ON RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN AMERICAN COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS

Gentlemen:

The late burning of University Hall has brought before the Regents for solution a problem of first importance in its bearing upon the architectural development of our University. Not only must University Hall be rebuilt, but other halls must follow shortly, so that within the next ten years the physical appearance of the University will be fixed in its main features. In a matter of such importance it will be well for the members of the Board to have in their hands all possible information that may help them to arrive at a wise solution. The problems of college architecture are highly special problems to which few architects in this western country have given serious thought. The temptation therefore which besets the hard working architect is to solve the problem in a conventional manner without taking the trouble to solve it in the very special manner necessary. For this reason added responsibility devolves upon the Board, which must supply the special knowledge too often lacking in the architect.

I have taken the liberty, therefore, to put into convenient form certain facts that I have gathered during the past few years bearing upon the subject of recent developments in college architecture in the United States, together with certain conclusions I have drawn from these facts, and I respectfully present them to the Board for its consideration.

Briefly stated, the two problems that press for solution are:

1. The preparation of a campus plan according to which the different buildings may be grouped effectively.

2. The selection of a style according to which the several buildings
shall be designed.

All other problems are secondary to these, and no further steps can be taken intelligently until these are solved. The two moreover, are intimately bound up together; in as much as the style adopted in the different buildings must determine largely the manner in which they are to be grouped, and likewise, the general layout must determine in part the style to be used in the buildings. For this reason I regard the problems as two phases of one and the same.

1. The Problem of the Layout

The present ground plan of the University was drawn in 1903 immediately after the burning of the old building. At that time the new University Hall was nearly finished. Its position at the head of the boulevard and its style of architecture seemed to call for the development of a broad common in front around which the principal buildings might be grouped. With the loss of this Main Hall the entire question is opened once more and the architect is freer today to lay out a general plan than he was in 1903. Ought we then to retain the main features of the present plan or make a new start? This question must be answered before intelligent work may be done by the architects who are outlining plans for the new university.

In order to throw light on the problem I have examined critically campus plans of some twenty-five universities, about two-thirds of which are state schools. In regard to each plan I have asked two questions: first, how successfully will the plan serve the needs of the university; second, how fully does it conform to the elementary principles of landscape architecture. Furthermore, wherever attempts are being made to change or modify the general plan I have tried to understand the principle upon which the changes are
The examination of the above plans has proved an interesting study. Not the least interesting fact which I have discovered is that both in the architecture of individual buildings and in the general lay out the state schools are inferior to the independent schools. For some reason skill of far higher order has gone to the planning of the latter. I have no explanation to offer for this condition, but I state it as a fact which anyone may easily verify for himself. The contrast between the two groups of schools has proved rather humiliating I must confess to one who believes that a university supported by the state for the common good is the noblest and most democratic force in our civic life; and it is with the hope that Oklahoma may prove an exception to this rule that I call your attention to the fact.

For convenience I have divided the schools into three groups:

I. Those developed without a plan. To this group belong Harvard, Illinois, Kansas, Tennessee, Vanderbilt and Maine.

II. Those making use of the University Hall as a center. The schools which have got no further than this very rudimentary conception are Arkansas and Arizona.
III. Those with a more or less clearly formulated plan. This third group I shall divide again into three groups as follows:

(a) Those which for various reasons, topographical and other, have solved their problem in ways peculiar to themselves. An excellent example of such special solution is the campus at Cornell.

(b) Those planned with an open court surrounded on three sides by buildings separated from each other by from 50 to 200 feet. The present plan of Oklahoma is a good example of this type. Other schools which make use of it are: Wisconsin, Missouri, Indiana, Montana, North Dakota.

(c) Those developing the quadrangle. Examples may be found at Washington University, Chicago, Princeton, Leland Stanford, Yale, College of the City of New York, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Ohio, Bryn Mawr.

Among these three groups there is shown clearly a development from one principle of landscape architecture to another. In so far as the schools of the first two groups are examples of any style they belong in the so-called naturalistic style; a style which was first developed in England in the early eighteenth century, the chief features of which are buildings isolated and set back, winding walks and drives, and planting in natural clumps. Well handled the style is delightful for parks or gentlemen's country estate, and the winding walks and isolated buildings absolutely prohibit that compactness of grouping which I hold to be the first essential of an economical working plan for a university.

