in Arts and Sciences rose for the first time in seven years and for the first time in nine years the acceptance yield surpassed 50 percent.

And what of life after their M.A.s and Ph.D.s? The majority teach and do research, but research increasingly includes work in business, industry, and government. For some time students have also looked forward to jobs as archivists, museum curators, school, clinical and industrial psychologists. Miss Park more than once stressed the value of research training for every demanding occupation. Inevitably, she was
challenged to defend its relevance to the rearing of children. "From all that I have observed," she responded thoughtfully, "I know of nothing that could offer better preparation. It is complicated, discouraging and the results often appear to be negative." More directly, Miss Park urged those graduate students who were trained—but not "hell-bent"—researchers to consider academic administration as a career, pointing out the necessity of experiencing and understanding graduate work in order to organize a sound college and its undergraduate curriculum. Men and women trained in Bryn Mawr's Graduate Schools who serve and strengthen administrations in a variety of institutions bear witness to the wisdom of Miss Park's precept and example.

A full range of graduate programs as an integral part of a small, liberal arts college has been, in Lily Ross Taylor's words, "Bryn Mawr's most original educational experiment." No other college without the equipment of a university has attempted to maintain graduate work in every department which offers a major. It is difficult to consider this College without it.
Harkening to Uncommon Drums: 
The Graduate School of Social Work 
and Social Research

More controversial than the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences—which was there from the start—was the gradual development of a School of Social Work and Social Research. The story Dolores Griffin Norton tells is a tale of strong women committed to the professionalization of what one described as “women’s old business”: the correction and healing of society’s ills and outcasts, that is, “performing the work of a housekeeper on a larger scale.” So many of those strong women must receive mention here: M. Carey Thomas, as practical as she was idealistic about women’s traditional occupations; Carola Woerishoffer, whose bequest served a cause her short lifetime had already honored; Susan Kingsbury, Anne Bezanson, Hilda Smith, Katherine Lower—each might warrant a chapter. But what is sketched out here betokens far more than individual energies; rather it is the concretization in academic form of that spirit of social responsibility evident throughout the College’s history. Nor was this merely a reaction to social conditions but a determination to resolve those problems capable of solution, a determination Rosabeth Moss Kanter in her portrayal of one sociologist’s experience will also express, a “commitment to social change supported by theoretical knowledge and based upon research.”

That philosophy of the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research has now been realized for over seven decades in one of this country’s more highly acknowledged graduate programs. Among its many interesting aspects, one has been singled out for special mention and an appendix kindly contributed by Rita Rubinstein Heller: the
Summer School for Women Workers in Industry. Though not administratively under the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research, the Summer School had many links to the Graduate School, was brought into existence by Susan Kingsbury, and nourished during its entire existence by Hilda Smith. So significant was this experiment that it finds a place in several essays, Millicent Carey McIntosh’s and Anne Hobson Freeman’s among them. For us it provides an example of the creative energy and imagination so abundant in these uncommon women and a legacy of endeavor not only to understand the world but to be actively and usefully engaged in it.

—PHL

During the past college year the Reform Club has been successfully maintained. ... The club includes all the members of the college, its aim being, through addresses delivered at the regular meetings, to keep us in touch with some of the earnest work outside our own walls.

THE LANTERN 1892

The Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research is committed to preparing its graduates for responsible achievement in both public and voluntary social welfare. We identify social welfare as the set of concerns and value choices relating to the well-being of individuals in society. Included in social welfare are the relations of individuals to each other, the interplay of individuals and institutions and the development of social policies for those institutions.

SELF-STUDY REPORT
PRESIDENT M. CAREY THOMAS triumphed in establishing her view of the merits of graduate studies in a women’s liberal arts college. But what about a professional school as part of a women’s liberal arts college—especially a professional school in such an unscientific field as social work without a discipline to call its own? That was quite another issue!

The history of the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research is a story of unusual women and their commitment to an education that best prepared women to be effective in their lives. This essay is not a comprehensive chronicle of the School of Social Work and Social Research, but a touching upon its history at those points which seem to illustrate the uncommon character of the women who participated in that history of the School and their commitment to the education of diverse women, unlimited by class, race, or ethnic group. Indeed, these women (both as directors and as students) were joined, as time passed, by a number of creative and able men, and their combined talents were to set up an institution which became an essential part of Bryn Mawr.

As a black woman, I have found that it is this firm commitment and the diversity of the women who taught and those who studied that have fostered my personal identification with and comfort in the School. It is remarkable that this comfort and identification has persisted (albeit with some ambivalence at times) in the many years of my involvement with Bryn Mawr as graduate student, faculty member, and trustee. This affinity began when I applied to the master’s program in social work. At the time, I worked for a social agency willing to finance my professional education in return for a two-year work commitment after graduation. Feeling somewhat hesitant about applying to this “smart girls’ school,” I approached the director’s administrative assistant.
“I have an appointment with Dr. Lower.” The face looked up with some disapproval. I waited suspiciously.

“Mrs.,” the voice dropped deliberately after underlining the word, and continued, “Mrs. Lower will be with you in a moment. She is looking forward to meeting you.” And somehow in that careful phrase correcting my use of the term “Dr.,” although the director did indeed hold a Ph.D., I caught a flavor of the place that immediately began to establish my affinity with Bryn Mawr. During the interview, Mrs. Lower informed me that I had been awarded a fellowship from the Friends Freedmen’s Fund. (This Quaker Foundation established in 1863 gave scholarships to black students until 1975, when the Fund became the endowed J. Henry Scattergood Fellowship given to black undergraduates.) “We can’t have you tied to an agency,” explained Mrs. Lower. “You may have very different career goals when you are ready to graduate.” The existence of such a fellowship and the individual concern further fostered my beginning sense of comfort with Bryn Mawr.

Such comfort was not universal when M. Carey Thomas proposed to establish a professional graduate school of social work as part of the College. Some thought it would taint the College. The Annual Report of the Alumnae Association of 1917 observed that “the establishment of a graduate school of this character is a departure with which some of the alumnae, believing strongly in a cultural college, may not be in entire sympathy.” Others had reservations: “If the technical character of the work is not allowed to influence the nature of the undergraduate courses, there should be no danger of encroaching on Bryn Mawr’s standards.” Still others thought the new idea should be given a chance to succeed: “Alumnae should actively interest themselves in the development of the new school and it should be given every opportunity to prove its value.”

Miss Thomas had no doubts as to whether a professional school belonged at Bryn Mawr. It simply reflected the College’s continued commitment to better education for women. She argued that the two great professions of women, chosen by at least 90 percent of all Bryn Mawr graduates who took up professional work, were teaching and “social betterment, paid or unpaid.” “Therefore,” she concluded, “I believe that these two vocational departments are the only two purely professional university schools that Bryn Mawr should maintain.” She added that those Bryn Mawr graduates who wished to train for law, medicine, dentistry, and other professions could do it better in the large coeducational professional schools.²

The unscientific character of social work also did not concern her. Although she acknowledged the fact that "the scholarly, scientific element was lacking in social work," she continued: "It would be Bryn Mawr's business to train leaders and investigators by the most strenuous academic methods. Social work training belongs in a college like Bryn Mawr with its excellent graduate departments, because it would draw from the allied graduate departments of economics, psychology, physiology, and mathematics and sociology." These disciplines would supply the conceptual tools and methods to investigate and research social conditions and improve social work practice. Summing up her argument, President Thomas vigorously asserted: "Such scientific studies are far more needed in my opinion than active workers. Active workers are everywhere in plenty, but very little preventive work is being done in a scientific way."

Viewed in the larger social context, the time was favorable for Bryn Mawr to start a school of social work. Cornelia Meigs, writing in *What Makes a College?*, states that in creating the school, President Thomas was looking beyond the actual process of educating women to the further question of what opportunity they had to make use of that education. Her desire to educate leaders in what she called the "natural" profession was supported by Mary Grace Thomas Worthington, an 1889 alumna and M. Carey Thomas' sister, writing in the *Bryn Mawr Alumnae Quarterly* of June, 1909, on the importance of a school of philanthropy in the training of women. "It can be asserted that to insist on a pure food and water supply, clean and decent streets and better housing and working conditions is women's old business ... performing the work of a housekeeper on a larger scale. Because it has become socialized and affects ... not only the comfort, health, and morals of her own family, but that of the rest of the community as well, is no valid reason for declaring such vitally domestic matters outside her province." Worthington ended with a call for education in philanthropy: "Efficient training is necessary before women can venture forth into the large fields of municipal activity ... where the student is trained in the practice of charity and sociology and where ... municipal laws and the government of public and private institutions of all kinds can be studied."

The idea of placing a social work program in an academic institution was shared by another group of uncommon women in Chicago which

---


included Edith and Grace Abbott, Julia Lathrop, Sophonisba Breckinridge, and Jane Addams. These highly educated women, active in the anti-child labor and the settlement house movements, were making the decision to move the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy to the University of Chicago. They too believed that social work education would profit from the social science disciplines and research methods of the University and should “abandon the too often anecdotal nature of its teaching.” Since they were planning to move an already established school, they did not have the freedom of President Thomas and were actively opposed by colleagues who thought the University would eliminate field work as not scholarly. President Thomas and the Chicago women moved ahead and Bryn Mawr’s school of social work became the first, Chicago’s the second, in the United States in offering social work graduate programs within a college or university.

The Bryn Mawr Board of Directors voted to establish the Carola Woerishoffer Graduate Department of Social Economy and Social Research on February 19, 1915, “to afford women an opportunity of obtaining advanced scientific training in philanthropy and social service.”

The name of the new graduate department introduces us to another uncommon woman, Carola Woerishoffer. Carola Woerishoffer came from a wealthy New York family, who published a profitable liberal newspaper, Der New-Yorker Staats Zeitung. It may have been the influence of a family involved in “causes” that turned her attention very early in life to “improving social conditions,” especially for factory women. Her biographers are clear that Carola grew up “spirited, independent, outspoken, and anxious to go to Miss Thomas’ school.” In 1903 she did come to Bryn Mawr, where she combined philosophy and economics and elected, in addition, all the advanced economic, political science, and psychology courses that could be taken as an undergraduate. President Thomas later stated that she believed that all of Carola’s courses were chosen for the social work she hoped to do later.

Carola Woerishoffer graduated in 1907, returning to New York where she took a job with the New York State Department of Labor and also worked with the Bureau of Immigration inspecting labor camps. As part of her social investigations, she also took employment in a steam laundry and worked in several factories in order to document what she described as the “conditions of dirt, bad air and unguarded

7 Ida M. Tarbell, Carola Woerishoffer: Her Life and Work. Published by the Class of 1907, Bryn Mawr College, 1912.
machinery that women and girls worked under." She contended that "unless we know in cold figures . . . in personally verified observations what the conditions are, we can never know the true point of attack, the laws and regulations necessary, the instruction necessary, the relief necessary."

In September 1911, Carola Woerishoffer was returning to New York City after inspecting several labor camps near Cannonville, N. Y. Her car went out of control on a wet curve and plunged over an embankment, killing her. She was twenty-five years old. In her Will, made while she was still a Bryn Mawr undergraduate, she left Bryn Mawr College $750,000 with no restrictions on its use. The major portion of the bequest went into a general fund to help the College keep pace with its increasing growth. However, $250,000, Carola’s name, and her social welfare interests were combined by the Board of Directors to establish the new graduate department as a fitting and lasting way to associate her name with Bryn Mawr College. The Board also voted to create the position of Carola Woerishoffer Professor of Social Economy and Director of the Department, a Carola Woerishoffer Fellowship in Social Research in the amount of $525 for the opening year, 1915, and to add another such fellowship the next year. Probably of great envy to any current dean, the Board even authorized the appointment of support staff calling for a “Statistical Secretary of Social Research and a Reader in Social Economy.”

The first Carola Woerishoffer Professor and Director was Susan M. Kingsbury, a Columbia University Ph.D. from California who taught economics at Simmons College. For ten years she had also been the Director of the Social Research Department of the Women’s Educational and Industrial Union of Boston, carrying out in a more formal way the same research interests as Carola Woerishoffer. In introducing Professor Kingsbury to the college community, President Thomas stated that she thought the Directors had “secured one of the best persons in the country” to direct the new enterprise and added: “We shall be greatly disappointed in our expectations if, within the next few years, we are not able to publish social investigations and research which will be of service to social workers, as well as to train women to direct and administer scientifically social work itself.”

With this admonition, Susan Kingsbury took over the new department with the cooperation of five faculty members from economics, psychology, political science, education, and mathematics. Although

8 Tarbell, p. 28.
called a graduate department, it was more nearly a graduate professional school with its own Ph.D. and M.A. degrees. The Ph.D. was open to graduates of all colleges of high standing, required an independent minor and a practicum “through which training and experience could be obtained under a social service institution.” The two-year M.A. was open only to graduates of Bryn Mawr. The Directors believed that Bryn Mawr could award the M.A. only to their own graduates after so short a time of study. They could not be sure of the quality of the undergraduate work elsewhere. Graduates of other schools who studied for one or two years received certificates attesting to the work they had taken. All students had to take “seminaries” in Social Economy and Social Research, a course in Social Statistics, a course in Methods of Social Research and the practicum. The practicum, which could be spent in residence in a social welfare organization in “Philadelphia, New York or elsewhere,” was to be supervised by the Director and the agency head. Director Kingsbury was quick to point out how the practicum was related to academic work stating that it “is comparable to laboratory work in the sciences; it gives an opportunity to study methods of treatment at first hand.”

It is interesting to note that the courses of study were divided into four groupings which seem to be the precursors of current social work groupings:

1. Social maladjustment; treating of dependents, delinquents, and defectives (direct or clinical social work practice)
2. Social and civic education including neighborhood development and social centers (community organization)
3. Industrial welfare and betterment (social change and social policy)
4. Research and investigation (research methods)

Seven students entered that first year. The first graduating class in 1916 awarded one M.A. degree and one one-year certificate. The first Ph.D.s from the department were not conferred until 1920. The recipients were Agnes Mary Hadden Byrnes, whose dissertation was on “Industrial Homework in the State of Pennsylvania,” and Gwendolyn Hughes, whose dissertation was a “Causation Study of Mothers in Industry.” The dissertation topics reflected the department’s interest in women engaged in labor.

10 *Bryn Mawr College Calendar*, Carola Woerishoffer Graduate Department of Social Economy and Social Research: 1915-1916.
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This interest was further indicated in 1918 when the department became engaged in the war effort giving emergency graduate courses to prepare women for industrial management positions. These women were to solve problems affecting women working in factories during the war. The department’s involvement did not reflect merely patriotism. Susan Kingsbury’s previous work had convinced her that poverty could not be prevented or even alleviated until the labor conditions for women improved. With men at war and more women being hired, the time was right to foster change. Therefore, when the National War Council of the YWCA offered Bryn Mawr a sum of money to prepare women for positions as “employment managers, industrial superintendents, and factory inspectors of industrial problems affecting women,” she quickly accepted. The courses were prepared with the endorsement of Felix Frankfurter, then Chairman of the United States Labor Policies Board. Scholarships of $300 were offered. The special program was eight months long, and the major responsibility for it was assigned to a faculty member, Anne Bezanson.

A memo from Miss Kingsbury to President Thomas about Miss Bezanson provides an interesting look at the faculty work load in social work at the time. Miss Thomas and Miss Kingsbury agreed that Miss Bezanson could take leave the following year to complete her doctoral thesis if she would take full responsibility for the war emergency program during the academic year 1919-20:

1. Carry the two required seminars in Industrial Organization Social Economy;
2. Supervise the practicum in Industrial Supervision;
3. Teach the two required courses in Elementary Statistics and Employment Management; and
4. Since the material will be new and supported by a national organization, it seems desirable that Miss Bezanson shall endeavor to bring together for publication an outline, or syllabus or series of reprints.

The memo consigned the hapless Miss Bezanson to develop and teach four new seminars, supervise a new practicum, and write it all up for publication in one academic year. Miss Kingsbury did state that a laboratory assistant would be allowed if the statistics course had more than ten students. Twelve students enrolled in the first group, and we assume Miss Bezanson got her laboratory assistant.

The wartime emergency courses reflected the overall philosophy of the Graduate Department, the commitment to social change supported by theoretical knowledge and based upon research. The assumption
was that scientific knowledge led to more effective change. Thus, knowledge was power and better educated women would have the power to change conditions. This was explicit in a letter Susan Kingsbury wrote to the *New Republic* in September of 1918, announcing a new course in community organization: “Many of the great problems of people are to be solved by securing wise community organization and solidarity. In offering the theory and technique of community and block organization, women will become community secretaries or organizers and will be skilled in stimulating, developing, and utilizing the resources of the community.”

Nowhere was this determination to use knowledge to help women bring about social change more evident than in the unique Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers begun in the summer of 1921. The workers’ educational movement, spreading through Britain and the United States, grew out of the belief that if workers had the opportunity to read and think critically about their life problems they would be more active and effective in solving them. Bryn Mawr’s was the first residential workers’ school and was based on the assumption that women workers had to be away from the responsibilities of work and family if they were to have the leisure to learn.

Although, as M. Carey Thomas professed, the idea of a labor school for women workers at Bryn Mawr was her inspiration, both Susan Kingsbury, the first Director, and another uncommon woman, Hilda Worthington Smith (Bryn Mawr, Class of 1910), at that time a warden and acting dean, were primarily responsible for implementing this real venture into diversity. At an alumnae supper on May 31, 1921, President Thomas announced that Susan Kingsbury would be responsible for the Summer School. She also acknowledged “that without the Carolina Woerishoffer Department bringing the College in close touch with social conditions, we could not have otherwise known the menace of the lack of education among women workers in industry.”

