

on a farm in Vermont, August 27, 1797, fitted for college in the country grammar school, graduated from Middlebury College in 1816. Later he studied medicine and thus acquired the degree of doctor of medicine. In 1820 he became the botanist and surgeon to Major Long's expedition to the Rocky Mountains. Ten years later he resigned from the army, and within a few years settled near Burlington, Iowa, where he engaged in farming. He died October 25, 1861. *Jamesia*, a very pretty Rocky Mountain shrub of the botanical family *Saxifragaceae* was dedicated to him by Torrey and Gray.

CHARLES E. BESSEY
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

THE ADMINISTRATION OF SYRACUSE
UNIVERSITY¹

SYRACUSE, N. Y., April 17, 1908.

DEAN WILLIAM KENT,

Syracuse University.

Dear Sir: The executive committee and the chancellor are firmly though reluctantly persuaded that your usefulness in this university is at an end and that your continued presence among us would be increasingly prejudicial to the peace and success of the university.

You have been a disappointment to the administration from almost the beginning of your official relation to the institution. We can not hope that you will be capable of any improvement in the future.

Without going into particulars, you will appreciate the fact that the trustees of a university can not possibly retain a dean who can not meet the chancellor or president of the institution upon amicable and even confidential terms and whom the chancellor can not address concerning the work of his college without being subject to the embarrassment of controversy and contention.

As much as I regret therefore the duty that is imposed upon me, I am compelled, acting upon the advice and with the unanimous concurrence of the executive committee of Syracuse University, to inform you that your connection with the university will be terminated with the close of the present college year. I am advised further

¹There is here printed the recent correspondence between the Rev. Dr. James R. Day, chancellor of Syracuse University, and Professor Wm. Kent, dean of the College of Applied Science, together with a statement which Professor Kent has prepared at the request of the editor.

by the executive committee to inform you that if you prefer to submit your resignation, you may have that privilege.

Very truly yours,

JAMES R. DAY,
Chancellor

SYRACUSE, N. Y., April 20, 1908.

CHANCELLOR JAMES R. DAY,
Syracuse University.

Dear Sir: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favor of the 17th inst., informing me of the unanimous action of the executive committee, and giving me the privilege of submitting my resignation.

Before deciding whether to submit my resignation now or to ask you to prefer charges against me and to let me be heard in my defense before being dismissed by a vote of not less than twelve trustees, according to section 4 of the university charter, I ask you to be more specific in regard to the following statement in your letter:

"You have been a disappointment to the administration from almost the beginning of your official relation to the institution. We can not hope that you will be capable of any improvement in the future."

If I have been a disappointment to the administration (I suppose that means yourself personally) I have not, as far as I know, been a disappointment to the trustees, faculty, students or alumni. I have not only done my duty as dean and professor of mechanical engineering to the best of my ability, but with all due modesty, I think no one else could have done it any better in my place. This question I am willing to leave to the judgment of experts in engineering education.

If I leave here at the end of five years' hard service it is only fair that my efforts in behalf of the college should receive such commendation from the board of trustees as I think they deserve, and that it should be made clear that I leave here not on account of any failure in my duty as dean or professor nor for any lack of ability as teacher or administrator, but only on account of the personal feelings of the chancellor.

I therefore request that you appoint a committee of three trustees, not members of the executive committee, to investigate into all matters relating to my administration of the offices I have held for the past five years, and report their conclusion to the executive committee.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM KENT,
Dean of College of Applied Science

SYRACUSE, N. Y., April 21, 1908.

DEAN WILLIAM KENT,
Syracuse University.

Dear Sir: Answering your letter of April 20, there is no provision in our charter and by-laws nor is there any precedent for the trial of an officer or professor of the university whose connection with the institution it is desired to terminate.

There is no reason for any departure from the usual procedure in your case. Therefore it is certain that the trustees will not establish the precedent which you demand.

If you do not care to accept the alternative of a resignation, then the report of the committee will be presented to the trustees for their action. The language of the report is: "The executive committee, believing that the interests of the university require that harmonious relations should exist between the administrative heads of the university and the deans of the several faculties, is of the opinion, in view of the circumstances, that the connection of Dean Kent with the university should be terminated, and recommends that the matter be presented to the board of trustees at the next annual meeting."

