

has been promoted to be lecturer in histology and embryology, and Dr. Roger C. Perkins, assistant professor of pathology and bacteriology to be associate professor of pathology and hygiene.

MR. CHARLES H. DANFORTH, who has been engaged in comparative anatomical investigation at Tufts College, has been appointed instructor in anatomy in the Medical Department of Washington University.

At Northwestern University David R. Whitney, Ph.D., Columbia, has been appointed assistant in biology, and J. W. Turrentine assistant in chemistry.

At Williams College, Mr. Charles Packard has been appointed instructor in biology; Mr. R. S. Corein assistant in geology; and Mr. L. B. Mears assistant in chemistry.

At Amherst College, Mr. Gordon Pulcher has been appointed instructor in physics; Mr. Charles W. Cobb, instructor in mathematics, and Mr. Arthur L. Kimball, Jr., assistant in geology.

EDWARD E. WILDMAN, M.S. (Pennsylvania, 1908), has resigned a fellowship in biology at Princeton on account of his election to a professorship in biology at the Central High School, Philadelphia.

MR. P. L. GAINNEY, a recent graduate of the North Carolina College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts, has been appointed assistant in botany in that institution.

DR. JESSE H. WHITE, Ph.D. (Clark), has charge of the work in psychology and education in Pittsburgh University, during the absence of Professor Edmund B. Huey, who is spending the year in Paris.

PROFESSOR M. STUART MACDONALD, of the University of Fredericton, N. B., has been invited to give assistance to the department of philosophy until the board fills the vacancy made by the resignation of Professor Taylor.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

THE ADMINISTRATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE abominable state of affairs which exists at some of our universities in America

could not last long if the true conditions were known outside. The faculties are powerless to correct them, for the very places where reform is most needed are the ones in which the professor is so shorn of his power as to be practically helpless. If public opinion is once aroused on the seriousness of this question, it will not take long to remedy the evil.

Those who are interested in the movement for putting our American universities on a true university basis will find some valuable material in the contents of this article.

I agree with the editorial in the *Popular Science Monthly*, for July, 1908, that Dean Kent did a public service when he exposed the administration of Chancellor Day at Syracuse University. I have heard that this is already producing a better atmosphere at Syracuse—as one might have expected.

For the same reasons I propose to give an account of a case at the University of Illinois, and in doing so I have no apology to make to any one; least of all to my fellow citizens of the state or to the alumni of the university. They are the ones who are most interested, and I believe that the vast majority of them will see at once that they will be benefited.

I am trying to clean up a condition which could not exist in the light, and which will spread its poison if allowed to persist in the dark. The university is too strong, the alumni too loyal, and the state, as a whole, too intelligent to allow the recurrence of such acts as have recently been perpetrated by the president of the university, supported, in part at least, by the governor of the state.

Those who are interested in academic freedom will be edified in seeing how the president of an American university handled a professor's case when he appealed it to the supreme court of the university—that is, the trustees.

Without going into the details of the case appealed, I will simply say that when President James came to the University of Illinois, I had completed seven years as full professor and head of the department of physiology. During this entire time I had had no friction with the former president, nor with any one else.

With President James's administration I began to bump over a corduroy road that led me to believe there was something wrong under the surface. I felt that I had been compromised, in several particulars, in my dignity as a professor, and finally, having failed to get a satisfactory explanation, at the end of three years of friction, I wrote to the president suggesting that he ask my resignation rather than to keep things going as they were. I knew, and the president knew, that if he asked my resignation I could request a hearing before the trustees, and he would have to show grounds for his request. As he would do nothing, I finally asked the board of trustees to court-martial me. I was conscious of a clean record, and did not fear a fair trial. I quote the first paragraph of my letter to the board:

When an officer in the army, by the act of a superior, is placed in a position which compromises his reputation, he may apply for a court-martial. In this spirit, I request an investigation by your honorable body.

The letter was addressed directly to the board, and was forwarded through the dean of the College of Science, and the president of the university. As evidence that I had not appealed to the board before exhausting every resource with the president, I presented to the board, at the first meeting on which the case was called, copies of two letters which I had sent to the president—one of the date of September 7, 1906; the other February 14, 1908; and I gave copies of these letters to each member who was present at that meeting. I quote from said letter of September 7, 1906, as follows:

Although I have headed this letter "unofficial" and have marked the envelope "personal" so that it will reach you without passing through clerical hands, it will contain nothing which I wish to be guarded by the seal of privacy, and I expect you to use its contents freely: especially with others whom it may concern. I intend it for an informal discussion: a friendly *pour-parler*, so to speak; preceding official action, if such action must be taken.