Susan Kingsbury and Hilda Smith plunged into a program that would eventually bring 1,610 women workers to campus during the summers from 1921 to 1938. Hilda Smith, after graduating from Bryn Mawr, took a one-year M.A. at Bryn Mawr and then went on to the New York School of Philanthropy to take a two-year certificate in social work. She worked in settlement houses, city courts, and employment bureaus before returning to Bryn Mawr for a one-year stint as a

Hall Warden. She returned to Bryn Mawr as Dean in 1919. When Susan Kingsbury asked her to help organize the workers' Summer School, Hilda Smith was exhilarated. A joint council of trustees, college faculty, alumnae of Bryn Mawr, and representatives of the industrial workers worked on the original plans. Speaking with unions and alumnae, raising money, finding faculty, and setting up curriculum, "not only to teach but to learn from the women workers the problems that together they and we must solve," Hilda Smith succeeded in having the school ready in June 1921 for 78 students. They included cotton millworkers, garment workers, milliners, telephone operators, cigar-box finishers, laundry, packing-house and paraffin workers. They included Russian, English, Polish, and Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic women, and with the summer of 1926, black American women. Although all students were supposed to speak English, many did not. They lived primarily in Merion and Denbigh Halls.

Hilda Smith resigned from the deanship and spent every summer for the next thirteen years (with the exception of 1925, when she went to Europe) as director of the Summer School raising money and speaking about the Summer School during the winters. It is her autobiography, *Opening Vistas in Workers' Education*, that tells the day-by-day stories of the women who attended the Summer School. Realizing differences in points of view, she consulted with the workers about everything ranging from courses to be offered and living arrangements to recreation. The women workers eagerly gave their opinions on everything except the recreation program, where they had no advice saying, "We don't know anything about it." One union leader of hundreds of industrial workers, who had been a child laborer herself summed it up: "We never had time to play."

Although black women were decidedly a part of the program, Hilda Smith quickly learned that the larger community did not always share Bryn Mawr's Quaker philosophy. Her autobiography describes the School's dilemma when the black women were not allowed to sit with the white women at a local movie theater. Should the School boycott the theater? Just for the summer? Involve the undergraduates all year? Her autobiography does not tell us what was done, but, according to a later historian, the School evidently brought sufficient pressure to bear on the theater so that it permitted its students to attend as an integrated party.

---
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In the fall of 1938 the College terminated its connection with its offspring workers' School. The Summer School was reconstituted as The Hudson Shore Labor School when it moved to Hilda Smith's home in upstate New York. The Hudson Shore Labor School ran as a year-round, coeducational, residential operation, with more explicit trade unionist goals, from 1939 to 1952. Lack of funds, the change in leadership, and the politicization of the School brought this Bryn Mawr venture to an end. But a way had been opened and other institutions would later respond to this original impetus. And many lives had been touched, among them that of Esther Peterson who had taught drama and gym in the Summer School and went on to become Assistant Secretary of Labor and advisor to three Presidents. Hilda Smith herself, after another career in Washington, D.C., with the Works Progress Administration (WPA) and the Office of Economic Opportunity, from which she retired in 1972 at the age of 84, lived on to March 14, 1984, when she died at the age of 95.\footnote{Rita Rubinstein Heller, “Blue Collars, Blue Stockings: The Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers” in \textit{Sisterhood and Solidarity: Worker's Education for Women, 1914-1984}, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984.}

The first major study of the Summer School is the Ph.D. dissertation, \textit{Patterns of Workers' Education} by Florence Hemley Schneider, prepared for the Department of Social Economy and Social Research in 1939 and published in 1941. Another uncommon woman with a long and lively career, Florence Schneider had already earned a B.A. from Brooklyn College and an M.A. in Money and Banking from Columbia University before coming to Bryn Mawr in 1935. The founder and director of a private school (Treehaven) in Arizona with her husband, and the first woman president of the Arizona Association of Independent Academic Schools, Professor Schneider gives us a picture of the Department from 1935 to 1939 when she worked toward her Ph.D.

While men had been enrolled in the Department since 1931, scholarships and fellowships were open only to women who must agree to live on campus. Special living arrangements were allowed for part-time students and those on leave of absence from social agencies, or for those who were married. Florence Schneider traveled back and forth to New York each weekend to join her new husband. Her program consisted of three seminars and field work each semester. She was also required to take a final oral and written examination, and pass two languages. She remembers it as being very stimulating.

Of her field experiences, she writes, “I worked with Dr. Lillian Gilbreth as an advisor when I observed the application of time and motion
study in a ball bearing company in Philadelphia. I was fascinated watching Dr. Gilbreth's participation on the board of the company. She passed around photos of her twelve (Cheaper by the Dozen) children. When I timidly mentioned that I had been told to be very cool and detached as a professional woman, she retorted, "Nonsense! Did you ever see a man’s office without a display of photos of wife, children, possessions?"

Until 1947, the Department of Social Economy and Social Research continued to award the Ph.D., the M.A., and the two-year certificate. The M.A. program, now open to graduates of schools other than Bryn Mawr required a reading knowledge of two languages, a specific number of credits in the social sciences, a Master’s paper, and field work. In June, 1945, the Department granted ten M.A.s and twenty-five two-year certificates. The imbalance between the M.A. and the certificate programs and the growing recognition of social work as a profession, prompted the faculty to initiate a curriculum review and petition the Board of Trustees for permission to award the degree of Master of Social Services (M.S.S.) in place of the two-year certificate. The new M.S.S. curriculum maintained the close interrelation between the applied and the theoretical. It continued to require a broad knowledge of the social sciences and the development of social research techniques as a basis for social policy and practice. The major differences between the M.S.S. and the M.A. were the language requirements for the M.A., and fewer required social science courses for the M.S.S. Both degrees required field work, a Master’s paper and a final examination. The 1948-49 catalogue offered three degrees, the M.S.S., the M.A., and the Ph.D.

Major expansion of the department came under the administrations of Mildred Fairchild Woodbury and Katherine D. K. Lower, two more uncommon women who were the directors from 1936 to 1947 and from 1957 to 1969 respectively. Mildred Woodbury had graduated from Oberlin College in 1916, received her Ph.D. from Bryn Mawr in 1925, and taught in the College from 1925 to 1936 when she became director of the department. She was a protégé of Susan Kingsbury with whom she co-authored a book, Factory, Family and Woman in Soviet Russia. In Mildred Woodbury’s last year as director Katherine Lower came to the department as a lecturer to teach, to do research, and to supervise theses. A University of Wisconsin Ph.D. in political science (1929), she went to Washington, D.C., in the Roosevelt era to work for several New Deal programs, including the Federal Employment Relief Administration, and the Social Security Administration. During her tenure as director, Katherine Lower expanded the department’s fund-
ing base through state and federal government funding and local and national private foundations. She increased the number of faculty in the department, strengthening the social science offerings by appointing sociologists and a psychologist to the tenure track. During her directorship the Department moved out of Cartref, originally built to serve as the first president’s residence, to 815 New Gulph Road, a large old house whose remodeled bedrooms and bathrooms provided faculty offices and seminar rooms; its ballroom became a large lecture room, and its garage a faculty/student lounge.

The department continued to grow, and in 1970 the Board of Trustees made it a School with its own dean, Bernard Ross, who had already directed the Department for two years. The size of the School required another move in 1975 to its present quarters with the purchase of a solidly built former Catholic school, at 300 Airdale Road, at last providing adequate, efficient space and parking facilities. In 1976, under the leadership of President Harris Wofford and Dean Ross, and the guidance of Richard H. Gaskins, later Dean of the School, another degree was established, the Master of Law and Social Policy (M.L.S.P.). This three-year degree provides an examination of legal processes and their role in shaping social welfare policy. It brought lawyers and those with degrees in both law and social work to the School as full-time tenure track faculty. The program is unique to Bryn Mawr and is the kind of program that the founders of the School with their interest in social policy and labor investigation would have applauded.

By 1986, the School had an enrollment of 209 students which included both women and men, twenty-one faculty, and a graduating class of 67 M.S.S., 8 M.L.S.P., 4 combined M.L.S.P. and M.S.S. and 3 Ph.D. degrees. Men could receive fellowships and scholarships. The past three deans have been men (about which M. Carey Thomas probably would have had an opinion), and the text in the brochures does not speak about women and their education, but rather addresses the broader issue of changing “those economic, political and social structures which constrain opportunities and potential and perpetuate the disadvantages of certain groups in our society.”

A graduate professional school in a women’s liberal arts college? The bold experiment has indeed worked. Its graduates participate in every area of social welfare such as individual counselling, policy analysis in state legislatures, research and teaching, administration and management in state and local governments, and social agencies. The School has lived up to M. Carey Thomas’ hopes that it become an important and useful addition not only to Bryn Mawr College but to the society
beyond, not only to women but to women and men working together to improve the lot of all.

APPENDIX

The following account of the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers in Industry was provided by Rita Rubinstein Heller, Class of 1959. In collaboration with Suzanne Bauman, Dr. Heller has produced a documentary film on the School, financed by the National Endowment for the Humanities and entitled, “The Women of Summer”.

To understand the demise of the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers one must consider at least three factors. One is the predictable life cycle of any ambitious and bold, if not utopian, undertaking such as the Summer School was. The other factors involve the specifics of the School’s personalities and politics. Experiments such as this, owe their existence to bursts of creative energy which, too often, are transitory. M. Carey Thomas’ dream was a notable exception. She was wise and lucky in her choice of steward for the School: Hilda Worthington Smith succeeded at transforming the dream into a working reality. But even a Hilda Smith and the School’s success could not guarantee its longevity. Experiments’ sources of monetary and moral support are tenuous, at best. Sponsors have a way of losing their enthusiasm when the money becomes harder to raise—as it did during the Depression for both the College and Summer School—and the novelty and infatuation wear thin. Such was the scenario enacted at Bryn Mawr between 1934 and 1938.

When the Summer School left the College campus after the 1938 session, it had been deprived of Smith’s leadership for five years. In 1934 she had resigned the School’s directorship to take a Washington, D.C., New Deal post. Thus the School had lost its crucial Bryn Mawr link and what turned out to be an irreplaceable leader. Perhaps as important as the void left by Smith’s departure was the political context of the School’s later years. In the politically-charged and turbulent years of the mid-thirties, partisanship and debate of “isms” came to dominate life and learning at the Summer School. To the College, the Summer School had become “controversial.” The student body was now pre-
dominantly unionized, whereas earlier the rule had been to maintain a balance between union and non-unionized women. Vocal union organizers and leftists among the students and faculty set the tone on campus. Given these dramatic developments it was hardly surprising that relations between the College and the Summer School became strained. Increasingly, the College distanced itself from the workers’ school; it put it off the campus in 1935 after a controversy involving a strike during the previous session. And finally, in 1938, it severed its connection completely.

Nearly fifty years after the demise of the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers in Industry, what seems important is that M. Carey Thomas, Hilda Worthington Smith and the Bryn Mawr College community gave life and sustenance to so ambitious and audacious an undertaking as the workers’ school. Nearly five decades after the fact, appreciation for the School’s accomplishment is reaching a wider audience of activists, feminists and historians. The School’s place in the social history of the twenties and thirties is attracting increasing attention. The School made its mark as the pioneering and perhaps unequalled collegiate, humanistic school for blue collar women in the United States. It launched the workers’ education movement that linked two generations of reformers. The School transmuted the progressivism of M. Carey Thomas, Jane Addams and Susan Kingsbury to the new liberalism of Hilda Worthington Smith and the remarkable women’s network that surrounded Eleanor Roosevelt. The School profoundly influenced selected members of the latter generation of blue collar women, idealists and activists, union organizers and academicians to work for peaceful social change. It enabled this group to discover new inner and outer worlds while kindling within them the spirit of enlightened reform.
The Key to the Fields: The Classics at Bryn Mawr

THE CURRICULUM of the young Bryn Mawr College was rooted, like that of all nineteenth-century universities and colleges, in the study of antiquity and its chief tongues, Latin and Greek. Only gradually, as much of the educational establishment in the United States moved away from these classical commitments, did Bryn Mawr's fidelity to them become unusual. And unusual it has remained.

That fidelity and its consequences explains much about the College. There was, first of all, the firm belief that poetry held the key to the fields, that philology and archaeology served one another. Bryn Mawr has long had a dig, from Hetty Goldman's work at Tarsus in Cilicia to the present Nemea Archaeological Project in a valley of the Peloponnesus. (What better metaphor for a liberal arts education than this certainty that words and earth can reveal each other's secrets?) Beyond the alliance of stanzas and stone, there was, and is, the alliance between faculty and students who saw themselves as partners in the search for the past. Here, too, were the international connections provided by the peripatetic faculty and intrepid students. Here was exemplified the interdisciplinarity of the departments of Greek, Latin, Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology, reflective of a continuing tradition at Bryn Mawr currently embodied in sections of Freshman English which may be taught by members of the Political Science and Art History Departments, and in a renowned classical archaeologist, Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway, also an art historian.

Vermeule's essay is the first of three which represent the three major areas of the curriculum: the humanities, the physical sciences and the social sciences. We have asked three distinguished representatives of
these areas to speak for them and accord the primacy of place to the classical heart of the curriculum which may indeed be the key to every field.

— PHL

The courses in ancient and modern languages will be of equal difficulty, and will be placed on a footing of equality. The traditional separation between ancient and modern languages has been disregarded, because . . . there is . . . no modern literature, of which the study may not fitly be preceded, or supplemented, by the study of Latin or Greek.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE PROGRAM, 1885-86

Weary but elated, I started off to Greece again as an Agora fellow of the American School in Athens excavations. The digging was excellent, the work good fun . . . , the interludes of travel to France, Germany and Constantinople delightful, and the companions so agreeable that I decided to marry one, in order to strengthen my ties with that irresistible institution.

DOROTHY BURR THOMPSON '23

It is a property of conscious spiritual apprehension that it can come into direct contact with distant events in paradoxical disregard of material space and physical time. The sentient mind cannot merely sense its immediate surroundings in space but can also apprehend past situations and environments. It can thus stretch the operative or living span of the present until the past reinfluences the present for a second time and in a novel way.

RHYS CARPENTER
Every true poet has the key to the fields.
—B. L. Gildersleeve, *Brief Mentions*

The Classics at Bryn Mawr have been highly visible, public and active this past century. The faculty from the three independent departments of Greek, Latin, and classical and near eastern archaeology have been a force inside the College, setting standards and shaping the curriculum, and outside the College in work recognized as achieving international distinction, as well known abroad as at home. Generations of students in all the fields represented by the Classics are scattered around the world, teaching, writing, and excavating. Why has the classical tradition been so powerful at Bryn Mawr?

It is not immediately obvious why a small women’s college should have attracted and held so many strong classicists on the faculty, or should have turned out so many students who made a genuine difference to the field in later life. Anyone even remotely familiar with classical studies in America will have heard, at least through lectures or book reviews, of Bryn Mawr graduates both of the College and of the Graduate School who have made more marked contributions than any founding Friend might have predicted, from Edith Hamilton and Hetty Goldman to Lily Ross Taylor and Mary Hamilton Swindler to the present faculty.¹

One explanation for the strength of the Classics must be that they were always exciting to study, in themselves, as they were presented by skillful teachers, and as they were integrated in college life, from the

¹ A limited list would include Helen Bacon, Patricia Boulter, Mariam Coffin Canaday, Dorothy Cox, Rosamond Deutsch, Edith Hall Dohan, Virginia Grace, Claireve Grandjouan, Evelyn Harrison, Louise Holland, Sara Immerwahr, Frances Jones, Mabel Lang, Berthe Marti, Lucy Shoe Meritt, Agnes Kirssopp Lake Michels, Marjorie Milne, Marianne Moore, Marion Park, Mary Zelia Pease Philippides, Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway, Evelyn Smithson, Doreen Canaday Spitzer, Agnes Stillwell, Marion Tait, Dorothy Burr Thompson.
Bryn Mawr owl to singing *kalon to athlon kai elpis megaile* in the Cloisters on Lantern Night. Classes were fun, the library was remarkable, the faculty was accessible but not interfering, the seminar rooms were a challenge to broader reading, and the mixture of graduate and undergraduate students seemed inspiring on both levels. Each was curious about what the other might be thinking, reading, or doing, and where the undergraduate looked with awe at the ease of the graduate student in sorting out lexical problems or locating German articles, the graduate student was also frequently astonished by the undergraduate’s enthusiasm for poetry or dirt archaeology, not yet abashed by being told that any problem was too difficult to solve. The intellectual climate was good for the Classics; the College was never troubled by debates on whether the Classics were “relevant”—that they were was taken for granted by everyone, thus sparing the faculty much hot air—and it was generally agreed that whether one was really engaged in science or literature or history, a closer acquaintance with antiquity could never hurt. For those who specialized, the teachers have always been good, the students eager, the enrollments quite high, and the undergraduate training carried on through life to an astonishing degree.

Students who lose the mental discipline that Greek affords should have that lack supplied so far as practicable.


Students often came into the College with Greek; Latin and ancient history were expected of them. The old entrance examinations showed the level at which incoming freshmen were supposed to deploy their talents. “Who were the Dorian?” they asked expectantly, a question still pretty difficult to answer. “Describe the Persian system of government,” they requested, “and point out some of its weaknesses.” No doubt the young scholars had good things to say on kingship and satrapies and revenues. One of the attractions of a Bryn Mawr education in the ancient world was that the fields were never kept apart in cloisonné cells but always integrated. The student of tragedy must know history; the student of archaeology must know Lucretius and Homer. Bryn Mawr was a place that expected good ancient languages of its art historians in the ancient field and a knowledge of vase-painting by students of myth. The independence of the three departments apparently freed the faculty from any sense of internal rivalry; less time was wasted arguing priorities, less psychic energy spent on competition than in universities with portmanteau departments where the philologists affect disdain for the archaeologists as ditch-diggers, not men of letters, and the Hellenists look down upon the Latinists as newcomers and in-
cept imitators. At Bryn Mawr, registration in the next department was encouraged even when enrollments were small; there was a general feeling that scholars did not and could not work in isolation, but needed the viewpoint of a colleague with different interests and orientation. There was no doubt that human history from the Bronze Age to the Middle Ages was large enough and interesting enough to hold everyone who made the effort to enter it.