The resolution was presented by one of the most eminent and judicial members of the committee and adopted unanimously. The provision permitting you to resign was adopted later, entirely as an alternative which you might prefer.

As to the number of trustees required to act in such cases: as the June meeting is never short of the required quorum, the action will be final and completed at that meeting.

If the chancellor's "personal feelings" were the only ground of complaint, that were enough. The trustees of this or any other university would not retain a dean objectionable to the head of the institution. That appears in the action already taken. It is not necessary to raise the question of the impression you have made upon any of the members of the executive committee or our patrons.

Understand the matter clearly: You are offered the privilege of presenting your resignation if you prefer. If you do not, your removal will be recommended to the trustees by the unanimous action of the meeting of the executive committee, held April 17. You can have no doubt of the decision in the case.

If you prefer that it take the form of dismissal, you certainly will have that choice. I have no personal wish as to how you decide the matter.

As the executive committee has also requested

me to make the necessary recommendation of your successor, and as I have reported to you the action of the committee concerning you, I consider the matter closed, so far as my duty in the case is concerned.

Very truly yours,

JAMES R. DAY,
Chancellor

SYRACUSE, N. Y., April 21, 1908.

CHANCELLOR JAMES R. DAY,
Syracuse University.

Dear Sir: I acknowledge receipt of your favor of 21st inst., containing the report of the executive committee. As it does not appear that there is any occasion for haste in the matter, I will defer my decision for the present.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM KENT,
Dean of College of Applied Science

STATEMENT OF DEAN KENT

According to the charter and by-laws of Syracuse University its government is vested in a board of sixty trustees. The majority, or thirty-two, of them are appointed by certain conferences of the Methodist Church—nearly all of them being Methodist ministers—for terms of six years. The others are mostly business men, or men prominent in finance and in the professions in Syracuse, New York city and other places. All authority is vested in them by the charter, but, as a matter of fact, they have practically divested themselves of this authority and given it to the chancellor, who not only rules the university, but rules the board of trustees. The trustees meet twice a year only, and it is rarely that more than one half of them are present. The business transacted is purely formal. There are no reports of committees on the separate colleges; there are no reports called for from the deans of the colleges. The trustees know practically nothing about the internal working of any of the colleges. Mr. Archbold, the president of the board, is vice-president of the Standard Oil Company and a warm personal friend of the chancellor.

The L. C. Smith College is a school of engineering, but there is not a single engineer on the board of trustees, and during the past five years not a trustee has ever consulted with the dean on the work of the college.

When spoken to about it, some of them have admitted that they were negligent in the matter, but said it was not possible for trustees, who are busy men, to spend any time on details; they necessarily had to leave all such things to the chancellor. Other universities, however, have expert engineers on their boards of trustees who are very active in seeing that the engineering college is kept up to the standard of other engineering colleges throughout the country in methods of administration, in curriculum and in equipment. At Syracuse University the chancellor himself does not take any active interest in the college of applied science. He attends a faculty meeting only once a year, and practically all of his administration of the college is done through the medium of the superintendent of buildings, who acts also as the chancellor's valet and spy.

This superintendent is a rather remarkable man. His connection with the university began as janitor of Crouse College. From that position he has been gradually advanced until he is not only superintendent of buildings, charged with their heating, lighting and repairs, but is also supervisor of new construction and purchasing agent. His salary is equal to that of the highest paid professor in the university, and his power is greater than that of any dean or any faculty. Four years ago he had a quarrel with the professor of practical mechanics in the L. C. Smith College, Professor W. M. Towle, and told tales to the chancellor about him which caused his dismissal. His successor, Professor George D. Babcock, was continually in trouble with the superintendent, who interfered with his work and equipment, and rather than submit longer to his interference he resigned a year ago. Professor Cardullo, who was instructor in machine design, was appointed to succeed Professor Babcock. He is a most able man, a man whom it would be to the best interests of the university to retain, but he also is about to leave on account of the trouble which the superintendent has made for him. My predecessor, acting dean Chas. L. Griffin, had