The schools included in the third group clearly have felt the weakness of the natural style and have sought for some method of grouping which should give to the landscape style a greater compactness. The open court was the first solution of the problem. This court could be treated either formally
or naturally; it could be either large or small; it could be a bit of well clipped turf or planted to trees and shrubs to suit the prevailing taste.
The style was in vogue from about 1850 to 1890. It is an interesting fact that in the year 1859 the University of Wisconsin had reached exactly the same point in its development that we had reached before the late fire, namely, a long open court blocked at one end by the University Hall and flanked on each side by other buildings. Since then the University has outgrown the plan and now after fifty years of accumulated mistakes the problem is being taken up and fairly faced.

As one result of that great awakening in collegiate architecture which took place in the early nineties the open court style and the naturalistic style both gave place to the quadrangle. Before the year 1890 the theory that buildings should be widely separated prevailed almost universally in our American schools and since that time it has been almost as universally abandoned. Where it still appears, as in recent plans of certain western schools, it is clearly an archaism, the work of a man who is either not familiar with the best practice of the day or who is primarily a landscape gardener trained in developing city parks. In support of this statement let me call attention to the fact that the two great universities lately established, Chicago, and Leland Stanford, and the three universities which have lately rebuilt from the beginning, namely, Columbia, College of the City of New York and Washington University, all have adopted the quadrangle frankly and their plans show the most thorough use of it yet carried out in this country. Moreover with very few exceptions every school which has lately attempted to reduce to order the chaotic conditions inherited from earlier days has planned in so far as possible to gather
its buildings into quadrangles. Examples of such schools are Princeton, Yale, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Ohio, Bryn Mawr.

One result of the development of a sentiment in favor of the quadrangle has been the growth of a spirit of discontent at many of the universities where the old order prevails. The wonderfully effective results secured at Washington University, the College of the City of New York and Princeton have forced upon other universities a comparison which is not to the advantage of the latter, and in a good many schools, especially western state universities, movements have been started to force the campus into some sort of order. Wherever such an attempt has been made lately to bring order out of chaos three steps usually have been taken; first, all the buildings with a common purpose have been gathered so far as possible into groups; second, the buildings of these different groups have been developed in the form of quadrangles usually enclosed; third, the relation of the several groups is carefully studied to add to the convenience and to the total architectural effect. I select as representative of this movement the University of Iowa. The present seat of the university originally was the state capital, which was given to the university upon the building of the new capital. Around the building as a center the university developed. In earlier years buildings were dropped anywhere with no attention paid to their relation either to the capital building or to each other. When such chaos became no longer tolerable competent men were called in to see what could be done. The plan which was finally adopted provides for the eventual pulling down in whole or in part of nine buildings, as follows: Engineering Shops, Mining Engineering Laboratory, Hall of Electrical Engineering, Carpenter Shops, Hall of Physics, Hall of Dentistry, Weights and Measures
Building, Students Observatory, School of Music. Some of these buildings are not important but among them are several that serve their purposes excellently. After having cleared the ground in this heroic fashion it is planned to group the new buildings in so far as possible in the form of quadrangles about the old capital building as an axis. To give room for the first of these new buildings, a four story brick structure had to be torn down in part, at a cost of $18,000.

From this brief examination of the present tendencies it is clear,

1. That a carefully studied plan is now regarded as of first importance.

2. That the principle of developing building groups is accepted.

3. That the quadrangle has established itself as the most effective means to that end.

In order to illustrate what I believe to be the essential principles governing the problem and to show how those principles may be applied to our own case I desire to submit herewith a suggested plan of the grounds. I do not offer this for adoption by the Board but only by way of illustration. I have assumed as a basis of my study a university of 5,000 students, with ample provision to meet an increase beyond that number. The principles that I have tried to keep in mind in developing the plan are mainly three.

1. Compactness and convenience of access. To achieve this I accept the principle of the quadrangle and whenever it seems desirable I make use of it. In as much as our campus is nearly level the quadrangle may be used with greater effect than would be the case were it broken or rolling.

2. Elasticity. This I regard as of such importance that at every point I have sought to leave ample room for large and even unexpected developments.
3. Architectural effect both of the university as a whole, and of the
several quadrangles.

Let me now briefly point out how I have adhered to these principles.