Bryn Mawr did not give a "general, universal" education by this interdisciplinary study, rather courses quite specific in their focus (the Odes of Pindar, Romans in Asia Minor), for this focus was as much mental discipline as Greek in itself, and generalities about the Classics, in or out of translation, were deplored. Still, even after the focused courses in all the fields, one was expected not to lose sight of the rest of the world and other histories and literatures and arts. One comprehensive examination question for seniors reminded them of this, harshly: "What quotations from classical antiquity were most frequently used in the House of Lords in the Eighteenth Century?"

No one who has ever heard Dr. Sanders discourse upon the Dative of Uncomfortable Supposition can ever forget the difference in feeling between a genitive and a dative.

—Agnes Kirsopp Lake Michels

Part of the power of classical training at the College came from the mutual respect of faculty and students, the students often unaware of the distinction of the faculty in a school where distinction was commonplace and lightly worn, but recognizing the level of their learning, their benign authority, and their genuine interest in the future potential of the student. "Dr. Sanders . . . always pays his youngest student the compliment of listening to her ideas with as much attention, at least outwardly, as he would to those of Jebb or Wilamowitz." The students liked this kind of teaching even when it scared them. They were never told what to think but, even in matters of grammar, they had to work out the rules and shadings of meaning for themselves, and in advanced matters of literary interpretation they were expected to hold a comprehensive and independent point of view. When the Bryn Mawr undergraduate recovered from the first shock of realizing that she must direct her own education instead of receiving predigested dogma, she generally found it to be a pastime of absorbing interest. If she did not speak in class, from shyness (rarely, in those days, from lack of preparation), she was subtly made to feel that she was doing her own talent a disservice, and that open and intelligent participation in a common discussion with fellow scholars was the best way to make sure she had thought of
all the aspects of a problem. If she failed to understand a verse because she did not see the syntax involved, this was never a matter for contempt (until it happened a second time) but always an opportunity for explanation. The work was a daily exercise which had best be done well, as in athletics, and maintaining a consistent level of fitness was expected. It was also exciting to see how things were put together, with nuances of tone and complexities of metaphor. “We had a chance to learn if we could, not only a language, but a mental attitude, a combination of intellectual curiosity and detachment, that would be of infinite value to us always, after we had left college.”

We do not send students to work with men who died some years ago.

—Lily Ross Taylor

Miss Taylor meant by this that the Bryn Mawr undergraduate preparation was acknowledged to be only a beginning. The college faculty itself was splendid, but students should also have the advantage of later study with different kinds of minds. A Bryn Mawr graduate was welcome to do whatever she liked; the academic life was never the only possible goal; she should travel or write or enter politics or train dogs; it should matter only that she liked to do something and never be content with the passive state of existence. Thus there came to be a number of distinguished strays, into fields like banking and veterinary medicine. A surprising number wrote poetry, in interesting meters, from long training in Greek cadences.

When a student wanted to continue classical training, the faculty was devastating in its advice. It would frankly warn against studying with any kind of academic guru, or men of literary fashion, or objects of mob idolatry; it reserved the highest and only respect for scholars whose achievements lay in research and publication—if they were both sound and original.

From the beginning these attitudes dictated the kind of faculty members who were invited to teach at Bryn Mawr. They were usually young men of great promise, just starting their careers. Some left Bryn Mawr for larger and richer institutions, but always with expressions of regret as they left and a vivid display of nostalgia later. Paul Shorey was one, who came back often from Chicago, to stimulate the undergraduates with the aristocratic salt he cultivated, and to warn the outside world about abandoning the Classics. He would preach to the converted against pseudo-scientists and education managers who found the past out of date and useless, who promoted vocational training and “doubted whether a civilization that spends fifty million dollars a year
on chewing gum . . . [could] spare the money to maintain a few chairs of old English and Greek.” Voluntary ignorance of the past seemed, at Bryn Mawr, then as now, a self-inflicted wound.

The young professors often exhibited great range in their teaching, in ways surprising to those who knew them as specialists in their later university careers. A. L. Frothingham taught the Monuments of Rome in 1887. Herbert Weir Smyth taught Greek art and archaeology in 1889, a decade before his great Greek Melic Poets was completed at the School in Athens. Bryn Mawr did not have enough money to allow narrow specialists, at least in teaching, although it encouraged special research in every way. The faculty seemed to flourish from having to look into matters outside their own work and were happy explorers of new fields along with the students. Amelia B. Edwards, Joseph Clark Hoppin, William Hayes Ward, Caroline Ransom, Arthur Wheeler, Henry Neville Sanders, Leonard Woolley, Edith Hall Dohan, Prentice Duell, Tenney Frank, Charles H. Morgan taught outside the fields in which their most renowned books became authoritative. When Dr. George Barton left after twenty-nine years the college made manifest its admiration for his range: “Assyriology in all its ramifications, Old Testament and New Testament criticism, Hebrew philology and archaeology, Phoenician inscriptions, Hittite lore, Islam and general Semitic culture, and the large field of the historical study of the religions.” Along with the range came the sense of high standards and expectations for every class. Tenney Frank spoke for all of them, in their serious regard for the young women whose training they were charged with, in his memorial words for Arthur Wheeler: “Careless interpretation, slipshod thinking, fallacious logic, evasive statements and cloudy style were things that he abhorred, and his students soon learned that these had no place in his classroom.”

An old Bryn Mawr friend and I set out from Nemea at six one morning to walk to the Styx.

—Lucy Shoe Meritt

Since the undergraduate education encouraged students to master more than one field in classical studies, there came into being from the beginning an unusual integration of literature, history, and archaeology. Bryn Mawr classicists were often abroad, early awake and afield. President Thomas’ expectations for the faculty were international, and they gladly complied. Students were attached to the American School of Classical Studies and to the Classical School of the American Academy at Rome as soon as those institutions were founded. Bryn Mawr faculty directed them both. The School and the Academy are still the
focal centers for advanced training, and there are sometimes complaints from students at other universities about the density of Bryn Mawr bodies in those halls. Still, since the School was co-founded by the same man who first organized an independent department of art and archaeology at Bryn Mawr in 1896, Richard Norton, son of Charles Eliot Norton who “invented” the undergraduate study of Greek art at Harvard, the connections are no doubt too old to be disrupted.

Hetty Goldman twice held Harvard’s Norton Fellowship at the School in Athens; Virginia Grace, Dorothy Burr Thompson, Mary Zelia Pease Philippides, Mary Swindler, Rhys Carpenter, Mabel Lang, and Machteild Mellink were to spend a large portion of their professional lives there. Lily Ross Taylor, Agnes Kirsoop Lake Michelis, T.R.S. Broughton played essential roles at the Academy in Rome, and Richmond Lattimore became engaged there. Best of all, these scholars’ homes abroad proved to be interchangeable; you would frequently find Mr. Carpenter in Rome, making his revelatory observations on familiar statuary, or Miss Taylor in Athens, wondering at the odd provincial Latin of Greek imperial inscriptions, or all of them would turn up together unexpectedly in Ankara or Cairo or Berlin. The same nomadic restlessness combined with certainty of meeting another Bryn Mawr tyr at the other end of the trek fills some early class notes: “1889: Emily Greene Balch and Harriet Randolph met quite unexpectedly in Constantine, a city of North Africa. The one had just come from the desert into which the other was about to go.”

I have much humiliation to record at the hands of brigands.
Twice have I been at their mercy and twice rejected as unworthy of capture.

—Hetty Goldman

When one thinks of archaeology at Bryn Mawr, one probably thinks of Hetty Goldman as among the earliest and most distinguished of the graduates to excavate in Mediterranean lands. She set a high standard for the many who followed, as one would expect of the only woman professor ever appointed to the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton in its first five decades. It is probably characteristic that the first publication by an impressive future archaeologist should have been her work on the staging of Aeschylus’ Oresteia, both in dramatic literary terms and with the support of the vase paintings; it is still the best standard article in a much-investigated field. Miss Goldman excavated with style and fortune. Her early adventures at Halac were saved when a fortunate gust of wind humiliated the black-robed priest holding a
pistol at her, by revealing his checked trousers. Her work at Eutresis issued in a model report to which students now turn as a prime example of lucidity in archaeological writing. She accepted gallantly the complete loss of her finds at "Homerian" Colophon in the disastrous year of the Graeco-Turkish War in 1921-22 ("all that remained was a single iron bedstead on which a local policeman was found taking his noon-day siesta . . ."). Bryn Mawr was the first women's college to sponsor a field excavation overseas, and Miss Goldman's work at Tarsus in Cilicia was another landmark in unraveling those historical relationships of Eastern and Western cultures which have always been a preoccupation at Bryn Mawr.

From Boeotia to Cilicia, from the Stone Age to St. Paul, from Bryn Mawr to Harvard and Princeton, Miss Goldman's career as a classicist and field archaeologist set a fine pattern for other Bryn Mawr adventurer-scholars: Mrs. Holland exploring the Tiber on a rubber raft, to identify bridges and the sites on both sides; Miss Lang patiently detaching and piecing together the crushed layered frescoes of Gordion to recreate the history of Anatolian wall-painting; Miss Mellink discovering the first archaic and classical painted tombs of southern Turkey; Mr. Broughton legging it over the Anatolian horizon in search of echoes from Rome; Mr. Lattimore reflecting with Bryn Mawr detachment on the murder victims of the Bridge at Arta. No conflict between archaeology and poetry, for any of them.

On Mount Eryx my attempt to understand the scene of the Fifth Aeneid aroused doubts in the mind of a carabiniere.

—Lily Ross Taylor

"Understanding the scene" may be one key to the success of the Classics at Bryn Mawr. In a college where the philologists excavate, like Miss Lang at Athens and Gordion and Pylos, and the archaeologists write poetry, like Mr. Carpenter, and the poets recreate the children and feelings of the past, like Mr. Lattimore, it is not surprising to see a vivid sense of reality permeating literary studies, or a strong sense of poetry invigorating the study of the monuments. Miss Taylor was no doubt doing what Miss Goldman had done with the Orestes, staging Vergil in her imagination, reflecting on the cerulean-spotted serpent or the burning ships, giving the fresh gift of life to the dead. This is what all scholars do all the time, and it is the special mission of the classicist.

Much of this classical work at Bryn Mawr is oddly but strongly connected to Homer and the Trojan War. While Miss Taylor was recreating old Trojan scenes on the top of Mount Eryx, Mr. Carpenter was
tracking the Phoenicians of the *Odyssey* across the waters below. Mr. Lattimore created the best translations of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in this century, while Miss Lang was deciphering—in the field, too—the Linear B texts of Pylos that seemed to show how Homeric Achaeans really lived and ate, and at the same time cleaning the frescoed pictures on their walls. Miss Swindler, in the course of preparing her monumental and irreplaceable *Ancient Painting*, became an expert on the iconography of the Trojan War in Greek vase-painting and in Roman wall-painting. Mr. Broughton understood the topography of Asia Minor better than most, and spent years exploring on foot those classical scenes. Mrs. Michels was the single authority who could disentangle what was Greek in the multiple Roman tales of their Trojan ancestors from what was Italian. Miss Goldman’s Tarsus excavation was designed to illuminate Bronze Age history and interconnections at the time of the Trojan War. Miss Mellink’s Elmali excavations extended that history, backward to an Early Bronze Age not unconnected to Troy, and forward to the period of the Persian Wars, and the paintings in which Persian and Greek elements are miraculously blended. Is there a theme here, that, though many other institutions separate archaeology from philology to the loss of both, and often engage in increasingly technological exercises forgetting humanism, Bryn Mawr has from the beginning joined forces across departments and focused on great poetry, and the Greek engagement with the older cultures of the East?

*Sophias philai parômen*

Few colleges sing their principal songs in Greek any more. Few, in their confidence, do not feel the need to debate the “relevance” of the classics. Few could have been given, as accolade from the 1982 committee of outside Accreditors who came to look into the teaching of the Classics at Bryn Mawr, this judgment: “The students feel respect. They respect their teachers, and themselves, and one another, and they respect their work. You do not see that in many places these days.” Feelings of respect are not confined to the classicists, of course, but they did on that occasion emerge in a classical context, and have evidently been part of the classical tradition from the start of the College.

The respect was created by the appointment of a faculty with every promise of distinction, which was in almost every case fulfilled, and by the serious purpose of these scholars in teaching. It is remarkable that so many generations of Bryn Mawr students should have studied with the absolute best in their fields, and should have been treated by these teachers as junior colleagues capable of solving the same problems they
were working on themselves. The curious mixture of cordiality and aloofness—no doubt in self-protection against erosion of time—that marked faculty-student relationships was a stimulating element in the atmosphere; we might be future junior partners, but like junior partners everywhere we had to work independently and imaginatively to be credible. Supervision was often minimal, although references and bibliographies would come flowing as fast as we could absorb them, and the final work, at all ages, was expected to be somewhere near the frontiers.

Stability and continuity on the faculty was another strength. It was possible for a freshman entering in the autumn of 1946 to work with two scholars who had been at Bryn Mawr since 1913 and 1914, Miss Swindler and Mr. Carpenter. At the same time, “at Bryn Mawr” did not mean withdrawing into the institution, but brought with it an atmosphere of London and Paris, Athens and Rome, which, supported by a stream of visiting scholars, made a small college in Pennsylvania some kind of international institute. No one was in awe of these explicators of mysteries, whether it was Toynbee or Eliot or a graduate student sharing a chapter of her dissertation. There was always a disarming modesty, a lack of pomposity or affectation, a constant interest in work and curiosity about the unknown, the awareness that library work was not enough, that philology could not be cloistered, that there were secrets in the earth that demanded all one’s honed skills.

It has all been so short, but so filled with incident, time compressed and imagination expanded, a moment quick as “the light-lifting wings of a dragonfly,” as Mr. Lattimore would say, impelled by Simonides. Yet in that moment, who could forget any of those personalities in a thousand vignettes? Edith Hamilton, at a festival in her honor at the Odeion of Herodes Atticus in Athens, picking up a stray black kitten that had bumped her on its course across the stage, and cradling it as she spoke so urgently into the microphone for thousands in the audience; Hetty Goldman, in great old age at Princeton, outshining her own shining black hair with her smile; Dorothy Thompson, who had discovered and retrieved from thieves a rich and untouched Mycenean tomb, explaining in fluent dialect to a cruel donkey-owner in Athens the responsibilities of a Christian gentleman toward the animal world; Miss Grace on Delos, elucidating a difficult problem in Hellenistic history that she had just solved, in terms of Winnie the Pooh; Mrs. Philippides, entering a crowded conservation room with pot-strewn tables, naming at eighty paces the artist of a black-figured sherd she had never seen before; Mrs. Holland impersonating the Warrior from Capestrano with vivid success; Lucy Shoe Meritt’s shock when her manuscript on
ancient moldings was stolen in Naples and her patience in redoing the meticulous drawings; Miss Taylor reciting Lucretius over her tea table, or wondering in the library stacks if the Romans had ever learned Greek really well; Mr. Broughton, known to alternately awed and irreverent undergraduates as The White Lion, silently pointing out a rare butterfly and moving away to leave it undisturbed; Miss Swindler walking her white bundle of dog named Happy and discoursing both of the correct dating of the Thermon metopes and her days on the Indiana varsity basketball squad; Mr. Carpenter, scarred and panting, saying “There’s no real harm in Rebel,” as he tried to restrain ninety pounds of snarling champion Doberman; Mr. Lattimore as squash champion and springiest member of the corps du ballet in the Faculty Show walking the railroad track at Rosemont while culling his *Sonnets from the Encyclopedia*; Miss Lang at Gordion, baking a cherry pie for the Fourth of July in the huge mud oven outdoors (it took six hours) or knitting argyle socks in Linear B; Miss Mellink persuading five hundred tourists on a cruise ship that she was having a romantic interlude with her companion whom she introduced as Heinrich Schliemann (“and when shall you be returning to your interesting work at Troy?” asked a gentleman from Boston), or racing horses in the evening on the Anatolian plateau.

Here were fierce scholars, earthily and practically in tune with the world, competent with their hands as with their brains, gardeners, botanists, naturalists, athletes, musicians, humorists, poets. *Enthumoume-tha orthós hosa praxomen orthós.*
Remarkable Participation: Some Beginnings in Science at Bryn Mawr

The high level of academic work maintained in the classics at Bryn Mawr is true of the physical and social sciences as well, including new developments in mathematics and computing. Jane Oppenheimer’s essay recounts alliances between undergraduates, graduate students and faculty which often issued in papers reporting advanced research and published in scholarly journals, signed sometimes by the undergraduate alone and sometimes jointly. There was every effort, from the earliest decades onward, to make of students in science full participants in the scientific community. Nor was there ever any suggestion that a woman’s education should not include the most rigorous scientific training.

In these fields, as in others, there were giants. Florence Bascom, the first woman to receive a Ph.D. from The Johns Hopkins University in 1893 and the only woman in the United States to hold a doctorate in geology at that time, launched the geology department at Bryn Mawr in 1895, and for the next thirty years divided her time between teaching and mapping eastern Pennsylvania in her horse and buggy. E. B. Wilson and T. H. Morgan were equally distinguished faculty in the Department of Biology. Among their students were Umé Tsuda, about whom Elizabeth Vining’s essay will have more to say; Nettie Maria Stevens, who discovered that the sex of a biological organism is determined at the moment of fertilization by the combination of x and y or x and x chromosomes; Alice M. Boring, whose letters from Yenching University in Peking where she “built up the Biology Department” animate the Alumnae Bulletin’s of the mid-20s and later. “The rare quality in Dr. Morgan,” Alice Boring recollected in 1945, “was his delightful
sense of adventure in all his research, and this sense of adventure was contagious."