to leave five years ago on account of the actions of the superintendent of buildings. It is entirely probable that the chancellor's prejudice against me is due chiefly to that same man's tale-bearing. Two or three months ago on one occasion he was so grossly insulting to Professor Shepard, of Smith College, that Professor Shepard demanded of the chancellor that the superintendent should make an apology to him or he would at once resign. The chancellor compelled the superintendent to make an apology, which is the only instance known of his being curbed by the chancellor. He is the chancellor's constant companion and confidant and appears to have more influence over him than any other single person in the university. As to his relations to the faculty, students and alumni, it is doubtful if he has a single friend or adherent. It would be difficult to find a man more universally hated. The chancellor seems to be the only man connected with the university who believes in him.

The chancellor has charged me with being a "disappointment to the administration [which means himself] from almost the beginning of his official relation to the institution" but he has not made a single specific charge in that matter. He also says that I can not meet him on amicable terms and that he can not address me concerning the work of the college without being subjected to the embarrassment of controversy and contention. The foundation for all these statements is of the flimsiest possible character. I have never refused to meet the chancellor in an amicable discussion of any subject, and the little controversies we have had have scarcely averaged more than one per year, and usually they lasted not over five minutes. The following is a statement of all my controversies with the chancellor, in five years, so far as I remember them:

1. A few weeks after taking office in 1903, I made a social call on the late Dean McChesney, in his office, in the college of Fine Arts. We discussed the work of the Fine Arts college and the relation of fine arts to education. Dean McChesney mentioned the

call to the chancellor, and the latter called me to account for it, saying, "You are going out of your province as dean in making such visits, and will find plenty of work to do within the four walls of your own college." The idea of such limitation was resented by me and I replied that I did not intend to narrow myself in any such way, but intended to study all educational questions that I wished to and to visit any place where I was welcomed. This talk probably prejudiced the chancellor against me, as it indicated that he was dealing with a man of independent mind, who would not submit to an undeserved rebuke. It also revealed the chancellor's propensity for petty fault finding and scolding, and showed the manner of man with whom I must deal. The incident was of trifling importance, however, and caused no lasting resentment.

2. Relations were very cordial up to January, 1904. I then presented, with a request for their consideration, to the chancellor, a package of letters which had been written, at my request, by the heads of departments of the college, showing what was needed for the improvement of the course and equipment. Accompanying these was a letter of transmittal, giving my own ideas. The letters were discourteously refused, the chancellor saying: "Take them away, I don't want to see them. Don't you know that professors are always asking for everything they can think of?" whereupon I took the letters away leaving only my own with the chancellor. The letter was never answered, and the matter caused no controversy as neither party ever referred to it again.

3. The next friction occurred in June, 1905. The chancellor wrote that he had expelled a certain student belonging to the L. C. Smith College. I replied that the man was not in college, having been dropped seventeen months previously, and that the printing of his name in the catalogue issued April, 1905, was a mistake. The chancellor's attention was also called to about forty names of men who had not been in college during the year beginning September, 1904, yet who were listed in the

catalogue. To this the chancellor replied in a letter dated June 13, 1904: "Your trouble is that you have not informed yourself as to the method of listing our students in the catalogue. A student who is present within a catalogue year for any time goes into the catalogue. . . . I do not like to have you state that such a number of students are in our list who are not in college. It reflects upon the institution. Suppose you call on me to discuss such matters as this instead of writing." Accordingly a conference was held in which I protested against padding the catalogue as essentially dishonest, and done for the purpose of misleading people as to the size of the university, and stated that I did not want Smith College misrepresented that way. The chancellor became enraged, and gave a characteristic exhibition of his bad temper, which would lead an onlooker to believe that he is about to have an apoplectic stroke. The rage was short, and we met at the chancellor's reception the next evening, as if nothing had occurred. The catalogue padding continued till this year, when it was changed. The present edition contains a correct list of the students in the L. C. Smith College during the year beginning September, 1907.