I am in doubt as to your attitude toward me and my department, and I wish to go straight to you for information. . . . I know of no reason to

justify any action that would insinuate that I was inferior to my colleagues; and if you have any such reason in mind, I wish you would bring it up and let us have it out, fairly, fully, and finally. . . .

I believe I have every moral right to remain here, and share all the benefits, in the growth of the institution to which a long term of efficient service (with many extras) would entitle me. On the other hand, if my position is to be compromised, in its dignity, either as to salary, amount of work, or responsibility, I would not be willing to retain it.

After such words as these, in a *pour-parler*, and even much more vigorous ones in an official letter, later, there was no excuse for the president to refuse to clear things up one way or the other, and the only higher court I could appeal to was the board of trustees.

When my case was called, I appeared before the board and made a brief preliminary statement, to the effect that I wished a clean slate, but that I did not wish to make a personal attack on any one, and would regret it if any personal questions arose. *I also stated that I hoped the case would reveal certain defects in our organization that I knew existed, and that I hoped the board would see and correct them.*

I was then excused, with the understanding that I would be called later. As I left the room I told where I would be, and how I could be back in three minutes if they telephoned to me.

The vice-president, the former dean and the present dean were then called. They were questioned by President James, and their testimony was taken in my absence. No record was kept.

If the president brought in these gentlemen, expecting that they would condemn me, their testimony must have been a sort of a Baalam's blessing; for at least two members of the board, who stuck by the president through thick and thin, told me that the evidence was so much in my favor, that if I would withdraw the case, I could do so without prejudice to my reputation for anything that had been said.

The board took a recess for lunch, after which they transacted other business and then

adjourned without taking up the case again. This was March 10; the meeting was at the university.

The next meeting of the board was held April 3, in Chicago. I was not notified and so was not present.

The next meeting was April 23, also in Chicago. I was notified and was present. The president of the board asked me what I had to say. I replied that I did not know what I would have to say until I was informed as to what had been done in my absence. I then said: "First, I should like to ask, 'Are there any charges against me?'" The president of the board gave me the official answer, "No." I then said, "This gives me a clean slate and leaves nothing for me to defend; but I have some witnesses who can tell of the difficulties I have had in the development of my department. I have brought these witnesses here at my own expense, and if you care to use this opportunity to learn of the conditions under which some of us have to work, I offer you their testimony." They were called in, and I voluntarily left the room to allow them to speak without the slightest restraint. They were questioned by different members of the board. Finally, the president of the board, in a genuinely courteous way, gave me ten minutes to "*close the case*"—these were his words. After I had left the room, President James, who had been present all the time, read from a nineteen-page typewritten memorandum in which he reflected on me both personally and professionally.

A resolution was then put to a vote, that the "board of trustees do not recognize that Professor Kemp has any just cause for grievance against the administration of the university." This was lost on a tie vote. Then occurred an accident which gave me the first tangible thing I could get from anybody. The president had taken the seat which I vacated when I left the room. I had left a whole stack of reports, etc., on the table; for I did not know what I might have been called on to prove, and I was prepared to show, if necessary, that my recommendations had not been carried out. After the vote went against him, the president left his memorandum

mixed in with my papers, and when I gathered these up, after the meeting, I found it.

Here I had incontestable proof of the president's unfairness. He had presented this paper behind my back, and it was full of misleading statements—especially half truths, very adroitly presented. Indeed I must give the president credit (*sic*) for the way in which he put some of it together. He attacked me on practically every point which is essential to the head of a department, viz., as an administrator, as a teacher, as a man of science, and in my relation to my colleagues. Everything was general—not a specific act was alleged. Here is a sample:

I do not think that Dr. Kemp's salary should be increased at the present time, or at all, until we get an entirely different atmosphere in the department, and particularly in the relations of the department to the other departments in the university.

If the president had said this to my face, I should have asked to which departments he referred; and what was wrong. If this *were* true, both the president and the dean had been guilty of flagrant dereliction in their duty, for not having called my attention to it. The same would apply to the head of any department making such a complaint.

I have received disciplinary letters from the (former) dean, on meeting a class out of schedule hours¹ and on "smoking in university buildings." If such trivial things as these could be put in writing, there is no excuse for secret action on one of the most serious accusations that could be brought against a professor.

Speaking of atmosphere, I believe I can say that my department has always contained as much university oxygen as any about the place, and my students who have breathed this "atmosphere" have gone out loyal, strong and true university men and women, who have made a record of which any professor may be proud. *That* is the *real* test.

Later in the day, I came upon a group of the trustees who were discussing the meeting. The reading of the memorandum behind my

¹ This was done by unanimous request of the class and involved no conflict with other classes.

back had been objected to, but the objection was not sustained. The group that I met were all indignant at the whole procedure and their talk drifted back to the meeting of April 3, for which I had received no notice.