With such contagious dedication, the problems once posed by inadequate facilities were somehow resolved. If once upon a time biological specimens were kept "in the small room in the cellar of Taylor which has been emptied of coal," if the physics lab spent its early days in a converted laundry, now a proper science building houses these disciplines and instruments such as the polarizing microscope and the x-ray diffractometer have come to supplement what the horse and buggy began. The high seriousness of advanced research continues undaunted by the irreverent remarks of initiates to dissection, as does the remarkable participation of students and the interdisciplinary activity of the faculty. Where a chemist works with an archaeologist to analyze scrapings from the walls of ancient Turkish tombs, these academic fields share their fruits and the academic estate remains a cooperative, proud, and productive joint heritage.

— PHL

There will be no marked distinction between students of science and of language. The standard of matriculation is the same for all.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE, 1884

We finish our pigeon tomorrow and begin on the rabbit in Bi. The girls who had it last year have their rabbit skins like little rugs hung on their doors. Personal association lends endearment, I suppose.

HILDA WORTHINGTON SMITH

Bryn Mawr students are six times more likely to earn degrees in the sciences than the average female college population nationwide, and eighty percent of these women continue with graduate study.
When Dr. James E. Rhoads presented to the Bryn Mawr Trustees his President's Report for the year ending Tenth month 10th, 1884, concerning preparation for the opening of the college in 1885, he wrote of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts that the students “must pass successful examinations in the elements of Chemistry, of Physics, of Botany, or of Physiology.” Bryn Mawr College was not the first American institution of higher learning to do so, but it was early in establishing a requirement in science for the Bachelor of Arts degree, and also early in permitting or encouraging first-year students to enroll in a science course.¹

Later in the report Dr. Rhoads discussed the sciences in more detail:

Among the various departments of science it has been necessary to select those most desirable as present forms of knowledge, and as most likely to be fruitful in the future life of students. Of these chemistry is easily chief. Treating of the atomic and molecular relations of matter, it is the basis of the allied sciences. Physics is closely connected with chemistry. It deals with the forces which bind and control all material things, and an acquaintance with it is necessary to the right understanding of mineralogy, geology and biology, so that instruction in its elements, at least, must be included in any wise scheme for a college... Physics has an added merit, in

¹ Lucy West, the College Archivist at Bryn Mawr, has provided so much assistance during the preparation of this chapter that in all justice she should be considered an equal co-author of it. I owe Dr. Alex Nickon, Vernon K. Krieble Professor of Chemistry at Johns Hopkins University, and Dr. John M. Kopper, a former Professor of Engineering at Johns Hopkins, enormous gratitude for their efforts to ascertain the degree of undergraduate participation in research in the Chemistry Department at that institution in early years. The first two words of this essay's title have been supplied by the editor.
that it supplies problems for the application of the higher mathematics.

It would seem natural to go on from these branches to mineralogy, as dealing with matter in its crystallized and agglomerate forms, and then to geology as the study of the larger masses which form the earth’s structure. But acting upon the principle that whatever is attempted should be done as thoroughly as possible, it has been found necessary to postpone these sciences, as well as the kindred one, astronomy, until the resources of the College will permit them to be made electives with adequate provision for teaching them.

Passing by these, biology has been chosen. Devoted to the consideration of matter under the control of those forces which have been termed vital, that is, to the study of the structure and functions of living things, it leads to a knowledge of our own body, with the laws of health, and has relation to almost all personal and social duties. . . .

Beside their intrinsic worth as means of self-culture, physics, chemistry and biology afford a valuable preparation for the study of medicine; a profession to which an increasing number of women are successfully devoting themselves.

It turned out that instruction in physics did not begin until the academic year 1887-88, when, according to the President’s Report covering that period, only the first-year course was offered. The reason for the delay was explained by the printed Bryn Mawr College Program for 1885-86, which stated: “There is as yet no space for a very extensive physical laboratory, and therefore, the department of Physics has not been separately organized, but is temporarily associated with the department of Chemistry.”

Perhaps in part because of their earlier beginnings, but also for other reasons that will soon become evident, my remarks here will concentrate on the Departments of Chemistry and Biology and their pursuits during the early years of the College. In the short space allotted to me here I choose neither to discuss the details of their early curricula, nor to heap eulogia upon the stellar dramatis personae who set their standards. I propose rather to point out the remarkable degree of student participation in research activities that characterized both of these departments almost from their very beginnings.

In the case of the Chemistry Department, my main sources of information have been the President’s Annual Reports issued by Dr. Rhoads for the academic years from 1886-87 through 1893-94. Some very
slight mention of research performed in the department first appeared in the report for 1886–87. The report for 1887–88 was a little more explicit, stating that “an experimental research upon the atomic weight of oxygen has ... been carried on during the past year. The results that have been obtained thus far have been published in two papers.” The report did not specify who wrote the papers, but the author proves to have been Edward H. Keiser, the College’s first professor of chemistry. He came to Bryn Mawr with a Johns Hopkins Ph.D. awarded in 1884; he had been an instructor at Johns Hopkins during the academic year 1884–85.

The portion of Dr. Rhoads’ report for 1888–89 devoted to class work in the Chemistry Department concluded with the paragraph stating that the atomic weight of oxygen was studied and the results published in two papers. The following year a paragraph headed Original Work again mentioned the atomic weight of oxygen and also determination of the atomic weight of palladium; “valuable results have been obtained, which will soon be published.” Paragraphs on original research continued to conclude the sections of Dr. Rhoads’ reports that dealt with chemistry, occasionally, although not invariably, mentioning publication, but until 1892–93 without specifying authorship.

The first real surprise comes in the report for that year, when the section on Original Research reported that “the results of some of these researches are in press. Miss Breed’s article upon ‘Phenolphthaeline and Methyl-orange as Indicators in Alkalimetry’ also deserves mention.” It has not proved possible to locate such an article on this subject published from Bryn Mawr around that time, and the present Chemistry Department has no record of it in what it considers to be a complete list of department publications. But who was Miss Breed, the very first author among the chemical research investigators to be named by name in the President’s Reports?

She was Mary Bidwell Breed, born in 1870, who came to Bryn Mawr in 1890 from Bloomington, Indiana, to become a member of the Class of 1894; she was later to be that Class’s European Fellow, to receive two higher degrees from Bryn Mawr, and to become a professional chemist and university administrator. But what was her status in 1892–93, the year that President Rhoads said that she had written an article on indicators? She was a junior at Bryn Mawr College.

I am told by present-day chemists (who differ from biologists in this respect, as we shall see) that it is unlikely that their periodicals would have accepted in the 1890s an article under the sole authorship of a student. Perhaps the article did not appear in print; possibly it was published in an organ unknown to me. But during Miss Breed’s senior
year, a number of months before she graduated, an article on the atomic weight of palladium, of which she was the junior author, appeared in the January 1894 issue of the important American Chemical Journal; Keiser was the senior author. Miss Breed’s participation in the work on palladium was not commented upon by Dr. Rhoads in the President’s Reports for 1892-93 and 1893-94 when he reported that it was under way, and he did not survive to write the report for 1894-95. Miss Thomas, who did write that report, also mentioned the work but not the fact that an undergraduate had participated in it.

Is it or is it not noteworthy that the only author among the chemists to be identified by name by Dr. Rhoads was Miss Breed, and that he did not call attention to the fact that she was an undergraduate? Perhaps in those early years of the College, when the student body was still small, the president could assume that all the readers of his report would know exactly who Miss Breed was.

I chose to discuss first the work in chemistry since Dr. Rhoads had so clearly expressed the opinion, as we have seen, that chemistry is the chief among scientific disciplines. Of the scientific subjects taught early in the College, he seemed to consider biology of the next importance. In his Annual Reports he treated the research carried out in that department in the utmost detail; perhaps because of his own professional training in medicine it seemed especially meaningful to him. In the report for 1887-88, for instance, he listed by title five pieces of work, with references to articles in two journals (to one of which he gave an incorrect title). The next year he identified by name two professors who were carrying out original work, and also mentioned, without giving their names, three students who were doing research. Of one, he said that she “began an investigation upon the relation of cardiac nerves and muscles which she intends to carry forward as graduate student next year,” a remark that might seem to signify that she was still an undergraduate in the year 1888-89.

In the report for 1889-90, he specified that the Fellow (who proves to have been Harriet Randolph, of the Class of 1889, later to teach at Bryn Mawr from 1892 to 1913, though she received her doctor’s degree elsewhere) was performing an embryological investigation “now well advanced, and... in part ready for publication,” and he said much the same of two students in physiology. Research and publications by E. B. Wilson, named by name, were also reported. This pattern, where faculty members and graduate students are named by name or identifiable by title, was followed in all his subsequent reports on the Biology Department. The first undergraduate name to appear among the biological investigators was not that of a conventional member of a
Bryn Mawr class, but that of a Special Student, a very special one at that. It was that of Umé Tsuda who had come from Japan to study English and history and who is described in detail elsewhere in this book: "Miss Tsuda’s work on the orientation of the axis of the frog’s egg should, on account of its excellence, have special mention," wrote Dr. Rhoads in his report on biology for 1891-92.

E. B. Wilson, head of the Biology Department, was a Johns Hopkins Ph.D. of 1881; he had taught one year each at Williams and at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology before coming to Bryn Mawr when it opened. He was one of the most distinguished American biologists of his own or of any later generation. He left Bryn Mawr for Columbia in 1891, and the position at Bryn Mawr was then filled by T. H. Morgan, a biologist of equal distinction. Morgan was an embryologist while at Bryn Mawr. He followed Wilson to Columbia in 1904, there becoming a geneticist. In fact, he was a principal founder of the science of genetics, for which he received a Nobel Prize in 1933, the only former member of the Bryn Mawr Faculty ever to receive the award.

Morgan’s teaching during his first year at Bryn Mawr was mentioned by Dr. Rhoads in his report for 1891-92 but that report did not mention original work in biology. In the reports for the two remaining years of Dr. Rhoads’ life, the research work of several graduate students in biology came in for much detailed attention, as did that of a number of individuals designated simply as “students” who may well have included undergraduates too. Miss Thomas’ reports for the three years following Dr. Rhoads’ death were fairly similar in form to his and laid much emphasis on graduate students’ research. Some mentioned the use of an investigators’ room at Woods Hole by “advanced students” without otherwise specifying their level of advancement.

In the case of the Biology Department, however, it is not necessary to depend on the President’s Reports for information about publications based on student work, especially during the days of T. H. Morgan. Morgan was a member of the National Academy of Sciences, and a full list of his publications accompanied his biography that appeared in the Academy’s Memoirs in 1959. Inspection of it shows that of Morgan’s articles published between 1894 and 1904, during his Bryn Mawr years, eight bore the names of Bryn Mawr students as co-authors. Umé Tsuda was one of his student collaborators—but she was hardly the only one: there were seven others as well.

For the Biology Department, it is easier than for the Chemistry Department to locate publications by students, at least for those that went to press during Morgan’s years at Bryn Mawr. In the year 1901, the College began to publish its own monograph series. Volume I of the
Reprint Series, its parts 1, 2, and 3, dated 1901, 1902 and 1904, and Volume V, which appeared in 1905, contained exclusively reprints of journal articles published by members of the Department of Biology when Morgan was its head. Forty-eight such articles based on work at least begun when the young authors were students were published under their own names by Bryn Mawr students or recent graduates, without carrying Morgan’s name as co-author; most of them included grateful acknowledgments to him in their texts. Biological and chemical journals then, as now, differed in their policies regarding inclusion of faculty sponsors’ names as authors. Included in my count are some articles that were published after their graduation by authors who had begun their research as students. (A few similar articles are numbered in the count of forty-eight that were not actually included in the reprint series; they happen to be familiar to me for other reasons.) All the articles appeared in journals that were preeminent at the time and that remain so today. The forty-eight solo student articles were composed by sixteen authors; several of the authors published rather prolifically. Of these sixteen authors, three were also included among Morgan’s collaborative co-authors.

The most important question raised by the student publications in biology may be what it meant to the students to have become scientific investigators and authors so early in their lives. The answer can only be surmised from what transpired during their later careers.

Of the eight collaborative authors, one, Umé Tsuda, later made it possible for Japanese women to learn English, not biology. Two of the co-authors pursued no graduate work after receiving their bachelor’s degrees at Bryn Mawr. Two, who had received their bachelor’s degrees elsewhere, were for a time graduate students at Bryn Mawr but received no higher degrees there or anywhere else. One student received her bachelor’s and master’s degree at Bryn Mawr, but did not continue for the doctorate. Two became professional biologists of the highest distinction, Nettie Maria Stevens, who took only her Ph.D. at Bryn Mawr, and Alice Boring, bachelor, master, and doctor, all of Bryn Mawr.

The proportion of the solo authoresses who continued in biological careers of one sort or another was somewhat higher. Nettie Maria Stevens and Alice Boring were two of the three young scientists who participated in both solo performances and in duets with Morgan. Other soloists who became professionals of high stature will be well-known to biologists; these were Helen Dean King, Florence Peebles, Margaret Reed (later Mrs. Warren Lewis), Lilian V. Sampson (later Mrs. T. H. Morgan), and Esther Fussell Byrnes. We may assume that their early
experiences in biological research foreshadowed their later accomplishments.

Three of the undergraduate authors did not enter graduate school at Bryn Mawr or elsewhere. But they did teach or undertake other professional work. Several who were authors or co-authors as graduate students also did not take graduate degrees at Bryn Mawr or elsewhere. But almost all of the women whom we are discussing spent at least a few years carrying out pursuits somehow related to what they had done in the biology laboratories at Bryn Mawr.

To shed light on what their Bryn Mawr experience in biological investigation may or may not have meant to individuals whose interest in the subject did not span their whole lives, I should like to present slightly more detail about the careers of two very different individuals, Abigail Camp Dimon and Alice Schiedt Clark.

Abigail Dimon received a Bryn Mawr B.A. degree in 1896, and a Bryn Mawr M.A. degree in 1899. She specialized in chemistry and biology as an undergraduate; as an undergraduate, she had two papers published in the first volume of the *Journal of Experimental Zoology*, one as a collaborator with Morgan, one under her own name. Upon graduating, she became a high-school vice-principal for one year, and an English teacher in a private school for another. Then she returned to Bryn Mawr to become a graduate student in biology, a tutor, and a warden. In 1904 she returned to teaching science in school; in 1911 she returned to Bryn Mawr for brief stints first as Demonstrator, then as Reader in Biology. But in 1912 she left biology behind her forever to become Recording Secretary of the College, a position she held until 1917. From then on she participated in a wide variety of civic and community activities in New York State. But although she seems to have abandoned biology, professionally at least, she did not forget Bryn Mawr. She was elected Corresponding Secretary of the Alumnae Association for the period from 1910 to 1918; from 1920 to 1925 she served on the Alumnae Association’s Academic Committee. What did her early exposure to research signify to her? She lived until 1955, and among her other contributions to the activities of the Alumnae Association, she was conscientious in filling out and returning its questionnaires. When she was asked to list her publications, one wonders why she never mentioned her student publications in the *Journal of Experimental Zoology*.

Alice Schiedt Clark’s life moved in a different direction. She was a member of the class of 1904; her specialties were history, economics, and politics. But she also carried work in biology, and in 1904 she collaborated in publishing an article with Morgan. At the time of her fif-
tieth reunion, she wrote: "I am grateful for Professor Andrews' two-year history course and for all my work in biology, especially that with Dr. Morgan. I should have majored in biology and chemistry because I have been absorbed in that sort of association." In 1906 she became a Librarian at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, whither she was presumably led by her interest in science, not by that in history, economics, or politics. She remained in this position until 1911, when she married Paul Franklin Clark, a bacteriologist then working at Rockefeller. They had four children; in 1925 she became a part-time laboratory assistant to her husband, by then a professor and department chairman at the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine in Madison. She collaborated with him on a number of papers, particularly on bacteriophage; viral diseases, especially poliomyelitis, were his specialty. Thus her scientific life passed from regeneration in flatworms, on which she published with Morgan in 1904, to phage and the modern clinic. But then, she did live for 99 years. Her long life provided long evidence of what biology at Bryn Mawr in its early days could mean to a student who did not begin by knowing how interested in it she would become.

Physics, as I have said, was later in starting at the College because of the physical state of affairs with respect to its laboratories. But the outlook of its teachers, also, differed from that of the chemists and biologists with respect to student research. In her President's Report for 1895-96, M. Carey Thomas remarked specifically in her section on physics that "the present tendency toward putting undergraduate or even newly made graduate students to work at a so-called 'original investigation' is deemed by this department entirely unwise and not attended with good results to the student; and it is thought the cause of science will not suffer while the student is gaining a discipline and a more thorough preparation for her work." It is only because of its late beginning that discussion of the Geology Department is omitted here.

Some general questions remain to which the answers might not be so definitely clear-cut, and perhaps these are the most interesting of all. First, how and where did the idea of student research originate? For biology, we know the answer; A. McGehee Harvey, a historian of The Johns Hopkins Medical School, has recently attested to the fact that this was a practice of both graduate and undergraduate students in the Biology Department at Hopkins when it was administered by H. Newell Martin, thus during the days when both E. B. Wilson and T. H. Morgan were graduate students there. Hugh Hawkins, another fairly recent historian of the early days of The Johns Hopkins University, has mentioned specifically that H. A. Rowland, easily the leading physicist then
at Hopkins, was uninterested in student research. But no one seems to have mentioned student research at Hopkins in the Chemistry Department in the early days we are discussing. Dr. John Kopper, an Emeritus Professor of Engineering at Hopkins, once chief administrator in the Hopkins Chemistry Department, has checked for us the lists of papers co-authored with Ira Remsen in the *American Chemical Journal* for the period 1879-98 and could not find that any co-author had been working on other than a Ph.D. program. The same was true for the papers co-authored with Harman Northrup Morse, whose student Keiser had been. There is some slight evidence that in the History Department at Hopkins undergraduates had carried out research projects as early as 1883. But no evidence, hard or soft, seems to remain about chemistry. This fact does not, of course, in any way diminish Miss Breed's accomplishment, and may well enhance it.

The final question remains even more an enigma. Who was primarily responsible for the early emphasis on science at Bryn Mawr when it opened its doors? President Rhoads? Dean Thomas, as she was then? or both?