1. Compactness and Convenience of Access: In so far as I can foresee
the future needs of the university, the buildings that must be provided for
are as follows: 1, the College of Arts group; 2, The Semi-public group. By
this I mean such buildings as the general public is likely to visit often,
in particular the Administration Building, Chapel, Museums, Club Houses,
etc. 3, The Science group by which I mean those buildings required for
special work, such as Chemistry and Botany, etc; 4, The Fine Arts group;
5, The Engineering group; 6, The Law group; 7, The Medical group; 8, The
Dormitories, Commons, etc; 9, The Gymnasium and Athletic Grounds.

In placing these buildings it will hardly be wise to separate any
group farther than four minutes walk from another group in which work will
be done by one and the same student.

2. Elasticity: No matter how carefully the needs of the university
may be calculated it is possible to arrive only at a very rough approximation.
Since this is true it is unwise to draw up too detailed a plan, or a plan
the effect of which depends upon the balanced and symmetrical arrangement
of the several parts. Such a design must be ineffective until the total
plan is worked out, whereas the chances are overwhelmingly against such a
possibility. Changes in policy, in endowment, etc., or unforeseen develop-
ment in certain departments must render such a thing well nigh impossible.
Assuming on the other hand, that the plan is worked out I conceive that the
situation is worse than before; for it is not easy to see how additions may
be added without spoiling the effect. An excellent example of a grandiose but overformal plan is that drawn up by Snelling and Potter of New York for a proposed university at Gainesville, Florida, a sketch of which is submitted herewith. The plan received much favorable comment at the 21st Exhibition of the American Architectural League where it was exhibited, but the defect of inelasticity is sufficient in my judgment to condemn it.

3. Architectural Effect: The question to be determined here is first what shall be the main features of the total plan, and second how may they be combined into a whole effectively. It is not enough that the several buildings be convenient of access to each other; they must likewise stand in an effective architectural relation to each other. In other words, there should be certain axes upon which the total plan may turn. There must be subordination and unity. I have suggested in my plan the following features:

1. University Hall and approach flanked by the semi-public buildings;
2. three quadrangles grouped together; 3. two flanking quadrangles with formal walks; 4. the botanical gardens; 5. the dormitories and gymnasium with a long common; 6. the boulevard system.

I have suggested as the key to the whole composition the placing of University Hall in axial relation in so far as possible to the other groups. Placed thus the building necessarily must be dignified and commanding and the approach must be handled in a dignified way with a suggestion of formality. To accentuate University Hall I have grouped in front and on each side the semi-public buildings with a railed space around them. The flanking quadrangles I have tied together by a broad boulevard and I have brought them both into relation with University Hall by means of a formal walk. The resulting triangles give added dignity to this main approach. Immediately back of University Hall are the three quadrangles made up of buildings which minister
to the needs of the University as a whole and especially to the College of
Arts and Sciences. This triple quadrangle is the heart of the University.
Immediately south of these quadrangles I have placed the botanical gardens
which will serve as an effective setting for the stately library. Three
hundred feet south of the gardens I have placed the gymnasium and between
the two I have laid off a common 1,000 feet in length, stopped at the ends
by dormitories for men. I have planned to make this the center of the social
life of the undergraduates. Between these different points I have drawn
boulevards leading always to definite groups and opening up effective views
at every turn. In providing for the walks I have gone on the principle
that the directest line will be followed, and I have indicated therefore
many straight walks between buildings.

II The Problem of Style

Until very recently no college or university authorities in the United
States had given serious thought to the consideration of the serious problems
of collegiate architecture. Each building as it was provided for was left
to the taste or fancy of the architect, who in most cases had no clear notions
of what would adapt itself to collegiate needs or would be in keeping with
university traditions. The result of such shortsighted policy is an unpleasant
page in the history of American architecture. The grounds of well nigh
every one of our older universities are covered with a clutter of buildings
groups in no order, most of which not only have no architectural distinction
but too often are an offense to good taste.

The last few years, however, have seen a wonderful growth in the artistic
development of our college architecture. Never before in the history of
education has so much money been given to the cause of higher education in
an equal length of time. One result of this development has been that with such vast sums to spend, for the first time in the history of American Collegiate architecture serious thought had been devoted to the problem of determining the style best fitted for college purposes. The very ablest men in the architectural profession have studied the problem. The answers which have been returned are so significant and of such importance for our present purpose that we cannot well overlook them. Within the past fifteen years more than a dozen colleges and universities in the United States have offered their solutions of the problems of collegiate architecture. These are by no means all the schools that have taken up the question but they are in themselves so representative, with such large facilities at their disposal and such interests at stake, that we may accept their conclusions as the wisest solutions as yet offered for the problem. These schools are:

The University of Chicago  Washington University in St. Louis
Leland Stanford University  George Washington University,
Princeton University  Washington, D. C.
Columbia University  Wooster University
College of the City of New York  Carnegie Institute of Technology
Yale  Bryn Mawr College
U. S. Naval Academy  The James Milliken University
U. S. Military Academy
Union Theological Seminary

From a study of the recent architectural developments of these schools two facts are apparent at once.