4. Another trifling dispute during 1905, concerned a statement I had written for a pamphlet describing the work of the college. This was to the effect that a year of practical instruction in a machine shop, in addition to the high school course, afforded the best preparation for an engineering course. The chancellor struck these words from the manuscript. I protested that I had given not only my own opinion, but that of the most advanced engineering educators on the subject, and offered to show their printed words. The chancellor said he cared for no one's opinion, and would allow no such statement to appear under the imprint of the university.

5. During the college year 1905-6, the chancellor and I attended the annual meeting of the Albany Association of Syracuse Alumni at Schenectady. Although we rode together from Syracuse to Schenectady, the chancellor

would not permit any discussion of college affairs, although the opportunity was excellent. I made a little speech at dinner to the alumni and said to thirteen from the College of Applied Science, who were in the employ of the General Electric Co., at Schenectady, that I hoped they would soon be so numerous and strong in influence that they could elect one of their number to an alumni trusteeship, so that their college could be represented by its own alumni. For this I was taken to task by the chancellor, who stated that the alumni trustees represented the university rather than any particular college. To this, I replied, that the plan of having each college represented on the board of trustees was a good one, and one that would soon be acted on if the university grew. This talk indicated to the chancellor that he and I had radically different ideas on university government. No further differences occurred until December, 1906.

6. On December 11, 1906, while I was in the chancellor's office on formal business, he stated that complaints had been made of disorder in L. C. Smith College—"rough housing," he called it—and that he wanted it stopped. At the perfectly natural inquiry as to who had told him, the chancellor became violently angry and began to rage. I left the room as soon as possible without losing my temper, or creating any disturbance. This trouble did not blow over as quietly as others had done, for the next day the chancellor sent a three-page, scolding letter beginning as follows: "My dear Dean Kent—I wish you to decide between this time and the meeting of the trustees in January as to whether you are to act harmoniously with the administration of this university and treat the chancellor with civility and respect. I will not permit you to repeat the incident of yesterday morning in my office and the language which you used after you left my office." Another paragraph contained the most remarkable statement: "I called your attention to certain lack of discipline in your college. You had no right whatever to begin to interrogate me as to who the authority

was in the case, and if you had had experience as an educator you probably would not have done so. It would have occurred to you that that would be impossible." This letter created a difficult situation. It was from a peevish, irritable man, under a severe nervous strain from the castigations of the press for six months past, on account of his violent attacks on President Roosevelt, and a man incapable of reasoning in the same manner as other men. It was also evident that he had been misled by some tale bearer and held exaggerated ideas as to slight breaches of discipline. In such a case, no answer but a most abject apology would satisfy him, such as no man would write and retain his self-respect. Therefore, a long letter was sent him, from which the following is quoted:

Replying to yours of the 13th inst., I do not need to wait a single day to decide that it is my honest intention to act harmoniously with the administration of the university and to treat the chancellor with civility and respect. I am not aware that I have failed to do this in the past.

You speak of the "incident yesterday morning" in your office. As far as I can remember that incident, it was merely that you informed me that complaints had been made to you of "rough-housing," as you called it, in this college, and I asked you the perfectly natural question who made the complaints and why did the person who made them not make them to me, and you refused to give me the information. If I am wrong in this statement of the incident, I wish you would correct me.

. . . You say I have "no right whatever to begin to interrogate" you "as to who was the authority in the case." Perhaps I have no right to interrogate you about this or any other matter, but if my ability as an administrator is attacked by persons making complaints, I think I ought to know who makes such complaints, and to have them made not in general terms, but with detailed specifications as to the particular things complained of, with dates of the events, and the names of the offending students if they are known. Then I can intelligently take such steps as may be necessary to punish the offender and to prevent a repetition of the offense.