When Edward Keiser, then the senior science professor at Bryn Mawr, spoke at the Memorial Meeting for Dr. Rhoads on January 7, 1895, he said of him:

> From the very beginning of the College he always took a strong interest in the organization and development of the scientific laboratories. He had very broad and liberal ideas in regard to the work that these departments ought to do. . . .

> When in the early years of the College, we wrote to consult him in regard to changes, modifications or improvements in our departments he was always ready to help and encourage us, to assist us in every way that he could. . . .

> It was no doubt partly owing to his early training in medicine that he took such an active interest in current scientific questions, and always kept himself well informed of the progress of events in the natural sciences.

Dr. Rhoads had taken his M.D. degree at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine in 1851, and had been an intern at the Pennsylvania Hospital; he could not have had better training in scientific medicine at that time. But Miss Thomas was the daughter of a physician, and when Dr. Rhoads stated in his Report to the Trustees in 1884 that "beside their intrinsic worth as means of self-culture, physics, chemistry and biology afford a valuable preparation for the study of medicine; a profession to which an increasing number of women are
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successfully devoting themselves,” we must assume he had the fullest agreement from his dean. No correspondence on the subject between these two remains; they spoke with each other. In the absence of any real reason to doubt it, we must assume that we owe to their conjoined enterprise the College’s early superiority in the basic sciences.
Reflections on Social Science as a Liberal—and Liberating—Art

In 1885-86, the first year of an academic program, the Department of History and Political Science was represented by one young and brilliant instructor (although he lacked his doctoral degree), Woodrow Wilson. The range of courses offered undoubtedly stemmed from his abilities and interests: political economy, political opinion, English and American constitutional history, history of political institutions. By 1900, the department had expanded to include economic geography, economic theory, theories of sociology, and American primitive society, and therefore the familiar range of what today are the many separate disciplines of the social sciences.

Wilson did not stay long. Holding that the failure to grant him an assistant released him from his contract, he left Bryn Mawr after three years for Wesleyan University. But he had worthy successors. To this department Franklin H. Giddings came, adding the study of public law, of administration and finance, of charities and correction; and it was here that Alvin Johnson began his distinguished career (he later remarked that in all his life he never encountered “such a wealth of interesting conversation as flowed freely at Bryn Mawr”). From this beginning, eventually an undergraduate major in sociology developed in the late 1930s, drawing strength from the pre-existent Carola Woerishoffer Graduate Department of Social Economy and Social Research and, according to Helen Taft Manning, wisely planning “its undergraduate work so that the courses offered shall be broad in scope and non-technical.” That breadth has been maintained, even as the discipline evolved, separating itself from anthropology with which it had been allied. “Anthropology is not really a social science” wrote Frederica de
Laguna to Katharine McBride in 1959. “It is a natural science, a branch of Natural History, just as Sociology is by origin and present character linked to Social Philosophy (with moral and ameliorative overtones).”

These qualities of sociology—its breadth, ameliorative overtones and interdisciplinarity—are explored by Rosabeth Moss Kanter in her presentation of sociology as a liberal and liberating art. Her essay is at once an outline of the discipline as it developed in this country and a personal statement. The ties many sociologists acknowledge with the humanities are, today, of intense topical interest as the social sciences continue to reaffirm humanistic connections and adopt modes of humanistic discourse. The goal of transcendence Dr. Kanter identifies may also be found in the conviction of others, expressed elsewhere in this volume, that knowledge enables. The belief that change can be made change for the better and that the availability of opportunity and the uses of power deserve careful consideration are widely acknowledged in the Bryn Mawr community.

For me, sociology has provided the tools with which to define myself, my marginality and my world. But more importantly, it has taken me beyond the defining of my own world and allowed me to broaden my perspective. I began sociology planning to study the Afro-American community. Sociology has allowed me to view this not as an isolated community but as an integral part of the whole.

I marvel time and time again at what ownership of a competence really means as a liberating force, and I believe further that the greater the competence, the better it lasts.

DOROTHY NEPPER MARSHALL
In my last year of college (1963-1964), I moved from the humanities to one of the “lesser” social sciences at Bryn Mawr—sociology, “lesser” because it had exactly one full-time faculty member then—and I treated it as one did then at Bryn Mawr, as though it were still essentially a humanities discipline. Indeed, the field’s links to philosophy, history, and literature often seemed closer than its links to the other academic social sciences. One of the virtues of the social sciences at Bryn Mawr is that they are too small to permit overspecialization, thus preventing the kind of mindless pre-professionalism that sets in at major universities when students are forced to learn the canons of the discipline, qua discipline, without exploring it in the context of all other realms of knowledge. Instead, as an outpost of the humanities, a social science is assessed against what it contributes to the total study—and improvement—of human existence.

This essay deals with social science Bryn Mawr-style—as a liberal art. It is of necessity idiosyncratic: part reflection on a Bryn Mawr education, part reflection on the virtues and limitations of humanistic social science, and part intellectual autobiography.

Sociology is not just the study of particular social institutions (families, businesses, workplaces, communities, societies), nor is it simply a set of empirical methods (surveys, observations, mathematical models). It is a unique perspective on social institutions that examines the forces creating them and the forces holding them in place.

In my own view, the two most important things the sociological perspective teaches are these. First, things are not always as they appear, because appearances themselves are shaped by the various inten-
tions of the people or groups involved. Second, behind action there are interests. In various guises, all of modern sociology has been an exploration of the real functions served by social arrangements: who wins, who loses, who benefits. Sometimes these interests are latent rather than manifest, but they can be discovered by informed inquiry.

The goal of this understanding is transcendence—the ability to gain control, to question and therefore transcend the given, to be able to make change. By seeing that human interests rather than divine manifestation or biological imperative created social institutions, one can argue that they need not be this way, one can argue for change.

This is the message that I, at least, took from my Bryn Mawr education. Knowledge is power, because knowledge permits action. While much academic social science in twentieth-century America detached itself from the major social struggles of the society at large, or became a tool for those who wanted to understand social institutions so as to control them better, there were also threads in the social science disciplines arguing that their best use was as an active tool for change. (This is one reason that I see no conflict between being an intellectual, or knowledge producer, and a practitioner/consultant, or knowledge utilizer.) These activist threads were consistent, in my mind, with the meta-message of my Bryn Mawr education: Go out and conquer the world, rather than quietly accept one’s place in it.

Modern sociology had its roots in nineteenth-century European struggles against tradition, in the social, economic, and political upheavals of that time. For sociology (and its closest cousins in the social sciences) is intimately connected with enlightenment or self-consciousness, a questioning of the “traditional,” a skepticism about the “given.” Only when a group is confronted with alternatives, with difference, with contrast, does it become self-aware or self-conscious about its own taken-for-granted-pattern.

I have captured this notion in microcosm in *A Tale of “O”* (1979), a cartoon fable about the Xs and the Os, which described the reaction of a group of one kind (the Xs) when someone of a different kind (the Os) enters the group. Part of the X’s hatred of the O, but also their fascination with it, comes from the heightened self-awareness that the O’s presence forces. The O becomes the occasion for the Xs to reiterate their own commonness and reject the differences the O represents. But at the same time, into the smug righteousness of the Xs creeps a note of doubt: could there be another way? Would some of us be better off if we followed the course the O symbolizes? Will the O, and its kind, prevail? The Xs wonder not only whether the O represents a revolutionary potential that must be guarded against, but also whether the O
might be laughing at the Xs, treating their most cherished traditions as objects of ridicule.

On a much larger, and of course more profound, scale, it was this contact across groups seeking different ways of life that brought about the modern era, and in its wake, modern social science. And it is the function of sociology and its sister disciplines to continue to push self-consciousness, to reveal the hidden meaning behind patterns, to point to the self-interest or the power motive reflected in elite groups.

Indeed, for some of the most prominent early social theorists, social life was a kind of trick staged by those in power in order to fool those without it into false contentment. The task of sociology, as they saw it, was to reveal this vast trick. It is this cynical feature of sociology—its critical edge, its rendering of everyday ritual in ways that are discomfiting for the people who engage in them—that must have made many elite institutions shy away from the field in the early twentieth century. While European intellectuals continued to raise the critical questions appropriate to societies falling apart in the wake of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century wars, revolutions and economic dislocations, it was more palatable to the American taste to translate the potential of the social sciences into social welfare and social engineering.

Social welfare work is a creature of twentieth-century America rather than of Europe. Social work, in its early incarnation, was a way to make a commitment to easing some of the stresses and strains associated with inequities without questioning the basic structure of institutions themselves. This orientation was appropriate for a society that saw itself not as struggling to preserve traditions, but rather as creating the best country on earth. And it was a way to soften the critical edge the social sciences potentially represented without denying the reality of their empirical findings about poverty or injustice or the human costs of the industrial revolution. Similarly, the social sciences and humanistic studies best received in early twentieth-century elite colleges—at Bryn Mawr as well as elsewhere—were often those studying the phenomena most distant from students in time and in space, such as anthropology and archaeology.

As they gained respectability, the social sciences at most large colleges and universities quickly divided into too clear-cut territories in the academic equivalent of mitosis. But at Bryn Mawr the integrative humanistic emphasis remained. The college was simply too small to "professionalize" and thus to lose essential ties with history, literature, art, or in general the study of culture and politics. While psychology at Bryn Mawr leaned toward biology, sociology/anthropology/political
science remained closely linked with the humanities. Especially soci-
ology, because initially it had had so small a faculty.

The very peripheralness of sociology at Bryn Mawr, then, forced the
field to remain integrated with the humanities. And this integration
kept me, as one of the very few sociology majors (before the field be-
came fashionable in the late 1960s’ spotlighting of social activism), to
gain a different sense of the potential of the discipline from that of
many of my professional colleagues.

Whereas many academic social scientists are characterized by an occu-
pational pessimism—the more one knows about how social institu-
tions really work, the more mistrustful one can become—I found my-
self, instead, increasingly convinced about the prospects for change and
the necessity to use social science knowledge to help shape it.

Certainly our era, the late twentieth century, has given us a clear
view of the limits of “progress.” We are surrounded by the threat of nu-
clear annihilation; by technological horrors that appear to be out of
control; by cities on the brink of either bankruptcy, or destruction by
violence, or both; and by frightening new biological technologies,
from genetic engineering to medical interventions that dramatically
throw into question the very meaning of being “alive” or “human.”
One role of social science in the public arena is to identify ways to shape
the society, including its decision-making structures, so that neither
wars nor the horrors represented by new forms of scientific knowledge
come to pass. Indeed, my colleague Charles Perrow has concluded
from his studies of “normal accidents” (those of high-risk technologies
in nuclear plants, supertankers at sea, and chemical plants) that many
of these accidents can be prevented not by engineering of a technolo-
gical kind but by social intervention: the making of decisions by teams
of people who work more democratically than hierarchically, listen to
more opinions, respond to public concerns, take more factors into ac-
count, and collaborate.

Bryn Mawr teaches one to explore and transcend limits; first by the
simple act of nurturing what would once have been an oxymoron—the
“achieving female.” The college also teaches this by providing an edu-
cation that stresses critical questioning made possible by integration of
vast bodies of knowledge on which one is not tested by rote, but mea-
ured instead by the virtuosity by which one can bring new viewpoints
on known phenomena. And because of the small size and thus great
contact across the student body regardless of field of special interest,
and close ties across the faculty regardless of intellectual discipline, the
account for women's positions without invoking an essential "difference" which would also mean the impossibility of change.

I found these structural factors in an archetypal corporation that I called Industrial Supply Corporation. At the time I published _Men and Women_, I was sorry that I could not name the company on which I had done most of the research, because clearly that had topical interest and many reviewers hazarded a guess anyway. But as time went on, it became clear to me that I was not writing about simply one place, or even one type of organization, but rather about the structural arrangements that inhibited achievement regardless of where they were found. In addition to the roles and images into which women were cast, I found three key structural issues that became the cornerstone of my theory: opportunity, power, and proportional representation.

Opportunity is the first major structural variable central to my approach. Opportunity means access to career development in its fullest sense: to growth, to increased skills, to increased influence and voice in decisions, and to advancement in pay and status. Even though opportunity can have these multiple meanings, in most large organizations it tends to be defined solely in terms of upward mobility, for without providing for advance in status and rank most organizations do not know how to let their employees develop and contribute in other ways. Opportunity is structured and built into the design of jobs and their location in the system in terms of their connection with other jobs and their prospects for mobility. In many organizations the structure tends to divide jobs into roughly two kinds: those with a great deal of opportunity—with many ladder steps, a high ceiling, frequent promotions, expectation that people will be moving on to better jobs, and attention to training or the development of new skills; and those with low opportunity—short ladders, low ceilings, very few chances for movement into other jobs, infrequent promotions, little expectation that people will move on to better jobs, and no attention to training or the development of new skills. It is important to note that what is critical here is not job content or pay, but rather the job's standing in a chain of other jobs.

This differentiation of opportunity has implications for women's positions in organizations, since most managerial and professional jobs are designed to be high in opportunity, whereas practically all clerical jobs and a great many factory jobs—particularly those in which women are clustered—tend to be formally low in opportunity. But it is also this difference that explains many of the findings about differences in motivation and work style between women and men.

High- and low-opportunity positions tend to breed two very differ-
ent styles of involvement in work and thus two different "ideal types" of people: what I call "the moving" and "the stuck." Much of the behavior that has been attributed to women in the workplace emerges as behavior characteristics of stuckness, for men who are stuck exhibit the same tendencies.

Opportunity affects such key organizational behavior variables as aspirations, self-esteem, work engagement, self-preparation, and style of expressing dissatisfaction. The moving tend to have or develop higher aspirations and to aim for higher positions, in large part because they can already see themselves on a path leading to those positions. The stuck, however, tend to limit and lower their aspirations, and appear to be less strongly motivated to achieve because they lack a sense that better and higher positions are realistically attainable.

The moving also have higher self-esteem and tend to recognize in themselves, and use, more skills. In short, much of what has been attributed to women qua women might stem instead from their common structural positions in society.

My second key structural variable is power—the capacity to mobilize resources, human or material. It refers to influence and resource-access in the organization, in conjunction with, or in addition to, whatever formal authority or accountability for tasks or the actions of others is contained in the official definition of a job. It derives from the informal system of an organization as much as from its formal definitions of authority, for it is clear that power does not automatically derive from the formal designations of "who is in charge." Relative degrees of actual power exist, based on one's informal system relationship as well as who is most likely to have the resources needed to gain the cooperation of subordinates and get the job done. In organizational terms, power is defined then as an issue of systematic connections and the degree of influence over the environment both upward and outward, rather than as an attribute of the individual.

Relative organizational power or powerlessness is significant in two ways. First, it affects the question of which people are in the best position to influence or shape organizational goals, policies, and decisions. Second, to the extent that people's location in a power structure contributes to leadership style and capacity and to follower morale, power differences determine who becomes and is seen as effective and is thus given the chance to accumulate more power. As with opportunity, there are cycles of advantage and cycles of disadvantage built into differentiation between the powerful—who are also in a position to accumulate more power—and the relatively powerless—whose behavior is likely to reinforce their situation.
The issue of power is important not only in its direct impact on access to decisions or resources in the system but also because of its impact on leader behavior and style. The more organizationally powerful tend to foster higher group morale. They engender more cooperation and less criticism from subordinates, delegate more control and allow subordinates more latitude and discretion, and provide opportunities for subordinates to move along with them. Naturally, then, they tend to be better liked, talk more often, and receive more communications in meetings. In contrast, the relatively powerless tend to foster lower group morale. They behave in more directive, authoritarian, controlling ways: they supervise too closely; restrict opportunities for subordinates’ growth and autonomy; use more coercive than persuasive power; and are often very much concerned about threats to their authority and thus engage in a great deal of territorial domination. Consequently, they tend to be less well liked and less talkative in meetings with higher powers.

Some of the characteristics of the powerless have been embedded in occasional research findings and in popular stereotypes about women’s tendencies as leaders, and have been used as one explanation for the greater likelihood of men to emerge as preferred leaders. But closer examination of the “bossy woman boss” stereotype, based on the analysis of power and the organizational factors that influence it, makes clear that those characteristics often attributed to women are really characteristics of powerlessness and reflect not necessarily innate sex-linked differences but rather historical differences in women’s organizational location.

My third structural variable, the effects of social composition or proportional representation of people of different types, is straightforward and need not be discussed at length. But it is directly relevant to understanding what happens when only a few women are introduced into situations in which men are numerically dominant—or, for that matter, what happens to any “token” or numerically rare groups who are forced to operate among peers of a different societal type. It is possible to see that social composition has an effect—and perhaps, in some instances, even a more important effect—beyond those of attitudes or traditional cultural role definitions. As a structural feature, numbers have importance in and of themselves. What appear to be prejudicial responses on the part of the numerically dominant group may turn out to have less to do with inbred attitudes that are impervious to change (or at least require in-depth psychological work to change) than with the forces and dynamics set in motion by the group’s skewed social composition. Similarly, what appears to be ineffective behavior on the
part of people in the token category may say much less about their capacities and abilities or the effect of their cultural heritage than about what they are forced to do because they are scarce and treated as such by the dominants.

The problems of acceptance and effectiveness that many women encounter in managerial and professional occupations may derive primarily from their token status—the fact that there are, as yet, so few women in those positions. In general, people whose social type is represented in very small proportion tend to be more visible, to feel that they are “on display.” They feel more pressure to conform, to make fewer mistakes, to try to become socially invisible, not to stand out so much. They also find it harder to gain credibility and trust that they can do the job, particularly in situations involving risk. They are more isolated and peripheral, more likely to be excluded from informal peer networks, and hence more limited in this source of power-through-alliances. Similarly, they have fewer opportunities to be “sponsored” because of the rarity of people like them in higher levels. If they are in the very small minority or in the situation of being the “only” ones, they are more likely to turn against other people of their kind as a price of admission to the dominants’ group. They often face misperceptions of their identity and role in the organization, and therefore develop a preference for already-established relationships; thus, they are more likely to be stereotyped, to be placed in role traps that limit effectiveness, and to face more personal stress.