1. That with the exception of Yale and Columbia every one of them has adopted a clearly defined architectural style, according to which the several buildings are planned. In the case of Yale two styles are followed: one quadrangle being developed in classic, and two quadrangles in gothic. In the case of Columbia two forms of the same general style are being used; namely, pure neo-classic and French Renaissance.
2. That with the single exception of Leland Stanford University, all the other schools fall into two general groups: those which have adopted some form of the classic and those which have adopted some form of the gothic. The history of Leland Stanford is so unusual as to have little bearing upon our present inquiry. Palo Alto, the seat of the University, is in the immediate neighborhood of some of the best examples of early Spanish architecture on the western continent. It seemed fitting, therefore, that the style should be adopted in the university buildings. This is the only example in the United States of the consistent use of this style in college architecture, although plans are now being made I understand for the use of a somewhat similar style in the University of the Territory of New Mexico.

Those which have adopted the classic are: Columbia University, U. S. Naval Academy, George Washington University, and Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Those which have adopted some form of the gothic are: The University of Chicago, Princeton, the College of the City of New York, West Point, Union Theological Seminary, Washington University, Wooster University, Bryn Mawr, James Milliken University.

I propose to take up most of the schools named above and set forth very briefly the recent architectural history of each.

I. The schools that have adopted some form of the classic style.

1. Columbia University: Several years ago it became necessary to move the university from its down town situation and build a fresh plant. With an endowment of $20,482,000, being two and a half millions greater than that of Harvard, the university had abundant resources with which to develop a beautiful university. It employed a celebrated firm of architects, Messrs. McKim, Mead and White, probably the best known firm in the United States.
For the central building Mr. McKim selected the library and designed and built it in pure Greek. It is a beautiful building, and one of the best examples of the modern handling of Greek architecture in America. Then, feeling that the monumental style employed for the library could not be fitly used with cheaper materials and for prosaic purposes, the overseers changed the style to the Renaissance, and most of the halls are built according to the latter style. In certain cases however the Renaissance style likewise has been abandoned, as for example St. Paul's Chapel, which is pure Byzantine.

2. Annapolis Naval Academy: Shortly after the plans for the improvement of West Point were determined upon, it was determined also to rebuild the naval academy at Annapolis. As the result of a competition the plans of Carrere and Hastings of New York City, calling for the development of the plant in the French Renaissance style, were chosen and the work was begun. This is the best example in the history of modern collegiate architecture in this country where it has been proposed to follow the classic style consistently throughout the buildings. It is still too early to know whether the plan will be adhered to, or whether the style will be abandoned as not being sufficiently flexible.

3. George Washington University, Washington, D. C.: Some three years ago a competition was opened for plans for the development of the new university. The plans submitted by Geo. B. Post of New York, architect to the College of the City of New York, were adopted, calling for a development in pure Italian Renaissance. The reasons which led to the adoption of that style were two: first, the ground at disposal was limited; and second, in as much as the university was under the shadow of the national capital it
seemed desirable to adhere to the general style of that building and of
the other state buildings.

II. The Schools which have adopted some form of the gothic:

1. The University of Chicago: The building experience of the University
of Chicago is easily of first importance in any consideration of American
collegiate architecture. It was the second to plan its development as a
whole, and its vast endowment - now close to $30,000,000 nearly $8,000,000
greater than that of Columbia the second richest of American universities -
has enabled the university to develop its plan unhampered by problems of
economy. Very early the Board of Control came to the conclusion that of the
several architectural styles available only one had proved an unqualified
success, not only adapting itself to the complex needs of a university, but
enshrining worthily academic traditions; and that style was the Tudor gothic
as used at Oxford and Cambridge. The style was adopted therefore by the
Board, and since the first building was erected it has not been departed
from in any instance. Architects have been changed, but the only change in
style has been a steady movement toward a purer and more faithful rendering
of the gothic. Up to April, 1907, the university had erected 31 buildings
in this style at a total cost of $4,500,000, and at an average cost of
$142,000.

