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PREFACE

To the President and Board of Curators,
University of Missouri:

AS CHAIRMAN of the General Centennial Committee, permit me to submit the following report:

The one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the University of Missouri was an event of considerable educational significance not only to the people of the state but in fact to all interested in education, especially those in the Western part of the United States. As the pioneer state university west of the Mississippi River, the University of Missouri has been influential in building up other state universities in the Middle-West and Western states; it has also affected the development of other educational institutions within Missouri, including the state system of public education. Celebration of the centennial event became, therefore, at once a matter of considerable importance.

Recognizing these facts, President Walter Williams appointed in 1934 a committee to survey the possibilities of an adequate commemoration of the University centenary event.

The first report of this committee was submitted to the President and the Board of Curators on December 15, 1934, and was signed by Jonas Viles, chairman of the committee. Discussing the various possibilities, the committee finally summarized its recommendations as follows:

“First: That the Centennial Celebration of the University of Missouri be held in 1939.
Second: That the Centennial Celebration, while including the customary emphasis on the university as an institution of learning and research, feature, rather, its services and functions as a state university serving the people of Missouri.
Third: That a committee be appointed to consider the memorial volume of the centennial.”

(v)
In closing its report, the committee states that when more information becomes available as to the type of celebration which seems the most desirable and feasible, it will complete what it considers to be its functions by suggesting a list of committees and a general administrative organization for the centennial.

The second report of this committee was submitted on October 8, 1935. In this report the committee offers the following suggestions as to the types of programs which might be offered.

Program

I. A one day purely local celebration, with little attempt to bring in outsiders, on the birthday of the University, on Saturday, February 11, 1939. The legislature might well be invited to attend.

II. The more conventional celebration, with delegates from other universities, at Commencement, June 1939.

III. The appeal to the alumni and the state to come at Homecoming time early in November 1939.

Further suggestions were made as to the appointment of committees. The final recommendations submitted in this report were as follows:

I. The immediate creation and appointment of two committees: the General Centennial Committee, consisting of five members, three from the Faculty, one from the Board, and one from the alumni; the Publicity Committee of three, one of whom may be a non-Faculty member.

II. The consideration and discussion of the suggested program and committees but without definite or final action until they are approved by the General Centennial Committee.

III. The consideration of an aspect of the Centennial which perhaps is not certainly within the jurisdiction of your Committee, that is, the opportunity offered by the Centennial to secure an endowment fund or building, or both, from private gifts, and thus initiating in Missouri a prac-
tice which has been greatly to the advantage of the University of Michigan.

In October 1937, President Middlebush appointed the writer as chairman of a General Centennial Committee. After many conferences and consultations, recommendations were made which were presented by President Middlebush to the Board of Curators, as shown by the following extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Curators of July 14, 1938, page 2102.

"The President of the University presented: . . . .

3. the following recommendation from the Chairman of the Committee on Centennial Celebration:

A. (1) That the University take cognizance of the fact that 1939 is the centennial year of the founding of the University.

(2) That all general programs and exercises in celebration of this event be of such nature as to contribute to the better understanding and improved planning of higher education in the State of Missouri.

(3) That all exercises be as little disruptive of regular University functions as possible, that in fact the instructional and research functions of the University be enhanced by these exercises.

(4) That in the appointment of committees to supervise and direct the several Centennial celebration programs, the regularly constituted administrative organization of the University be used wherever possible.

B. That the three following public exercises be carried forward during the school year as part of the Centennial celebration program:

(1) *A Founders' Day program* on February 11, 1939, sponsored by the Board of Curators. It is recommended that various organizations of the several divisions of the University be invited to participate in the Founders' Day exercises by arranging the
dates of their annual conventions on our campus to coincide with the date of these exercises.

(2) An Academic Centennial celebration, sponsored by the faculty of the University, to be held in connection with the meetings of the Association of American Universities in November 1939. It is also recommended that a convocation be held, open not only to the University but to the general public as well, at which some outstanding university president may address the audience on a subject appropriate to the occasion.

(3) An Alumni Day celebration to be held during the fall of 1939, the exact time to be determined upon by the committee appointed to take charge of this celebration.