The power of an analysis like this is that it does not accept the given as immutable, as fixed beyond all human intervention. If observed behavior is the result of the structure of institutions and the placement of people within them, then changing those structures and changing the roles that people play within them can make an enormous difference. This is the “liberating” aspect of social science. The more one learns about the factors creating institutions and holding them in place, the factors shaping human beings as social actors, then the more variables one learns can be manipulated to change those circumstances. And the more one becomes conscious of the forces operating on one’s own life, aside from innate individual limitations, the more possible it is to take control—to become active agent rather than passive victim.

But while learning from the social sciences that institutions are shaped by human intentions, we also learn the limits of intentionality and simplistic individual responses. The social sciences, particularly as taught in an integrative liberal arts environment, teach the interpenetration of
aspects of social life; thus we also learn about the complexity of change. “Intention” itself has limits: behind even well-intentioned human acts, Robert Merton taught us, are “unanticipated” and therefore potentially uncontrollable consequences.

The difficulty of guaranteeing that human organizations do only what was intended, no more and no less, is in part a function of the numerous overt or hidden institutional patterns that permit particular forms of organized cooperative activity. Social scientists are currently debating the extent of the articulation among all the institutions of society. But whether or not one subscribes to the notion of a unified and integrated social system, the ability of human institutions to operate in particular ways depends on a variety of seemingly unrelated decisions made in other institutions that determined the forms of behavior encouraged.

For example, some have argued that in American society families and schools are designed for employing organizations, although these sectors also may limit the extent to which economic organizations can require or expect particular kinds of behavior from their members. History and culture, as carried by those institutions that socialize the young, affect the shape of economic and political organizations—but are also, in turn, shaped by them, and perhaps to an even larger extent. We see this by noting the unique configurations in Japanese companies as compared to American ones—the stress on loyalty, team work, commitment to the company rather than to a job, widespread “lifetime” employment, acceptance of authority, concern with maintaining status gradations, and the like. We also see it in the historical forces that helped shape the premier American corporations as social institutions. In the formative years of the large industrial corporation, 1890 to 1910, the labor pool included a large proportion of unskilled migrants from other countries or rural areas who were unaccustomed to the discipline of industrial work and maintained an attachment to places of origin. Turnover and labor conflict were both extensive. Jobs and job hierarchies were designed with these conditions in sight, thus giving rise to fragmentation and simplification of tasks and long, graded job ladders that were the legacy from that era. Some analysts have argued that schools soon took on the role of industrial trainers and universal public education filled the need for work-habituated employers. Indeed, in a study of a nursery school in Ann Arbor, Michigan, that I conducted as a first-year graduate student, fresh from Bryn Mawr, I noted that the school seemed to be training 3- and 4-year-olds to be comfortable in bureaucratic organizations, dubbing the product the “organization child.”
Thus, some of the difficulties of changing any particular organization, whether one is the presumed chief or a regulatory body or an activist in an organization's midst, come from the many other social institutions with which any organization is intertwined. Any particular group is bound by decisions, sometimes coordinated and coherent, sometimes idiosyncratic and scattered, made in many other places. It is similarly bound by its own history. Once a social pattern is established, it is difficult to change. The explanation lies not so much in human nature as in the nature of organized social life—what it takes to get a set of individuals acting together. Social life forces an interest in stable patterns. Cooperative activity itself is not possible unless people can count on the stability of structures and behavioral patterns. We rely extensively on such patterns without even being aware of it. Unquestioned expectations permit us to function without renegotiating every bit of activity that takes place, and it is only because others can be expected to honor fully these commitments that a complex society can do its work.

Change therefore requires, as a first step, the unraveling of a network of expectations. Only then is it possible to learn new patterns that form around the activity in question. By contributing to the unraveling of these networks of expectations, the patterns behind patterns, social science can aid change by making it possible to work on the real nature of the system rather than a series of minor individual acts that do not get at the underlying forces.

This is not a simple problem; it is a highly complex one. And no single point of view, no single decisionmaker, no single intellectual can hope to encompass and master it all. But by encouraging informed investigation that makes more and more of the patterns clear and by encouraging the creative leaps of imagination that help see new configurations, social science education can be a positive force.

Ideas like these form the core of my latest work, *The Change Masters*. My arena was again the modern business corporation; my theme was human possibility and its encouragement or stifling by social arrangements. I saw that large-scale change, such as a shift of corporate strategy or corporate culture, was often the result of a number of smaller-scale changes driven by creative or strong-willed individuals at all levels of the organization. It was the courage of those entrepreneurs of ideas within systems that may not have welcomed their ideas that made the difference in whether organizations ever learned to solve problems, improve, do things differently, or transform themselves. Major change, I concluded, is constructed out of the actions of entrepreneurs and innovators at different levels as well as those at the top. Even when at-
tributed to a single dramatic event or a single dramatic decision, major changes in large organizations, as in society, are more likely to represent the accumulation of accomplishments and tendencies built up slowly over time and cautiously implemented. The build-up of experiences from successful small-scale innovation, experiments on the periphery, outbursts of activity, deviant behavior, or deliberate exploration are later embraced, if they are successful, by leaders as part of an important new strategy.

The kinds of changes necessary, then, to solve the important social and technological problems of our time, do not necessarily involve only the grand decisions made by the official leaders in the society. They also require empowering numerous individuals to act in their own spheres, however inconsequential those spheres may seem, because social life is not only driven at the top, it is also created at the bottom by the intertwining and aggregation of all of those individual acts.

To me, the ultimate goal of education in the social sciences is clearly not idle knowledge but empowerment. And ultimately, power springs not from the learning of rote formulas, but from the deepest kind of understanding of theory—of the principles at work that make things be as they are.

I like to make this point by retelling Charles Lamb’s parable of the roast pig. In this essay, he describes a time in the more primitive history of humanity when cooking was first discovered. In a rather primitive village, where animals wandered in and out of the houses, and people ate their food raw, a father one day left his eldest son to guard the house, but the son accidentally set the house on fire. When the father returned, he looked through the ruins of the house to see if anything could be salvaged, and he happened to touch one of the neighborhood pigs that had been caught in the fire. He touched it, but because the flesh was still warm, he put his fingers in his mouth to cool them off, and the sensation was delicious. He had just discovered cooking. News of this great discovery spread in the village, and soon everyone was burning their houses down. The moral of the story, as I take it, is: if you don’t understand why the pig gets cooked, you’re doomed to waste an awful lot of houses.

I think of this story often. It comes up in minor and also major ways. My book, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, came out just about the time it was very fashionable to publish lists of “rules for career success” for women. I felt then that I was arguing against the tide in saying that any one set of rules might be very misleading and that it was better to learn the principles behind what makes organizations work and what makes people effective. Now that most of those “rules” have faded
from the public memory, courses in organizational behavior that do indeed teach people why rather than simply what, are more popular than ever.

In more major ways, the story comes to mind when I see the fumbling in major economic organizations that blindly follow inappropriate formulas—strategic planning “rules” or someone’s version of Japanese management. They run the risk of burning the whole house down just to get a roast pork dinner when more theoretically informed knowledge of what it takes to run a good organization might have helped.

The role of the social sciences, then, in a humanistic tradition such as that at Bryn Mawr, should be to teach people about the complexities and possibilities of change—and thus, eventually to empower them to take action to channel social life into meaningful and productive directions.
Far Beyond Bryn Mawr: The International Network

There was never a time when the international aspect of Bryn Mawr was not in evidence. M. Carey Thomas had studied abroad and was vigorously aware of what European universities had to offer American education. Several of the earliest faculty were imported; after 1892, ten resident fellowships at the College existed for foreign students, and by the first decade of the twentieth century, four European fellowships were established for graduating seniors. In 1965, a Commonwealth Africa Scholarship made it possible for Bryn Mawr graduates to study or teach in former British colonies in Africa. And in 1973, the Elizabeth Gray Vining Scholarship Fund was established "to support Bryn Mawr alumnae, graduate students or faculty members who desire to do academic research in Japan or to have direct contact with Japanese culture." Indeed, Bryn Mawr graduates were to be found everywhere in the world (as Emily Vermeule has described), making and witnessing history. Alice Boring, Class of 1904, visiting professor of Biology at Yenching University, described "The Funeral of Sun Yat Sen" for readers of a 1925 Bryn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin; Anna Louise Strong (Class of 1906), wrote from Russia in that same year of how, as a correspondent for Hearst's International Magazine, she still could "take time off to give English lessons to Trotsky... for three months, learning from him the real feeling of the Russian revolution."

To be sure, scholarship itself assumed a knowledge of the world and its tongues. Bryn Mawr's language requirements were famed and dreaded for much of its history, although later the "orals" as these were called became written examinations; eventually language requirements were broadened to include mathematics. Today, Bryn Mawr language
institutes exist in Avignon, Florence, Madrid, Moscow, and Trier. Miss Park carried forward President Thomas' international commitments during the troubled years of the Second World War, and Harris Wofford, during his presidency, established the International Advisory Council, which supported the examination of global issues on the campus. Quakerly concerns, humanitarian efforts, and political activities have strengthened the cosmopolitan qualities with which the College began.

But the story Elizabeth Gray Vining tells here is not of what the American students learned or where they went or what they have done, but of the great gifts of presence, diversity, and quality which have been bestowed on the College by its foreign students. In recent years, these women have formed a tenth of the student body and represented as many as forty different countries. One of them, Michi Kawai, Class of 1906, dedicated one of her books in 1950, "To my friends of other lands whose soft touch of understanding and open-mindedness will readily induce any door of my country to slide to let them see even our inner chamber, the real Japanese heart." This essay honors in turn all those foreign students whose own courage, understanding, and fair-mindedness have opened, for Bryn Mawr, the doors to self-knowledge and the wider reaches of the human heart.

—PHL

It is particularly the presence among us of students from foreign countries who jog us into an awareness that ours is not the only world of thought, the only language, the only national point of view, that "God's own country" stretches far beyond our national boundaries, even to the uttermost ends of Cathay.

ELINOR B. AMRAM '28

I am no visionary, so I see nothing, but, like a lantern lit, one of the symbols of our College, I am standing on the mountaintop and letting the light you kindled in my heart almost twenty years ago shine far and wide.

DORA OBI CHIZEA '69
“I want to tell you, and please tell President Thomas too,” wrote Ida de Bobula, a Hungarian student, in 1924-25, “that I have carried with me some of the Bryn Mawr spirit over the ocean. I have given it to others, to a younger set, and I hope they will give it to others again, in order to make women here freer, better and happier.” Her sentiments echo and are echoed by many of the foreign students who have come to Bryn Mawr, but whose contribution to the spirit of the College was as great as what they gained and what they carried away with them. Her message would have pleased Miss Thomas who was convinced of the value of international contributions to offset American provincialism, and who was herself educated in Europe and remained, throughout her life, an ardent internationalist and intrepid traveler. After Ida, it was almost sixty years before another Hungarian student arrived to join the class of 1987. Andrea Madarassy was one of thirty-seven entering foreign students (in a class of 299) from some twenty-four countries across the world.¹

Nearly a century earlier, when Bryn Mawr opened its doors, there were no foreign students among the thirty-six undergraduates of the first class. It was not until 1889 that one appeared from Croydon, England—Jessie Ellen Barritt, of the Class of 1892. Few though they were,

¹ For the generous time they gave me I am especially indebted to Lucy Fisher West, College Archivist; President Mary Patterson McPherson; Elizabeth G. Vermey, Director of Admissions; and Charles Robert Heydtk, Director of Student Services. Sources for this essay have been histories of Tsuda College and Keisen, My Lantern and Sliding Doors by Michi Kawai, the files of the Bryn Mawr Alumnae Register, the Bryn Mawr Alumnae Quarterly, the Bryn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin, Commencement Programs, personal correspondence, and other material in the College Archives. Throughout, I have used the names of the international students as they were when they were in college. Many of them, perhaps most of them, have since married. They can be traced through the Alumnae Register.
some of those early foreign students in the College's history were to lead remarkable lives, none more so than that of a young woman who came from Japan as a "special student" in 1889, who stayed for two and half years but did not graduate.

Umé Tsuda was a very special student indeed. She had come to the United States in 1871 as a child of seven, the youngest of five Japanese girls sent here to study by the Japanese government, which only eleven years earlier had emerged from its two-and-a-half century isolation. In 1882 she returned to Japan to teach English in the newly opened Peeresses' School. Seven years later, on leave from the school, she came back to the United States, the first of a long line of Japanese students, most of them from the school Miss Tsuda later founded in 1899 and which became Tsuda College, and many of them funded by a scholarship which Umé Tsuda had herself helped to establish.

Close on the heels of Miss Tsuda came graduate students from Europe and Canada. An article in the Bryn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin of January 1927 describes their effect on the students of 1892: "The undergraduates of that day can recall the thrill caused by the arrival of these honour students from London and Cambridge who brought into the cloistered life of those early years a sense of the older European world from whose traditions of culture and scholarship our small college had drawn so much that was valuable."

The first graduate student from Europe, Agnes Mathilde Wergeland, came from Norway in 1890 to study the Swedes and Germans in Pennsylvania before the American Revolution. A gifted critic and historian, the first Norwegian woman on whom the degree and title of doctor of philosophy had been conferred, she sought and obtained a stipend from Bryn Mawr. "May it bring me happiness," she wrote in her diary. "God grant it." But her prayer was denied. As she wrote later, "I came to America by seeking a fellowship at one of the woman's colleges there and the following year I was appointed Reader in History of Art. It lasted two years. There was no material with which to work. I myself was compelled to buy all the material I needed and I found a certain jealous opposition on the part of those in authority." Wergeland went on to the University of Chicago and was finally appointed professor of history and French at the University of Wyoming at Laramie.

Wergeland was succeeded by Fellows from Canada, England, Scotland, and France, who came to study Greek, English, History, Romance Languages, Teutonic Philology, and Physics. Occasionally it was the College who was disillusioned: one unfortunate graduate student seems not to have been well prepared and was in addition labeled "negative and uninspiring." One, Ada Isabel Maddison, from Girton
College, Cambridge, who came in 1893 and took a Ph.D. in Mathematics in 1896, was an outstanding success. In 1905 her photograph figures in the Seniors' Class Book among the faculty as recording dean. She has a romantic look among the other women who resolutely faced the camera in shirtwaists and ties. Her head is turned to show her youthful profile and swan-like neck, bare in an off-the-shoulder evening dress. In my day she was assistant to the president, known to the students as “Izzy Mad.”

In the year of Miss Maddison’s Ph.D., 1896, Aletta Van Reypen came from Finland for an A.B. Fourteen years later, married to Baron Serge A. Korff, she had an article in the Bryn Mawr Alumnae Quarterly, April 1910, “The Practical Working of Woman Suffrage in Finland.” With confidence she assured her American friends that “the experience of three years of woman suffrage in Finland has proved, I think, beyond doubt that the emancipation of women is not a thing to be feared or dreaded, but merely a natural step in the evolution of modern society.” So did the old world teach the new about the future as well as the past. Since Aletta Van Reypen’s day, there has been a trickle of students from Finland, the most recent in the Class of 1982.

Across the past century, then, the connections between Bryn Mawr and countries around the world were made. From East and West students came; alumnae committees promoted interchange, and patterns of relationships were established which were to be enduring.

In 1900, the Japanese Scholarship Committee, formed under the leadership of Mrs. Wistar Morris together with Umé Tsuda, brought to Bryn Mawr first Michi Matsuda and then Michi Kawai. Michi Kawai was to become one of the most original, determined, far-seeing, and influential of modern Japanese women. Returning to Japan after her graduation in 1904, she taught in Miss Tsuda’s School and also founded the YWCA in Japan, of which she was general secretary for many years. In 1928, when anti-American feeling in Japan was still strong over the Oriental Exclusion Act, she wrote with her unconquerable honesty: “Whenever an opportunity is given me I do not hesitate to speak the positive side, the good side of America. Your land being big, there are lots of good and bad qualities mixed, and we who have witnessed the good qualities of your characteristics and tasted your Christian hospitality should be the bond of true friendship for these two countries.”

In 1929, in her own home with nine little girls and ten teachers, Miss Kawai founded her own school, Keisen, which means Fountain of Blessings. The whole wonderful story of Miss Kawai’s life is told in the two volumes of her autobiography, My Lantern (1939) and Sliding
Doors (1950). She came through World War II without lowering her standards or succumbing to government pressure to temper her teaching on the value of internationalism. During the war she actually managed to add a Department of Horticulture modeled on the School of Horticulture at Ambler, Pennsylvania, and after the war she added a junior college.

Lantern Night at Bryn Mawr had deeply touched Miss Kawai’s heart and imagination, and she took the ceremony to her own school. In the more frugal Japanese way, each class had one lantern, and in the graduation ceremonies it was carried at the head of the academic procession by the student with the highest record.

“The things I learned in the classroom,” wrote Miss Kawai more than thirty years after her own graduation, “may slip from my memory; but the things girls said and did under this circumstance or that can never be erased from my memory. Even now my decisions are affected by those things and I pity our Japanese young people who go abroad to study and get nothing outside of intellectual education. I crave for them the personal associations which are the by-products of college life that have been so precious to me.”

The expressions of friendship and support for Michi Kawai which weave through the alumnae notes of her class, the patent grief of her classmates over her death, testify to the permanence of the Bryn Mawr ties, to that bond of true friendship of which Michi Kawai was such an extraordinary example.

Such close personal ties were not confined to Japanese students. Somewhat later than the Japanese Committee, a Chinese Scholarship Committee came into being. It followed upon a sabbatical trip Lucy Martin Donnelly took to the Orient. She had stopped first in Japan, where she visited Miss Tsuda’s School, and then had gone on to China. There she was struck by the lack of similar opportunities for Chinese women and came home to establish the Chinese Scholarship Committee. In January 1917, it issued a brochure with this statement:

We hope that the coming of Chinese girls may add much to the life of Bryn Mawr. . . . Acquaintance and friendship with modern Chinese girls should give more reality to the study of their ancient arts and should add greatly to the variety and interest of campus life.