To this the chancellor replied with a long characteristic letter, in which the following sentences appear: "I do not propose to permit

you to act the 'bull in the china shop,' " "I will be the judge of whether I shall give you the names," "Permit me to say that I do not wish that question raised in the future. When I tell you that there are certain things in your college that require correction, I wish it to be accepted as sufficient authority that I make this statement. I am responsible for it, and I don't propose to have you put me on the witness stand for cross-examination. It is simply a piece of insolence." To this I replied in a short letter in part as follows: "It will make it much easier for me to suppress disorder if, when it is complained of to you and not to me, you will request the person making the complaint, if he (or she) is connected with the university to make it to me direct, and furnish me with the particulars of the occurrence so that I can investigate it promptly. . . . There are several remarks in your letter which are of a personal nature and have nothing to do with the main question, viz.: the question of disorder in this college, and I do not refer to them further than to say that my judgment differs from yours, but yet I hope we may differ as gentlemen and remain on cordial terms." The chancellor then gave his ideas on the duty of a dean in a three-page letter, in which he said: "It is not for you to tell me what to do in the premises. It seems to be an exceedingly difficult thing for you to learn the duties and limitations of your office as dean. You are not acting in any independent capacity or in an independent college. You are in your position to assist the chancellor." He closed with stating, "You will please to consider this incident closed with this letter, if you propose to work with me upon the terms which happily exist between myself and the other deans." I, of course, considered the incident closed.

7. The next difficulty did not come up for about thirteen months. Outbursts on the part of the chancellor, of the character outlined above, happened only once or twice a year, and I considered that I did not need to think of resigning for at least a year, as I saw the chancellor not over twice a month and then only for five or ten minutes at a time. Dur-

ing the thirteen months, the chancellor attended only one Smith College faculty meeting, and did not meet me in the college except on that occasion. Finally, in January or February, 1908, there were three conflicts, all originating in one source—the interference of the superintendent of buildings with Professor Cardullo, professor of practical mechanics. He made two attacks on Cardullo to the chancellor: (a) for fixing the brushes of an electric motor without consulting him; (b) for not compelling students to clean their lathes after using them. These attacks were due solely to the superintendent's animosity to Cardullo, and I so told the chancellor, thereby arousing his wrath. The third conflict occurred when I requested the chancellor to make an inducement for Professor Cardullo to remain at Syracuse, he having applied for a position to the dean of a western college. This caused another outburst of rage from the chancellor.

The above are the only conflicts of any importance I had with the chancellor up to April 17, 1908, when I received the chancellor's letter of dismissal. On all of these occasions I could have met him on amicable terms for a friendly discussion, had not his dictatorial and discourteous manner made such a discussion impossible.

In regard to my administration of the offices of dean and professor of mechanical engineering, as far as I am aware, no complaint has ever been made against me by any trustee, professor, student or alumnus, nor has any one of them said that I ever treated him otherwise than with courtesy and consideration. It is difficult to come to any other conclusion than that the sole reason for my dismissal is the irrational personal feeling of the chancellor, due to my not submitting humbly to his petty fault-finding and scolding.

It will be difficult for any one not personally acquainted with the chancellor to understand the existing state of things at Syracuse University, and how it is possible that the head of a great university could act as he has done. Perhaps a brief statement

of the personality and the ideals of the chancellor may explain the situation.

The reason why Syracuse University is what it is is the overpowering personality of the chancellor. He is a large man, physically and otherwise, 63 years of age, and over six feet tall, and weighing over 250 pounds. He has a magnificent voice, a power of eloquence, and mastery of an audience equal to that of William Jennings Bryan and a capacity for invective like that of Senator Jeff Davis. Pompous in carriage, irritable in temper, and often discourteous in manner, he paralyzes the voice of any one who has the temerity to differ in opinion with him. But to those who are willing to suppress their own opinions, to defer to him in everything, to say yes to everything that he says, even to take a scolding in silence and humility, if he happens to be in a scolding mood, he is kindness itself. He has many good qualities, he is generous to a fault to poor students in distress, enjoys a good laugh and a good story and therefore has many friends among those who have not had occasion to incur his displeasure. He is preeminently a Methodist preacher, a pulpit orator of great power, and pulpit orators always have their admirers who think that a great orator is necessarily a great man. It is a common saying that "you can get along with the chancellor if you know how to take him." The "knowing how" is to suppress one's individuality, never to offer one's own opinion, to flatter his vanity, and never under any circumstances to enter into a controversy or discussion with him. He never comes to a faculty meeting of the College of Applied Science except once a year, but he presides over the faculty of Liberal Arts and keeps it in a proper state of subservience and stagnation. One member of that faculty says: "No one ever dares express an original opinion in the faculty meeting for fear he will be snubbed by the chancellor." I have been thus treated by him in a meeting of the university senate, before I learned that the senate is not a deliberating and legislative body, as it appears to be, according to the charter, but a mere registering body, the chief

duty of its members being, never to do anything but to vote "yes" on a few purely formal matters.