It seems that at that meeting the governor was present, as were all the ex-officio members. The governor almost never attends even the *regular* board meetings, but he was at that *special* one. He presented a set of laudatory resolutions on the president and spoke so pointedly, on his wish that the board should back up the president, that it excited comment at the time. Shortly thereafter my case was called, and discussed in my absence. The president attacked me, then, behind my back; and tried to get the board to pass resolutions which would have led to my resignation in self-respect. Action was only deferred by the vigorous protests of some who insisted that I had been promised a *hearing*; that up to that time I had had no chance to reply to anything that had been said, and had not even heard it.

After I was sure that there was no doubt on this point, I showed those members my file of the president's letters containing this one:

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

DR. G. T. KEMP, April 11, 1908.

Natural History Building

My dear Doctor,

The board of trustees at its last meeting on Friday April 3 in the city of Chicago considered at much length your communications to the president of the university and the president of the board. Through some misunderstanding it seems you did not receive notice of the meeting. I urged that action be deferred until you could be heard if you care to be.

Faithfully yours,
(Signed) EDMUND J. JAMES.

As will be seen, in my resignation, I accepted the version of the trustees—not that of the president. There is not a member of the board from the governor down who can plead ignorance after this.

There is another thing which happened at the meeting, on April 3, which has a very ugly look. I was not there and did not hear what the president said, but he certainly gave

some of the trustees the impression that I had referred him to three men at Johns Hopkins, that he had seen these men, and that all three had spoken unfavorably of me. He did go to Baltimore, and if he was as misleading there, with those whom he saw, as he was in his "secret report" to the trustees, I do not know what sort of impression he created. As a matter of fact, I knew nothing of his intended visit to Johns Hopkins, and did not refer him to anybody. If I had done so I should have given him my card.²

The rest is soon told. The president's actions had made the whole affair a burlesque on justice; the governor had aided and abetted him, and was evidently keeping his influence active. The sense of decency of about half the board was outraged, and the others were likely to stand pat. It was disagreeable for everybody. I was disgusted and willing to sacrifice my "job" for the dignity of my profession. A university professor is entitled to more respect than to be subjected to such a farce of a hearing.

I was prepared to resign, but before I did so, the president contributed one more serio-comic feature, in the shape of a letter. It was serious, because it came from a man in his position; it was comic because of its form, and because I received a letter of the *same date*, from another official, and it would take a pretty clever casuist to make the two agree. The one letter was from the secretary of the board of trustees giving me the words of the president's resolution, which had been lost at the last meeting, and also the vote. This resolution has been quoted above. The president's letter, on the same date, is as follows:

²I can not pass this by, without expressing a thought which will appeal to more than one reader of SCIENCE. I have known men to have injustice done them when it was never so intended. In judging the speed of a horse, you must see if there is a handicap. A horse that can trot a mile in 3:50, carrying weight over a heavy and broken road, may have just as good stuff in him as one that can make it in 2:25 on a good track in a proper rig; and the fact that the 3:50 animal has never quit, and refuses to have his racing-spirit broken is not such a bad recommendation for his old stable.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

April 28, 1908

DR. G. T. KEMP,
Natural History Building
My dear Doctor Kemp,

The board of trustees after a long discussion over the matter did nothing in regard to the subject matter of the communications which you have forwarded to them. They will have another meeting on next Saturday at nine o'clock at the Palmer House in Chicago. If you desire to make any further statement or appear again before the board at that time I shall be very glad to ask that permission be accorded you.

Faithfully yours,
(Signed) EDMUND J. JAMES.

I do not see how the action of the board could have been more to the point. I asked a court-martial on the ground that I had been compromised by a superior. The board told me, through its president, that there were no charges against me, and put it on record. They then refused to say that I had no just cause for grievance against the administration of the university. That was as complete a vindication as any man could wish. Everybody was tired of the thing, and I felt outraged and disgusted, so I sent the president the following letter, with my resignation enclosed:

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSIOLOGY

May 1, 1908.

PRESIDENT E. J. JAMES,
University of Illinois.
My dear President James,

Following my letter of yesterday, I now enclose you my resignation, as the only communication I have to make to the board of trustees for their meeting to-morrow.

This settles the case so far as I am concerned, but if the board wishes me to appear, for any reason, I shall, of course, do so.

The reasons for my resigning, as I am now doing, are set forth in the preamble to the resignation. A further discussion seems superfluous.

Very respectfully yours,
(Signed) GEO. T. KEMP.