The first student, Liu Fung Kei of Canton, came to the United States in the autumn of 1917. She had a preparatory year at the Shipley School and graduated from Bryn Mawr in 1922. I knew her only by sight and I had no idea of the courage and vision that were latent in the thin, hur-
rying, rather anxious girl who remains in my mind’s portrait gallery. But Miss Liu went home to found her own school in Canton in 1925, and during the Civil War, when the Nationalist Army under Chiang Kai Shek battled against the war lords, she kept her school going, until finally she moved her boarding school students to Hong Kong and then to Macao. Contributions from friends in the United States not only enabled her to go on with the school but also gave her the courage to continue. By 1937 the school had 140 students. “The young people,” she wrote, “must be trained to think fairly and to act fairly.”

Miss Liu was followed by a succession of able Chinese students, one of whom, Vaun Tsieng Bang, A.B. 1939, became associate editor of a Chinese weekly in Shanghai. Another, the first graduate student, Djuh Luh, 1924-1926, was married at Miss Park’s house in Chinese dress to Mr. Foo-Hsi Hsiung, who later became ambassador to Russia. Still another, Fang-Chi Chen, also known as Agnes Chen, was the first Oriental student to earn a Ph.D.

It was, of course, easier for students to come from Europe than from Asia. Germany had been the scene of M. Carey Thomas’ own academic triumph, and conversely, students had been coming from Germany since the early days. One of them, Elizabeth Klein, a graduate student in 1910-11, wrote to the Bryn Mawr Alumnae Quarterly: “It is this general patriotism, the social spirit and the training in working together for a common purpose, which seem to me the most attractive feature in all college life,” in contrast to the individualistic ideal in German universities. She also noted “the general sense of humor, which is another feature of Bryn Mawr life.” It is good to be able to add that she survived both World War I and World War II and in the 1960 Bryn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin was to be found married and living in Göttingen.

Even during the 1940s there were German students at Bryn Mawr, refugees from Hitler. One of them, Ruth Fiesel, A.B. 1942, the daughter of the distinguished German scholar, Dr. Eva Fiesel, reminiscing recently about her years at Bryn Mawr, thought that the foreign students, especially the French, were more concerned with form, the Americans with content. On the other hand, naturally enough, since many of them would have to make their own way in the United States after graduation, the Europeans held education to be more important than did the Americans, who had an eye also on marriage. She was especially impressed by the total lack of anti-Semitism at Bryn Mawr.

Perhaps the most interesting of the German students in the 1940s was Maria von Wedemeyer, who came in 1948 on a special scholarship offered “to a German citizen who had had a remarkable record in opposition to the Nazis.” A Red Cross nurse and then a teacher, she had at
nineteen become engaged to Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a young German pastor and theologian. Almost immediately after their engagement, he was imprisoned by the Nazis on the charge of plotting against Hitler. For nearly two years she was able to write to him and occasionally to visit him, taking him small delicacies, until in April 1945 he was executed. Miss von Wedemeyer was at Bryn Mawr for two years and took her M.A. in 1950. Instead of returning to Germany, she remained in this country, married a Mr. Weller, and lived in Sudbury, Massachusetts, until her death some time after 1966. Her letters to Dietrich Bonhoeffer and his to her are in the Harvard University Library and are not accessible to the public. In a brief account of him, however, in the appendix to the volume of his *Letters and Papers from Prison*, she included a paragraph from his last letter to her, dated December 19, 1944: “What is happiness and unhappiness? It depends so little on the circumstances; it depends really only on that which happens inside a person. I am grateful every day that I have you, and that makes me happy.”

Over the years there had always been students from France, and even during the war there were a few at Bryn Mawr, notably the daughters of René Pleven, former Prime Minister of France, who was at that time working in the Underground in Paris. Françoise Pleven won her A.B. in 1944 and returned to France in 1945. Nicole stayed until 1947. President Wofford, in France thirty years later, met René Pleven and his daughter Nicole, who as Madame Michel Worms de Romilly was doing outstanding work at the Maeght Gallery in St. Paul en Vence, not far from Nice.

The war, to be sure, interrupted much of the earlier exchanges with Japan. It was not until 1949 that the first of the Japanese came back to Bryn Mawr. Taki Fujita, Class of 1925, returned to the College for four months in the spring of that year. After twenty-five years as a professor at Tsuda College, she was one of two women sent by the Japanese government in 1949 to study college administration. She was especially impressed, she said in a letter to President McBride, by the administration-student relationship, by the cooperation among the three colleges, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore, by the number and variety of scholarships, by the Graduate School, and by the friendliness of everyone. Between 1951 and 1962, when she succeeded Ai Hoshino, A.B. 1912, as President of Tsuda College, she held various positions in the Japanese government, most notably as delegate to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women in 1957, 1958, and 1959. She was a delegate to the World Conference of the International Women’s Year in Mexico City in 1975.

In 1972 I was in Japan and was invited by Miss Fujita to lunch at her
house at Tsuda along with a group of seniors at Tsuda College. The whole scene reminded me of receptions at the Deanery in Miss Thomas' day, when we sat in a wide circle around the fire, Miss Thomas in the center, and she would begin, "Now, what shall we talk about?" Miss Fujita's room was much smaller, but we sat in a circle around her and she herself offered a topic for discussion.

In the same autumn of 1972, while I was there, Miss Hoshino died. In her will, thinking that very few would want to come to her funeral, she left directions for holding it at her small local church. When the day came, not only were the church and all its offices jammed to the walls, but friends stood on the steps and in the street outside to the corner in both directions, listening to the service over loudspeakers. Ai Hoshino had been greatly loved and respected.

From the early 1950s most of the Japanese have taken M.A.s instead of A.B.s and many have returned to Tsuda College to combine teaching with marriage. The first Japanese to earn a Ph.D. was Hiroko Sue in anthropology in 1964. She was a small, slender young woman with an intrepid spirit, indefatigable in the pursuit of knowledge. I sat entranced in a group one evening, listening to her account of several winter months spent among the Eskimos in an igloo. Eleven years later she returned to Bryn Mawr with her husband, Dr. Tadahiko Hara, both as visiting professors of anthropology and archaeology for a year. In Japan she teaches at Ochanomizu University and he at the University of Tokyo.2

In 1975 an effort began to reciprocate the flow from Japan to the United States. The Bryn Mawr Alumnae in Tokyo established a fellowship in Japan for Bryn Mawr graduates from the United States, of which the first holder was Susan Jones, M.S.S. 1975. Four others have succeeded her, their subjects ranging from sociology to Japanese prints. A little later Bryn Mawr and Tsuda College set up a student exchange. There is nothing new about a Tsuda student coming to Bryn Mawr, but a Bryn Mawr student taking a junior year in Japan is indeed a departure, though Bryn Mawr students have long been enjoying a junior year in Europe.

During our first sixty-five years most but not all international students came to the campus from Europe and East Asia. During the 1940s, two came from Mexico and one each from Australia, Costa Rica, Haiti, Jersey (of the Channel Islands), New Zealand, Turkey, and Venezuela. The Haitian was Madeleine G. Sylvain, whose ancestors

2 Dr. Tadahiko Hara was my student in Japan in the late 1940s, in the Crown Prince’s class in the Peers School.
had been leaders in the Haitian War for Independence of 1804 and whose father was minister to France, where she herself received her early training. At Bryn Mawr she took a Master of Social Work in 1938 and a Doctorate of Social Work in 1941. Returning to Haiti, she was instrumental in getting passed a law which did away with the restrictions barring women from the law school there. In 1983, after forty years, there was again at Bryn Mawr a student from Haiti.

In the last thirty-odd years more South Americans have made their appearance. Between 1950, when there were for the first time a student from Guyana and three from El Salvador, and 1983, they have come trickling in from ten of the countries of South America and five of Central America as well as from Jamaica and Grenada. In 1984 students entered from Peru, Bolivia and Mexico.

Even fewer students have come from Africa than from South and Central America. In 1983 there were entering freshmen from Ghana, Morocco, and Uganda, one from each country, and the one from Uganda the second on record from her land. Though students have been coming from South Africa since 1912, only very recently has there been a black student from there.

As for the Middle East, students have been coming from Egypt since 1947 and from Israel since 1948. The first student to come from Iran was Iran M. Ala, A.B. 1951. She was followed by nearly a score of others, some of whom returned to Iran and since the fall of the Shah have been lost to us. Others have remained in this country or other Western countries. In 1983 there were four Iranians at Bryn Mawr, two undergraduates, one in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and one who took a Ph.D. in nuclear physics.

Recently students have come by ones and twos and threes from the United Arab Emirates—Bahrain, Cyprus, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia. In 1983 Maureen Hula Ataka, a Palestinian from the troubled Left Bank, working for a Ph.D. in the Department of Education and Child Development, wrote:

> Once back at Birzeit University I will again take up the job of student counsellor. . . . The knowledge, experience and opportunity for growth that Bryn Mawr has offered me will be invaluable in all aspects of my work. The friendship and warmth of all the people who have touched my life while I have been here will be a constant source of encouragement.

For many years most of our foreign students came from Canada and Europe, but by 1983-84 the balance had shifted from West to East. India now sends more students than Canada, Pakistan more than the
United Kingdom, and of the students from England in 1983 three bore Indian names. Hong Kong sends more than France; Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Taiwan, and Viet Nam are now added to the familiar names of Japan, China, Australia, New Zealand.

Another benefit of the international student population of the College is that it lends further diversity to a student body which already includes Blacks, Spanish-Americans, Mexican-Americans, native Americans, and Asian-Americans. Ever since Martha Diez, who served from 1948 to 1958, there have been foreign student advisors, but in the past few years the work has ceased to be a part-time responsibility and become full-time. At the present writing this post is held by Charles Robert Heyduk, to whose office comes a steady stream of foreign students in search of advice on problems ranging from uncongenial roommates to summer jobs—everything, in fact, that is not covered by the academic deans.

Always interested in special groups of foreign students, the alumnae have recently been finding new ways of channeling their interest and concern to include the whole range of countries from which the students come. President Wofford brought to the campus periodic round-ups of interested alumnae, and the International Student Committees of the Bryn Mawr Clubs of Philadelphia and Wilmington have been active. They have introduced an annual program of orientation for incoming students two or three days before College opens. The International Students Association, the largest of all the campus organizations, with over 200 members, organizes meetings, social events, concerts, trips, and, each spring, an International Week and a very popular dinner, at which the representatives of the different countries produce and serve their native dishes. It also issues a lively newsletter.

Through all the years our foreign students have made their generous contributions to us not only during their college years but also throughout their lives, as individual friendships formed in college continue in warmth and depth and to some degree permeate communities both abroad and at home. One of their greatest contributions has been in bringing to the parochial American young a keener awareness of the world beyond the United States.

According to Dr. Alice Stone Ichman, President of Sarah Lawrence College, “Foreign students in campus communities are all too often an

3 The Asian-Americans, naturalized citizens, come from China, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Viet Nam.
unrealized, underutilized and unintegrated resource for dispelling the startling lack of knowledge of American students about international affairs.”

When I asked President McPherson if this were true of Bryn Mawr, she replied that she thought it was. But she went on to say that the problem was probably less acute at Bryn Mawr than at the large universities because of our small size and the greater percentage of international students—ten percent at Bryn Mawr versus an average of a little over three percent in the country at large.

As one way of meeting this situation the president has instituted a series of informal evening gatherings in her home of about forty American and international students and an expert or two on the subject of the evening. A topic of international interest is tossed out, and between dessert and coffee at seven-thirty and departure at nine, lively discussion follows. Some of the topics have been: Northern Ireland, Reaganomics, Dialogue Between the ’60s and the ’80s, The Position of Women in Mid-Eastern countries, Relations between Israel and Lebanon, the Legacy of Indira Gandhi. These evenings have been greatly enjoyed and have served the double purpose of bringing foreign and American students together and of widening American horizons.

It is not possible to foresee what lies ahead, what will be the patterns and influences of the next hundred years. Perhaps it is just as well. We can only go forward in hope and faith, building on what has been done, confident that whatever may be the stresses in international politics, the individual friendships and the shared pursuit of knowledge will continue to serve a network of understanding across national boundaries. May the “general sense of humor” so much enjoyed by the long-ago German student continue to flourish, as well as the experience described in 1983 by one of a long line of students from across our northern border. “One of the things I love here,” she wrote, “is long talks at dinner with people who love to learn; we may not love to study, but we love to learn.”

*Speech given by Alice Stone Ichman to the Japan International Christian University Foundation, March 16, 1983, in which she said that the number of foreign students in United States colleges had grown from 34,000 in 1954 to more than 312,000 in 1981.*
BRYN MAWR AND HAVERFORD: the relationship between the two colleges has been more kaleidoscopic than any of the aspects elsewhere described in this volume. There is continuity too. The geographical proximity planned by the founder, Joseph Taylor, foreseen as “mutually useful” as long as “wise restraint” was exercised, insured some sort of connection. There were, however, early decades when that connection was tenuous. A characterization of Bryn Mawr, written in 1908 by M. Carey Thomas’ sister, Helen Thomas Flexner, Class of 1893, does not once mention Haverford. The College’s identity is described in terms of “the joy brought by rigorous academic endeavors; pastimes of long walks, athletics, and conversations with one’s classmates; the influence of the graduate schools and the beauty of the architecture.”

Not so Bryn Mawr’s Admissions Office literature of the mid-eighties. Men abound in the pictures, as they do on campus. A blue bus spans the mile and a half between the two institutions. From the shared Friends’ meeting house of one hundred years ago, the colleges moved toward cautious cooperation on theatrical production and musical events, and this was eventually followed by a spectrum of academic and extracurricular cooperation, dormitory exchange and administrative joint activities. By 1984, the Boards of both institutions were coordinating some Board and committee meetings.

That the delicate work of cooperation and coordination has gone and does go forward has been largely due to the remarkable diplomacy of Mary Patterson McPherson whose terms as Dean of the Faculty and President of Bryn Mawr have coincided with the acceleration of this change. From the 1970s on, she has sought, in her own words, “to dis-
pel the myths that sometimes stand between these two institutions” and to resolve whatever requires resolution.

Many of these changes were personally witnessed by Jonathan Rhoads, descendant of Bryn Mawr's first president. His essay consequently presents the evolution of the relationship both historically and from a key observer’s point of view. Dr. Rhoads—who as Board member of both colleges knew both sides of the equation so well—sets his account of the relationship in the larger context of the wider educational community, including Swarthmore and the University of Pennsylvania, and beyond that, within a society in which a vast revolution has occurred, as the educational segregation of sexes, standard for so much of Bryn Mawr’s history, ceded to pressures of coeducation in most single-sex colleges and universities. And it is in this broader setting that the story of Bryn Mawr and Haverford truly belongs.

—PHL

Should it fall to the Trustees to make selection of a site I would suggest an elevated situation, and whether it would not be well to place it near to Haverford College say at or near Bryn Mawr, Haverford, or Ardmore station, and in walking distance of Friends’ meeting house. To some extent the same Professors could be employed in both Colleges; also the Observatory—Library—Lectures—gas & water in common for both Institutions; & by wise restraint, might be mutually useful.

JOSEPH W. TAYLOR

Where is it that men really intrude and challenge our identity as a woman’s institution, and is it physical presence or not? I frankly think you can have men doing a lot of things with women before you lose your identity as a women’s institution, but not everybody agrees.

MARY BETH KREBS ’75
The origins of Haverford College and Bryn Mawr were somewhat different. Haverford started half a century earlier and seems to have been beamed on younger boys around the age of fifteen when it started, so that it was perhaps more a boarding school in its beginnings than an institution of higher education. Bryn Mawr, on the other hand, started when colleges were well defined and the need for graduate education for women was being pressed by many, but by none more passionately than its first dean. It started out to deal with the upper levels of education almost from the outset. By the 1880s when Bryn Mawr was launched, Haverford was quite self-consciously a college, but it never undertook graduate education beyond the master's level and, in general, encouraged its graduates to go to the larger universities where there were so many opportunities for men in every field.

It is of interest to note in the Will of Dr. Taylor, the founder of Bryn Mawr, that he urged a location close to Haverford expressly with the idea of cooperation. At the time Bryn Mawr opened, there was one shared faculty member between the two institutions. J. Rendal Harris was professor of Biblical Languages and Ecclesiastical History at Haverford College from 1886-1891 and lecturer in Bible and Biblical Study at Bryn Mawr College from 1885-1891. Beyond this, it is by no means clear how much cooperation developed during the first decade, though President Rhoads sent his own son, Charles James Rhoads, to Haverford for his education. On the occasion of the fire which destroyed Denbigh in 1902, Haverford students were among those who fought the flames. Afterward, although they were properly thanked, they were not encouraged to come back. The two members of the first class at Bryn Mawr whom I knew, my aunt Caroline Paxson Stine and Catherine Bean Cox, who later went to Hawaii, never referred to ac-
tivities at Haverford so far as I can recall except possibly for a reference
to going skating on the pond there.

One does not read of the Haverford faculty's extending a helping
hand to their new neighbor, and presumably their resources were so
limited in those years that they could hardly have done so. During the
presidency of M. Carey Thomas, whose nephew, Hal Thomas, also at-
tended Haverford, the relationship between the two colleges seemed to
have declined to a nadir. I base this on her oft-quoted remark about the
"nasty little boys at Haverford." Although a number of members of the
Thomas and Carey families of Baltimore attended Haverford, this ap-
parently did not redeem the institution in the eyes of Miss Thomas. In
the long run, however, M. Carey Thomas was a great boon to Haver-
ford because of the College she built up in Bryn Mawr.

Rigorous and aristocratic, she developed an institution which
achieved a national reputation for excellence in education and inde-
pendence in thought and action. Furthermore, she established it as a
bastion of feminism, upholding a series of values that were sadly lack-
ing in the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth cen-
turies. I have described her as aristocratic, yet I believe that she would
have rejected the term. After all, it was she who developed the summer
program at the College to help working women gain more education.