The chancellor's ideal of a university seems to be: the chancellor, a board of trustees who provide funds and approve of the chancellor's way of spending them; large grounds; numerous large buildings, the largest stadium in the country, the largest college gymnasium in the world, the largest college of liberal arts in the state; the most brawny athletes and the greatest number of victories in inter-university athletic contests; and for the future, more real estate, an agricultural college, an industrial college, an alumni hall, to contain an auditorium capable of seating 5,000 people, the largest college assembly hall in the country; a hundred thousand dollars to spend on beautifying the campus, and enough students, male and female, to make it from a real estate point of view, one of the four biggest universities in the country, the other three being Harvard, Chicago and Leland Stanford. And while these ideals are being realized, there is neglect of the intellectual growth of the university, and short-sighted parsimony as to the teaching force.

The end and aim of these ideals and these ambitions is the glorification of the chancellor. Like the King of France, who said, "*l'etat c'est moi*," and the Roman Emperor, who said, "See this great Rome which I have builded," the chancellor says, "See this great university which I have builded." "I am the university." When I suggested to the chancellor that it would be well to have a committee of the trustees investigate the condition and needs of our college he said, "No, I am the committee." So far is it true that he is the committee, that although there are sixty trustees, not one of them during the past five years has ever visited the college for the purpose of inquiry into its needs, its methods or its efficiency as an engineering college, nor has the dean ever been called on to make a report of its condition. The trustees have no intercourse whatever with the faculties, they have no committees on the colleges, nor even on buildings and grounds. They

leave everything to his autocracy, the chancellor. He is the committee, but one that is as dormant in regard to the College of Applied Science as the trustees themselves are.

There is another ideal of a university which Syracuse does not yet seem to have acquired. It is that it is a group of colleges, chiefly professional, each of which has a large degree of autonomy, and its business is not chiefly growth in real estate and in numbers of students, but first and foremost the giving of the best education possible to its undergraduates, by means of the best instructors and the most complete equipment that money can secure, and second, the advancement of knowledge by postgraduate work, fellowships in research, publication of researches, etc. Such a university has a democratic instead of an autocratic government, and a board of trustees, who, if they are not active in its affairs, at least to some extent are in touch with the faculties, giving them sympathetic encouragement. In such a university the alumni of each college are represented in the board of trustees and in the working committees, and they take an active interest in college affairs.

Syracuse University is not a sectarian institution in the sense that the doctrines of any religious sect are especially taught therein. Nevertheless, it may be properly called a Methodist institution inasmuch as it is completely under the control of the Methodist church and was organized by the Methodists.

According to the charter there are to be not less than 20, nor more than 60 trustees. The by-laws prescribe that each of eight Methodist conferences, in New York and New Jersey, shall elect four trustees residing within its bounds, which make 32, a majority of 60. This majority insures the Methodist conferences having absolute control of the university whenever they desire to exercise it. Of the 28 remaining trustees one is Chancellor Day, a Methodist minister, and the catalogue shows three other Methodist ministers, two of them, however, deceased. Of these 28 trustees six are alumni trustees, being elected by the alumni association of the university. Two of

them, however, are salaried officers of the university, namely, the treasurer and the dean of the medical college.

Let us see how the Methodist church exercises its power of control over the university. It elects the chancellor, whose first qualification seems to be that he shall be a Methodist minister. This is not for the reason that a minister is any better qualified for such a position than a business or professional man would be, or than a professional educator, but that he may properly represent the Methodist denomination.