TO THE HONORABLE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
Ladies and Gentlemen:

WHEREAS, The Board of trustees has taken

much of its valuable time in discussing matters arising from my communication, of March seventh, to the board, and

WHEREAS, The action of the board was to refuse, by a tie vote, to pass a resolution, emanating from the president of the university, to the effect that I had no grievance, and

WHEREAS, I feel that I am sufficiently vindicated, by this action of the board, to resign without compromise of my reputation, and,

WHEREAS, I do not wish to give the board any further trouble with the case, and

WHEREAS, At a meeting of the board, on April third, the president of the university urged the passage of resolutions reflecting to my discredit, and

WHEREAS, I was absent from said meeting, and, at the time the president of the university urged such action, I had been given no chance to reply to anything that had been said about me, and

WHEREAS, At the next meeting of the board, to wit, April 23, I asked the question: "Are there any charges against me?" and

WHEREAS, The president of the board gave me the official answer: "No," and

WHEREAS, I then said "May I ask that this be made a matter of record?" and

WHEREAS, The president of the board said: "If there is no objection, it is so ordered" (or words to that effect), and

WHEREAS, The president of the university was present and interposed no objection, and

WHEREAS, After the case was supposed to be closed, and I had left the room, the president of the university read from a lengthy typewritten memorandum, and made statements which reflected to my discredit both personally and professionally, and

WHEREAS, My confidence in the administration of the university is now so shaken that I think it best to resign,

THEREFORE: I hereby tender my resignation, as a member of the faculty of the University of Illinois, to take effect September 1, 1908.

Very respectfully yours,
(Signed) GEO. T. KEMP.

In conclusion, I wish to quote again from the president's secret memorandum:

Dr. Kemp makes certain definite charges involving the good faith and honesty of the university administration. I shall dismiss these with this reference, as I do not consider that it is necessary to enter into this subject at all. I call atten-

tion to it simply as an evidence of the difficulty which Dr. Kemp has in taking a proper view of university questions. Everything is so bound up with his own personal view as to what is due him and his particular department, as to make it temperamentally impossible for him to take any other but a false view of this particular phase of the subject.

In my letter to the board, I tried to avoid anything personal, and when I appeared before the board, to make my preliminary statement, I laid special emphasis on this. In fact, I gave it as my reason, for appealing to the board, that I could not locate where the trouble lay. The dean referred me to the president, and the president laid the responsibility on the former dean, the present dean, and the vice-president. I felt that I was being shot at from ambush, and when I stopped, like a man, and challenged, the president would not bring us together, but said the reports were confidential.*

When I found the president with his secret memorandum, I had something definite. It is the irony of fate, that in making the very flourish with which he dismissed these *alleged* charges, he dropped a paper which proved most serious things on himself in stern reality. I frankly admit that I am temperamentally so constructed that I can not regard it as either "fair or honest" for a university president to make an attack on a professor behind his back that he would not make to his face. Furthermore, the same temperamental construction forces me to feel that a man who would not look upon such an act as disgraceful does not "take a proper view of university questions," and is not the best type of man to intrust with the instruction

*There is food for thought here. I have some excellent friends, for whose opinions I have genuine respect, who believe that a democratic form of university government would seriously upset faculty discipline. Here we have a typical monarchial form; and what could be more subversive of faculty discipline, and of confidence, than what I have just described? I finally came to fear that the president had ulterior motives which he did not care to allege; and that he was seeking cover behind which to fight.

of the youth of a nation. I do not mean these for words of passing sarcasm. The idea which they convey is of serious import to the educational interests of the country. One of the most famous educators of the past generation has said:

No educational system can have a claim to permanence, unless it recognizes the truth that education has two great ends to which everything else must be subordinated. The one of these is to increase knowledge; the other is develop the love of right and the hatred of wrong.

If we wish our system of state education to endure, we dare not condone a serious infringement of either of these fundamental principles, for a recognized amount of ability in the money-getting or in the advertising line. The State of Illinois, for instance, is not giving nearly \$1,000,000 a year in order that any man shall rear a showy structure, and say, "Behold the great Babylon which I have built." The people who furnish the money have a right to demand—and will demand—a clean administration, and a healthy atmosphere from the president's office to the athletic field. If anything half as bad as the president's attack in the dark had happened in connection with the management of the football team, there would have been a tremendous cry of "dirty athletics," and a storm of righteous indignation would have broken loose. The higher up we go, the harder it is to correct abuses—but the more important it is that these abuses should be corrected.

GEO. T. KEMP

HOTEL BEARDSLEY,
CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS

QUOTATIONS

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

A THIRD according to our informant, a fifth according to Mr. Cruce, of the faculty have been removed. They were removed with practically no notice; so late in the season that it is really a remarkable testimony to their ability that so many of them have already obtained appointments in colleges of standing not unequal to that of Oklahoma University. Accompanying this removal, without previous notice, was a refusal to pay the last two