Throughout the early decades of this century, Bryn Mawr gave its
own admission examinations long after most colleges had come to rely
on the College Entrance Examination Board. Thus, my classmates
from Westtown, Rebecca Wills Hetzel (’29), Ruth Biddle Penfield (’29)
and Margaret Perry Bruton (’28), were among those who took special
Bryn Mawr examinations, separately from those given by the College
Entrance Examination Board which, however, were also acceptable to
Bryn Mawr. It was not until 1926 that Bryn Mawr ceased to administer
its own examinations, well after other members of the Seven Sister
Colleges had made the College Entrance Examination Board exams
their only examinations, as did Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and many
others. Some alleged that the Bryn Mawr examinations were more rig-
orous but clearly this would have depended largely on the grading
process and the use the admissions office made of the numerical grades.
The separate examinations, however, maintained an aura of distinc-
tiveness about Bryn Mawr and its educational offerings.

By 1930, the two colleges were cooperating in producing plays
(Princeton having already shared the Bryn Mawr stage), and there was
a considerable interchange between the campuses which not only pro-
vided those of us from Haverford with much enjoyable companionship
but resulted in a certain number of marriages. Probably college admis-
sion officers do not think of themselves in any sense as matchmakers but they play a very real role in screening persons for the altar, and many a youth has avoided the error of marrying beauty without brains by associating with women who have been admitted to a first-class college.

Although there does not seem to have been any coeduction in the early decades, cross-fertilization was considerable at the Board level and provided enough interchange to support some commonality of educational objectives. John B. Garrett, who established one of the prizes for students at Haverford, was a Bryn Mawr trustee, as was his brother Philip C. Garrett. M. Carey Thomas’ father was another. Rufus M. Jones, Haverford Class of 1885 and later Professor of Philosophy at Haverford, served as the Chairman of the Board at Bryn Mawr, as did Charles Rhoads and Henry Cadbury who also had close ties with Haverford. When Judge Edmund B. Spaeth was Chairman of the Bryn Mawr Board, he served for a time as a manager at Haverford. Similarly, I was a member of the Bryn Mawr Board while Chairman of the Managers at Haverford. Other examples could be cited, and in recent years two Bryn Mawr alumnae, Martha Stokes Price and Eliza Cope Harrison, have been members of the Haverford Board as was James Wood, a Haverford graduate and longtime member of the Bryn Mawr Board. Currently, the Bryn Mawr Board Chairman and the Chairman of Haverford’s Board of Managers sit ex officio on each other’s Boards and since 1985, in addition to meetings of a joint council composed of members of both Boards and held since 1976, there have been several useful joint Board committee meetings.

Before I became a member of the Board of Haverford in 1949, it was agreed that students at Haverford and Bryn Mawr might take courses in the other college if they were not offered in their own institution. Thus, certain Haverford students might go to Bryn Mawr for geology and some Bryn Mawr students could go to Haverford for astronomy. A little later this interchange became more liberal so that cross registration might occur more or less at the convenience of the student.

When my two older sons were attending Haverford—1960 to 1965—each took advantage of course offerings at Bryn Mawr on one or more occasions. The blue bus started circulating in 1966 as cross-registrations mounted. It has been interesting to follow the course of the cross-registrations which were originally limited to subjects other than the major. At one point they would flow in favor of Bryn Mawr students coming to Haverford and at other times, there were more Haverford students taking courses at Bryn Mawr.

In 1969, as pressures at Haverford were rising for coeducation in con-
sonance with a nationwide trend, a more formal plan of cooperation was adopted which included an exchange of living quarters. Thus, a dormitory or two was reserved at Haverford for Bryn Mawr women who wished a more coeducational experience and a similar number of accommodations were reserved at Bryn Mawr for Haverford students. This sent predictable shock waves through the alumni and as Chairman of the Board of Haverford, I received some very sharp notes from people I respected expressing not only repugnance but dismay at this plan. My reaction was one of *honi soit qui mal y pense*, yet clearly the colleges would not undertake to *act in loco parentis*. In fact, each school wanted its freshmen to be socialized in the school in which he or she had matriculated; thus the freshmen were restricted to their home campus as far as living quarters were concerned and permitted to come to the dormitory facilities at the other college only in their sophomore and subsequent years. Much was written in these years about the unique character of the collaboration and how it permitted those students who wished a coeducational experience to have it and how it still preserved the values of a unisex institution, at least in part, for those who preferred that.

My own reaction at the time was that members of the Society of Friends had set up three colleges in the Philadelphia suburbs, one for men, one for women and one for coeducation. It seemed to me prudent to reserve these choices, and unnecessary for all of the colleges to move in the same direction. However, during the years that I served on both the Haverford and Bryn Mawr Boards, some perhaps thought I had a conflict of interest. This did not seem to me to be the case if one was interested in education broadly though, no doubt, it was a reasonable charge if one was interested simply in a particular educational institution. In general, cooperation prospered, though there were always a certain number of dissatisfactions. One of the difficulties in the early years related to restrictions of freshmen to their own dormitories. A larger dissatisfaction arose from a restriction which persisted for a long time against a crossover in majors. For a while some departments did not permit any of the courses counted toward the major to be taken in the other institution, whereas in other departments, such as economics, there was extensive cooperation so that the staffing was complementary and a major offered which was essentially the same regardless of which college the student attended.

Meanwhile, the pressures toward full coeducation kept mounting at Haverford both among the faculty and in the student body, and finally on the Board. President John R. Coleman of Haverford became stronger and stronger in his espousal of coeducation. At first he pre-
sented it to the Board as an economic necessity, taking the position that with the lowered birth rate we would not be able to recruit enough men to fill the college. Later, when it appeared that the college did fill with quite satisfactory students, he based the reasons for it on the un-Quakerly nature of unisex education and various other considerations. It was, of course, true that Quaker schools had offered equal opportunity to girls and boys practically from the beginning. It should also be remembered, however, that in those earlier days higher education was looked upon in Quaker circles with considerable doubt and suspicion. As the pressures rose for Haverford to become coeducational, Bryn Mawr raised a variety of objections. One of these was that if half of Haverford students were women and all of Bryn Mawr’s undergraduates were women and the undergraduate student bodies were approximately the same size, we would end up with three women to one man on the two campuses. Bryn Mawr was always quite clear that it did not wish to become coeducational itself but preferred to receive only women as undergraduates. It was also pointed out that with two admitting procedures, it would be awkward if a woman who had been turned down at one college were accepted at the other and then had the right to take her courses, and even her major, in the college that had turned her down originally.

Additional cooperative steps were taken: the preparation of shared admissions literature and the development of joint recruiting trips by admission officers.

In 1976 Bryn Mawr suggested that Haverford’s desire to admit women might be satisfied without disruption if Haverford accepted transfers to the sophomore, junior, or senior classes, refraining from competing with Bryn Mawr for freshmen. This plan was put into effect the next year and a number of women were admitted to Haverford at the advanced levels. Actually, this did not solve the problem, as these Haverford women took it on themselves to press for full coeducation at Haverford.

With the change in the administration at Bryn Mawr, the incoming president, Mary Patterson McPherson, defused the issue a good deal by saying that she thought that Haverford would, in the fullness of time, want to admit women and that this need not destroy intercollege cooperation. John Whitehead, as Chairman of the Haverford Board, felt it appropriate to delay the institution of total coeducation at Haverford for a time in the interest of preserving cooperation and allowing the issue between the colleges to become less tense.

Finally, when the Haverford Board authorized the admission of women to the freshman class, the calendar had turned over to May 1979
and the first freshmen women were admitted in the Fall of 1980. Segregation in the dormitories had been largely ended in 1974 so that men and women were using some of the same dormitories on both campuses. There remained, however, certain dormitories on the Bryn Mawr campus that were reserved for women who did not want to share dormitories with men. Not only was the cooperation preserved virtually intact at the academic level and in extracurricular activities but Bryn Mawr was most generous in supporting the athletic opportunities for Haverford women during a period when Haverford’s athletic facilities were still being adapted for coeducation.

One wonders to some extent how some of the earlier leaders of the colleges would feel about current developments. It is hard to believe that Miss Thomas would be exactly gratified. On the other hand, she is reported to have said that “as the great universities open their doors to women, it may be that Bryn Mawr will no longer need to be a college for women only.” Indeed, she proved herself adaptable fairly late in her life and one can easily underestimate her flexibility.

In any event, we now have two undergraduate student bodies, academically fused to a considerable extent. Some individual departments have cooperated but others have gone their separate ways. The libraries now function as fully conjoint. Eventually the advantages of cooperation should outweigh the reservations of those who have preferred independence to interdependence. Those who have worked together in such matters as hiring new faculty will have vastly increased the knowledge available on the two campuses in a given field.

What may one ask of the future? A great virtue of the small college is the interaction between undergraduate students and their teachers. This tends to be lost in the large universities as pressures mount on faculty members to be productive in research. Perhaps the ideal faculty member is capable of both research and of relating closely to students. The tendency is, however, for the research-minded faculty member to relate more and more to graduate students and rather less to undergraduate students. Haverford has escaped the problem by having no graduate students except for an occasional candidate for a master’s degree. Bryn Mawr seems to have avoided the trend more than have the large universities, perhaps because of the relatively larger size of the undergraduate body and the force of a long-standing tradition.

Another consideration, however, is not without weight; namely, that gifted young scholars wish the opportunity of establishing themselves in research and in graduate teaching. They wish to have the opportunity as they mature of training their own kinds of scholars, usually candidates for the Ph.D. degree in their respective disciplines.
Many teachers feel unfulfilled without this opportunity, and this may limit small colleges when recruiting individuals whom they would value greatly as teachers and as scholars.

In discussing this problem many years ago with the late Thomas B. McCabe, a long-time Swarthmore trustee, I asked him if he thought that this factor might not eventually outweigh the reluctance of undergraduate colleges to institute graduate programs; his quick response was that he thought eventually it would. Whether he would have come up with the same answer if he had had a week to think about it instead of thirty seconds I, of course, do not know. However, I believe it is a very real factor, and it raises the issue of whether Haverford and Swarthmore should each start graduate programs leading to the Ph.D. or whether all three colleges should share the expense of maintaining a combined graduate school of arts and sciences. At present, and in the foreseeable future, it seems unlikely that Bryn Mawr would want to share this responsibility, which distinguishes it so much from many of its competitors. However, the future is long. Joseph Taylor's recommendation that his college be established close to Haverford has had much more influence than most of his other injunctions and one can easily conceive of a degree of cooperation at the graduate level which might go far beyond that which has been achieved at the undergraduate level.

The road ahead may be no less rocky than the road we have traveled so far. Though there is bound to be some competition for the best students and for financial resources, the issue of admissions has been much less of a problem than some anticipated. The two college constituencies seem to be sufficiently distinct to have largely prevented unpleasant competition in admissions. However, these factors could change and it might only take two incompatible presidents to lead a retreat from the cooperation which seems so fruitful now.

As the percentage of women at Haverford passes the 40 percent mark, the disproportion of women to men on the two campuses approaches the 3 to 1 ratio projected a few years ago. The effect of this remains to be seen. The further issue is, of course, whether and, if it does, when Bryn Mawr will become coeducational at the undergraduate level. Personally, I am too old fashioned to want to see this and, in any case, the suggestion should not come from a Haverford graduate.

On balance, the advantages of cooperation, of using our proximity to offer a richer curriculum for students, broader groups of colleagues for faculty, more creative extracurricular activities in certain fields, and a more realistic social milieu, should outweigh the difficulties which will inevitably be experienced.
A few poems and a translation by Richmond Lattimore form our last section. These are, with one exception, poems written for or about specific Bryn Mawr events and people: two inaugurations, one commencement, one convocation, a springtime reverie in a neighbor's garden, a memorial poem for a student he never knew, and an elegy for a colleague. The last poem, not noticeably related to Bryn Mawr, and hitherto unpublished, was given to this volume by Lattimore shortly before he died in February, 1984. All these poems derive from this one poet's perceptions, as individual and particular as the perceptions of the other contributors which they follow. They are here because Richmond Lattimore was our poet, because his sense of life and learning were so intimately a part of this community for nearly half of the past century, because his expressed concern for ephemerality and permanence seems an apt conclusion to this moment of recollection, swift in passage, fixed in our awareness of it, radiant in its reflection of human endeavor and achievement.

—PHL
In all this change there is a kind of passion of permanence: abstract design, ceremony, and repetition.

RICHMOND LATTIMORE
In a time when our beloved possessions are turning against us,
when all are haggard with doubt, and the wisest counsels
confounded,
when the natural world, once strong and sovereign, begins to strangle
on its own garbage, what are we, with moderate
wit and less wisdom, to offer even a morality, no program?
Only whatever sense of things stirs in the dark blood’s tumult.
To cultivate what’s difficult. To put aside dreams
of do-nothing paradies. To heal the haters, not hate them.
To forego our given luxuries of easy thought and spoiled senses.
To liberate the oppressed from the tyrannies of nature
and us. To make exacting use of magnificent material.
When asked for much to give more, and try to undo the sorrows
of ourselves and the sorrowful around and among us.
I have thought of the Academic Overture and Gaudeamus,
and thus of flowers too perishable, but to be renewed,
the optimistic brass and Brahms, decay and eternity.
But then I thought of the ship of fools, who are we, where bound
in what storms, is the captain Philosophy, or is it some madman
sailing too near sea’s edge to topple us over the blue wall?
Or of Plato’s cave, a dreamed-up world of televised percepts
with our sober opinions dried like bats in a sunken belfrey;
how the poet is a spider who reels out the stuff he has eaten.

I thought, how would our world look to some starship commander
from saner space, how he might report on our tragic glories,
on genius gone mad, divine intelligence zeroing on annihilation.

Dream-thoughts, love-thoughts, death-thoughts, public and
personal,
These were my thoughts. They have no wisdom, but what they
concern
is here with all of us, here and now, so I give them to you.
A mining town in Wales.
A gray rock in the wind.
A difficult flower in a crack of the rock.
The rigor, time, toil and patient imagination of science,
wissenschaft, that is, which is all of the learned studies.
The honorable estate of being a woman.
Contempt for fads and facility.
The fascination of facts and figures.
The problem puzzled out in private agony, then shared.
The mind the soul and the body.
Austere but willing to be sometimes silly.
Nerves, nerves sometimes in the spells of hysteria any college has to go through.
Yet still
not modeled on but model.
Tradition and innovation.
The great names of the past and the young promise.
In black and white, beauty on the grass.
Fresh lawns and cool towers not of ivory.

1 Read at the Inauguration of Mary Patterson McPherson as President of Bryn Mawr College in 1978.
It's a time of blossoms momentarily fixed shaken and gone; a time of contradictions; black and white on green and gray; hopes and desperate peril; a time of change; farewells forever and new beginnings, new combinations. The world could end tomorrow; the world could be much better than it ever was; but, saving the presence of armageddons that hover at the edges of probability, in all this change there is a kind of passion of permanence: abstract design, ceremony and repetition: in the fugitive, the fixed, steadiness in fluctuation. Your gaudeamus remembers the times of other rituals. I have been through it in my years, and my hopes go with you.
ODE FOR GERTRUDE ELY'S SPRING PARTY

Spring, never half so sweet as now nor ever half so sweet
again, now if never after, come spring come
with
tree trunks in pools of water, green rain and yellow willows,
daisy wheels and buttercups, meadowlarks and song-sparrows
with
milkmaids and shepherdesses, colin clouts and morris dances,
may rings and tennis balls, white shirts and boys running
with
broken hearts mended, wars hates and cares and fears forgotten,
green strength and careless love, lazy wits and shallow fancies,
spring, never half so sweet as now nor ever half so sweet
again, now if never after, come spring come.
IN MEMORIAM

This is the stone bench on the Bryn Mawr campus. Sometimes in mild weather I teach my classes at the bench of Elsie, killed by Chinese Boxers.

Mobs, rage, weapons. The sleeping dragon shook his scales between the spells before his last awakening to red fire and howling guards.

The quaint and pretty graduating class, round-eyed before the camera, gave her up to her short duties, love, and violent death.

The Empress Of India, small, yacht-prowed, reeling in high waters off the Aleutians (those stormy gray ships on the Eastern Grand Circle), carried my parents, innocent and clever, squeezed by hard means from their own academe, to China, months and dollars away from home.

Where Elsie’s blood was only six years faded, at the hired temple, next the lily pond, I was born in Paotingfu. The stars are joined.

All taught. It’s in our blood, a hard gray strain to discipline our little furies, knot our stormy-colored lusts into cool form until dragons shall dim their fires and smile.

Elsie Campbell Sinclair Hodge, AB 1897.
Born Dec. 15, 1874. Died in the massacre of Christians at Paotingfu, China, June, 1900.
ELEGY FOR RHYS CARPENTER

You wanted to slip away
quietly, and did. Ours
to remember today
what had been yours.
The bold mind setting sail
on uncharted exciting
seas. Artist’s eye for detail.
The sculptured writing.
Love for all growing grace,
flowers, wild creatures.
Full-lived adventurous days
in all that is Nature’s.
The huge walks on the Greek
hills, and the climb
in the crack of the bleak
cliff, in your strong prime.
Now light comes in the trees.
The world turns green.
Fortunate he who sees
them as you would have seen.
Package our past, place names, journeys, woodside stops, sandwichcs in the forest, pathways and promises and sudden embraces; package the rooms drinks showers plunges in the pool, and wakenings; all gone, still present as the morning light spills in through the window by the dresser and the red sun comes up all for us alone, beyond thin trees.

Coming going gone. There is little time allotted by the authorities upstairs. Take hold tie up forever our going and gone gifts, secure them into the ages.
We are things of a day. What are we? What are we not? The shadow of a dream is man, no more. But when the brightness comes, and God gives it, there is a shining of light on men, and their life is sweet.
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