2. Princeton University: In the year 1896 Princeton College celebrated
its 150th anniversary. At that time two steps of grave importance in the
history of the school were taken: first, it was decided to change the name
of the school from Princeton College to Princeton University; second, as a
fitting step in the further development of the university it was decided to
adopt a suitable style of architecture according to which future buildings
might be designed, and a beautiful Princeton be developed. The matter was
considered maturely and the collegiate gothic was adopted. The architectural
firm of Cope and Stewardson of Philadelphia was employed to design the
buildings immediately needed, the first of which was a gymnasium. As a result
the most beautiful gymnasium in America was built, and since then four addi-
tional halls have been added. In the short period of twelve years more in-
telligent progress has been made in the development of Princeton University
on the material side than had been made in the 150 years before, and Prince-
ton is today one of the most beautiful of the great American Universities.
The wisdom of the Board of Control is clearly evident to one who will go from
Princeton to Harvard, where no plan has been adopted but where the buildings
have been designed in most of the styles known to the history of architecture.

3. College of the City of New York: The history of the College of The
City of New York repeats in one phase that of Columbia. Being forced to
give up its down town quarters it chose a new situation. With the assistance
of George B. Post, one of the most scholarly architects in this country, the
university outlined a comprehensive plan in the Tudor gothic. This is one
of the most important of recent examples of collegiate architecture, as the
plan has been conceived in a large way and is being carried out faithfully.
As a result, although still incomplete, the university has probably the most
beautiful group of college buildings in America. In speaking of these build-
ings Mr. Frederick S. Lamb, a well known mural painter and decorator, said:

"In spite of the fact that many designs were made for these buildings
and various styles suggested, the final decision was given in favour of a
modified form of collegiate gothic. The buildings most fittingly meet modern
requirements. Not only has every practical condition been successfully met, but many of the buildings have reached a plane of excellence seldom if ever attained. The view of the Assembly Hall from the college grounds is most imposing and will stand as an example of a happy combination of line, form and color. When completed this will be the most important series of municipal educational buildings as yet planned for this country."

4. West Point Academy: Within the past few years it became necessary to rebuild the greater part of the plant at West Point. The old buildings were a mixed group, comprising buildings in the classic, Roman, Norman, Tudor and French gothic and miscellaneous. Of these buildings the most important, the barracks and the library, were in the Tudor collegiate gothic style. They were the oldest of the group and the first of the two, the barracks, was the main building. A preliminary report dealing with the problem was submitted by Colonel Charles W. Larned, professor of drawing and president of the Advisory Board, in which he recommended that inasmuch as the barracks and the library had proved the most satisfactory of the buildings the newer buildings should conform to them. As a result of a competition, the plans of Messrs. Cram, Goodhue and Ferguson of Boston were accepted, calling for a development in collegiate gothic. In some cases they have given to their handling of the style a decidedly mediaeval character. Although the needs of the school call for buildings varying from chapel, riding-school and the like on the one hand, to power plant, laboratories and barracks on the other, the gothic style has lent itself without forcing to every condition. The result has received the very highest praise from the critics. As Colonel Larned says "The final result will be from certain points of view one of the most striking picturesque architectural masses in the country,"
and a very fit expression for an institution which is at once military and academic in its functions."

5. Washington University: Several years ago it became necessary to move the university from its down town situation and build a fresh plant. Cope and Stewardson of Philadelphia, architects to Princeton University, were directed to draw up a comprehensive plan in Tudor gothic, including not only the present needs of the university but future developments adequate for years. That plan is now well under way, and the group of buildings already erected forms an interesting study in college architecture. Speaking of the selection of this style, Acting Chancellor Snow says: "It seemed to all interested that this particular style was far superior to the so-called classical style * * * and that the two story plan with sufficient land on which to build was altogether superior to the higher plans suggested by some other styles of architecture * * *. I certainly should strongly advise its adoption (i. e. the gothic style) if you have land enough and if you do not feel compelled by economical reasons to build up high in the air."

From my own study I have come to the conclusion that the general lay-out and style of Washington University place it first from an architectural point of view, among American universities - and I strongly urge upon the Board a careful study of the solution given there before any decision is reached in our own case. The circumstances are so like our own that the example becomes of special interest.