The next qualification seems to be that the chancellor should be a strong man. Recently a trustee, also a Methodist minister, wrote to me and said: "I have long been a trustee and was connected with the university when the persecutions on the part of some professors led Chancellor Sims to think that he could not stand it any longer and in spite of our persuasion he resigned. He had the sympathy of the trustees in all that struggle and we felt very well satisfied that in Chancellor Day we secured a head to the institution who could not be driven away by hostile professors." In the same letter, while referring to the chancellor's demand for my removal by the trustees at their next meeting, he said: "The chancellor was appointed by the trustees as head of the institution, and while I do not know what they will do if the matter comes up, it is my opinion that they will stand by the chancellor and let anybody go who gives him trouble."

From the above it is evident that the trustees do not care to give themselves any trouble with the government of the university. It is not apparent that any attempt was made to discover the grievances of the professors against Chancellor Sims, which might have led to the alleged "persecutions." Neither was it a question whether Chancellor Sims was or was not a good administrator. He had the sympathy of the trustees right or wrong. The same is true of the present chancellor. He has been appointed by the trustees as head of the institution, and they will stand by him and let anybody go who gives him trouble, notwithstanding that the trouble may

have been of the chancellor's making. Neither does there seem to be any investigation as to the merits of any trouble which arises between the chancellor and those under him. The chancellor is to be supported regardless of the fact that injustice may be done thereby.

The conference members of the trustees forming a majority appear to have no duties except to attend meetings of the board twice a year. They listen to the chancellor's report, approve all his recommendations, eat a dinner and adjourn. The other trustees, the business men, are busily engaged with their own affairs and turn the whole administration of the university over to the chancellor. Vacancies in the board of trustees, other than the conference members, are filled by the chancellor nominating one of his personal friends to the position. This gives him practically unlimited power; the board of trustees being made up first of some of the chancellor's rich friends, and secondly, of the inactive conference trustees. The board allows him to do as he pleases and agrees to all his recommendations, even to mortgaging the university for \$400,000 to obtain funds to build the largest college gymnasium in the world, and, if the ideas of the trustee quoted above are followed, to dismiss the head of one of his colleges without any investigation on the part of the trustees to discover whether the dismissed man is a suitable person for the position or not, and without giving him any opportunity to present his side of the case.

The chancellor thus has unchecked power, which always tends to tyranny. The chancellor has, therefore, become a czar.

The conference trustees while they have it in their power to see that the university is provided with the best possible system of government, and while they have every opportunity to study by visiting other universities, what the best system of government is, have abdicated all their power and delivered it to a czar. Under such circumstances it can not be expected that the educational interests of the university can be well managed, any more than it can be believed that the governments

of Russia and Turkey are the best governments under the sun. It is not to be expected that one man, however able he may be, possesses all the wisdom necessary to the proper outlining and developing of the many varied courses of a large university.

The remedy for this state of affairs is entirely within the control of the Methodist church. Controlling as it does the majority of the board of trustees, it can, if it so wills, give the university the best governmental system possible. Would it not be well for the Methodist General Conference to request its committee on education to study the subject and report to the several conferences which have jurisdiction of colleges, what should be the best system of administration in a university, in order to make it as efficient an educational institution as possible and be a credit to the Methodist denomination?

WILLIAM KENT,

Dean of the College of Applied Science
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

CONFERENCE ON CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

THE Conference of Governors on the Conservation of the Natural Resources of the country, held in the White House, May 13-16, proved a notable occasion. Except a few detained or called away by pressing state business, all the governors of the states and territories, including Hawaii and Porto Rico, took part, as did the governors' advisers, the justices of the Supreme Court, the members of the cabinet, the presidents of the leading scientific and technical organizations, and a few special guests, including Messrs. Andrew Carnegie, James J. Hill, W. J. Bryan and John Mitchell. President Roosevelt presided throughout two of the five sessions, and during a part of each of the other three. It was the consensus of opinion that the condition and probable duration of our leading resources were summarized more completely than ever before; and that the deliberations did more to emphasize the importance of research relating to the physical phenomena of the continent than those of any other earlier assemblage.