6. Wooster University: A disastrous fire in 1901 forced upon the trustees of Wooster University the problem of rebuilding a greater part of the plant. After a rather long trip of investigation which extended into England, it was determined by a committee of ten to rebuild in the collegiate gothic.
The plan has since been largely carried out. How suitable the style has proved may be seen from the following statement by Mr. Lester E. Wolfe, Registrar: "Our Board of Trustees are so well satisfied with the gothic that they will not consider anything else for the future buildings at Wooster."

7. James Milliken University: About twelve years ago the Cumberland Presbyterian church established at Decatur, Illinois, a school which they determined to make a great university. There again the question came up of a suitable architectural style, and it was solved as it had been at Wooster. The school was endowed only moderately, and the rather plainer handling of the gothic than had been adopted at Princeton and at West Point was necessary. Developed thus, however, the style has proved sufficiently flexible to answer all purposes admirably. When the cost is taken into account — the very moderate sum of $216,000 having been expended for four buildings — I do not know another school that can show a group of buildings so attractive in themselves and so plainly suitable for academic uses.

The foregoing statements may be summed up as follows:

1st. That without exception all who are competent to speak on the matter are agreed that an ample and consistent plan for future development should be drawn up at the earliest possible moment. This we may accept as the final verdict.

2nd. That almost without exception they are agreed that the buildings should be grouped mainly in quadrangles. This also I believe we may accept as final.

3rd. That of the different styles now being used two only have won large favor: some form of the classic — ranging from pure neo-classic to Italian, French or English Renaissance; some form of the collegiate
gothic—ranging from mediaeval to Jacobean.

Between these two therefore our choice must be made. For convenience I will gather up in brief form the arguments which may be urged for and against each of these styles. It is with a certain hesitation that I approach the question. Such strong differences of taste prevail that it is not easy to keep a clear head and deal fairly with both sides. There are those who hold indeed that any abstract discussion of style is futile. I cannot agree with that view, either as a general statement, or in our particular case. Under the circumstances I believe that we shall do well to select a style, and to that end we shall need to weigh carefully what may be said both for and against the two.

The arguments in favor of the classic are:

1. It is dignified, stately, monumental.
2. It is the style which most of the architects know best, and with which the public is most familiar.
3. It has been used in many civic buildings.
4. It is advocated by some very brilliant architects. Chief among these I may cite McKim, Mead and White, architects to Columbia, Carrere and Hastings, architects to U. S. Military Academy and Yale. In fairness however I must call your attention to the fact that none of these men in any sense is a specialist in academic architecture, but all of them have done their important work in municipal architecture, which popular taste today demands shall be in the classic. For example, Mr. McKim, the most brilliant of them all, won his fame by such buildings as the Boston Public Library and the Rhode Island State Capital.

The arguments against the classic are:

1. Being a monumental style it calls for noble materials and dignified
To be used effectively, it demands colonnades, stately drives, formal landscapes, etc. As a result it is the costliest of all styles.

2. It is the least flexible of architectural styles. Only a few of the different buildings needed for university purposes can be fittingly designed in the classic style: namely, the Main Hall and Fine Arts Building, the Library, etc. For such purely utilitarian buildings as power plant, gymnasium and laboratories it is wholly out of keeping. As a result it is difficult to develop a university plan as a whole in any form of the classic.

3. Its wide use in this country for civic buildings, such as state capitals, post-offices, libraries and the like, has left a stamp upon it which renders it unsuitable for academic purposes.

4. It has become so conventional a style that architects find great difficulty in handling it in any other than a hackneyed and stereotyped fashion.

5. It is a style suitable for the city rather than for the country.

6. Ethnologically, it is an alien style.

7. Its recent use in collegiate architecture may be easily explained. With the single exception of Annapolis there were special reasons in each case for the adoption of the classic. They were situated in the heart of the city; land was dear, and the buildings must run from three to six stories high. In the case of the George Washington University, Washington, D. C., and the University of Iowa the style was determined already: the former by the fact that the nucleus of the university was the old state capital building. None of these conditions prevail with us and we are free therefore to consider the question on its merits.

The arguments for the gothic are:
1. It is the single style in the whole history of architecture that bears the academic stamp, and that all authorities from Sir Christopher Wren to the best architects of today are agreed to be in keeping with academic traditions.

2. It is the most flexible of architectural styles, lending itself equally well to the various needs of university life and work, adapting itself without effort to the stateliest and the most utilitarian buildings.

3. It lends itself with especial effectiveness to the development of the quadrangle.

4. It is practical and economical, lending itself to effective treatment in common brick or in choice stone; and without needless pillars, domes, cornices and costly details.

5. It has been largely adopted by the highest authorities and has been pronounced satisfactory wherever it has been used.

Although the compiling of a list of authorities is not argument it is worth while to notice that many of the men who have had the largest experience in dealing with the very special problems of academic architecture are advocates of the use of the gothic. Among these men are: Cope and Stewardson of Philadelphia, whose work at Princeton, Bryn Mawr and Washington University entitles them to rank as the highest American authorities on such questions; Cram, Goodhue and Ferguson, architects to Princeton and West Point; Allen and Collens, architects to Union Theological Seminary and Vassar; George B. Post and Sons, architects to the College of the City of New York and the George Washington University; Shepley, Rutan and Coolidge, architects to Chicago University; Charles C. Haight, architect to Yale; and C.B.J. Snyder, architect to the Board of Education, New York City. These men are all highly
trained specialists in collegiate architecture, and their opinion is of value especially because such another body of specialists I am certain cannot be found in the United States.

The arguments against the gothic are:

1. It is a style unfamiliar to many architects and is therefore liable to unfortunate handling by them.

2. It is a style unfamiliar to the public, which confuses castellated with the collegiate gothic.

Inasmuch as the problem to be solved is one of such grave importance I trust that it will not seem officious in me if I offer for the consideration of the Board four suggestions. They are:

1. That the Board consider carefully the question of adding to the present campus. From my own study of the situation I am convinced that the present grounds are too small to permit of the development of any comprehensive plan for the university.

2. That in consideration of the authority given it by the recent experience of our American universities some form of collegiate gothic architecture – preferably Elizabethan – be adopted, at least tentatively. In support of this suggestion may I call your attention to the sum spent within the past few years by nine American colleges for buildings in this style. The table is far from complete as I have omitted such schools as Vassar, Union Theological Seminary, and all of the late Manhattan High Schools, for which I have not accurate information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of buildings in gothic</th>
<th>Sums spent on buildings in gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>7 (all since 1896.)</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the City of New York</td>
<td>5 all</td>
<td>4,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Point</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,500,000 (Appropriated, spent thus far $2,965,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn Mawr College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,000,000 (estimated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooster University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>685,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Milliken University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>261,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$21,696,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. That before any further steps are taken, a competent architect be called in to advise both as regards the general layout and the architectural style to be used. In making choice of such an architect, it is of the first importance that a man be selected who is familiar with university needs and problems. It would be wise, I believe, to make choice of a specialist in academic architecture who has served as advisory architect to one of the older universities of the east.

4. That under his direction a competition be established and that he pass upon all plans submitted.

In conclusion I cannot forbear adding a few words which, while not a part of my report, nevertheless will help to set forth and emphasize the importance of the present situation. Personally I feel that we talk too much about a big university and too little about a beautiful university. To prefer
the utilitarian and to assume that the utilitarian must necessarily be
ugly, and conversely that the beautiful is useless and therefore effemi-
nate, is one of our national heresies. Nevertheless so strong is this be-
lief that even the gentle art of scholarship is in danger of becoming ugly
and material and the home in which this scholarship must live is fast becom-
ing a combination of barrack and factory. Against this the architectural
renaissance of today is a vigorous protest. It holds that in no possible
combination of barrack and factory can a university be fitly housed. We
may refuse of course to recognize the cultivated tastes of scholarly men
and women, but in so doing we shall kill the goose that lays the golden
eggs. If we hope to educate cultivated men and women we shall do well to
surround them with those things which will inspire a wish for culture. I
hold that it is a social crime, graver still because committed against
youth, for any state to educate its young men and women amidst surroundings
that are ugly, or shoddy, or pretentious. If there is any spot that
should be made homely and honest and beautiful, it is a school, and it is
a short sighted view, that only the American people are guilty of, that
looks wholly at the utilitarian side and deliberately chooses the ugly and
the shoddy. It is this strong belief in the need of a beautiful university
that is transforming the older independent universities and setting them
rapidly in a class apart from the state schools, and above them. For my
part I feel this contrast keenly and it is with the earnest hope that the
Board of Regents will recognize the imperative need of giving to our univer-
sity a fitting architectural dress, that shall be at once homely, honest and
beautiful, that I have put together this hasty report.

Respectfully submitted,

W. L. PARRINGTON,
Professor of English Literature.

Norman, April 25, 1908.