C. That associations such as the American Philosophical Society be invited to hold their annual conventions on our campus during the Centennial year.

D. That a general administrative committee of the faculty appointed by the President of the University be empowered to organize and supervise the various programs to be offered in celebration of the Centennial event during the course of the year 1939, and that this committee be given authority to investigate the possibility of still other exercises appropriate to the Centennial occasion.

Upon motion, properly seconded, it was ordered that the above recommendation be approved.”

In view of this action by the Board of Curators, the following faculty committee was appointed in October 1938, to function as the general administrative committee in organizing the centennial celebrations:

General Centennial Committee

Theo. W. H. Irion, Chairman
Frederick A. Middlebush (Ex-Officio)
Leslie Cowan (Secretary of the Board of Curators)
A. H. R. Fairchild (Chairman of Committee on Assembly Lectures)
Early in the deliberations of the Committee on the Founders' Day Program, which program was sponsored by the Board of Curators, it was found that the date February 11 would not be suitable, inasmuch as the members of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri then in session at the Capitol in Jefferson City could not attend the program on that date.

In the spirit of resolution C, adopted by the Board of Curators, urging that associations be invited to hold their annual conventions on our campus during the centennial year, it was arranged through the School of Education of the University to have the convention of the Department of Superintendence of the Missouri State Teachers Association on the campus of the University on February 11, the exact date of the signing of the Geyer Act by the Honorable Lilburn W. Boggs, Governor of Missouri in 1839. On the occasion of this program, the President of the University was invited to present the address of the morning session, using as his theme the subject, "A Century of Progress of the University of Missouri." We may consider this program and the address to be the opening event of the centennial celebrations of the year 1939.
In Chapter I, following, is printed in full the address which sounds the main theme of all subsequent celebration programs.

On February 14, 1939, in the Rothwell Gymnasium, a dinner celebration was given with the Governor and the staff of state officers, members of the General Assembly and the Judges of the Supreme Court of the State as guests. The Board of Curators, assisted by the deans and members of the University Faculty, acted as hosts on this occasion. The after-dinner program was presided over by Mr. John H. Lathrop, a grandson of the first President of the University of Missouri. Mr. Lathrop was at that time Vice-President of the Board of Curators of the University of Missouri. Speakers on the program included the Honorable Lloyd C. Stark, Governor of Missouri, and prominent members of the Sixtieth General Assembly, representatives of higher educational institutions in the state and of the State Department of Education, and the President of the University.

In Chapter II will be found the addresses delivered on that occasion.

On May 2, 1939, a student celebration was held at the foot of the Columns on Francis Quadrangle. Approximately fifteen hundred students and members of the faculty and visitors assembled at that place at 11 a.m. President F. A. Middlebush delivered the principal address.

In harmony with Resolution A 3, adopted by the Board of Curators on July 14, 1938, the student celebration was arranged to coincide with the Annual Tap Day celebration, adding to the usual ceremonies appropriate features bringing out the centennial thought.

Chapter III, following, is devoted to a more complete description of this event.

In the autumn of 1937, the representatives of the University of Missouri attending the meetings of the Association of American Universities at Providence, Rhode Island, invited that Association to convene on the campus of the University of Missouri during the 1939 centennial year. This invitation was tentatively approved by the Association. In November 1938, the representatives of the University of Missouri in this Association renewed the invitation
of the University of Missouri, with the additional invitation that the Association take part in an academic centennial program on the occasion of its convention in Columbia, Missouri, as one regular session of the Association. The members of the Association of American Universities readily accepted this invitation, and the committee on the Academic Centennial Convocation celebration decided to arrange for the convocation to be held at the time of the meeting of the Association of American Universities.

This program was sponsored by the Faculty of the University of Missouri. The program was held in the Brewer Field House at ten o'clock on the morning of November 1, 1939. The attendance on this occasion was between four and five thousand, composed of guests from Missouri schools and colleges, faculty members and students of the University of Missouri, and other interested citizens and friends of the University. Platform guests on this occasion were the presidents and graduate deans of the member institutions of the Association of American Universities and the presidents of other neighboring invited universities. This program was the outstanding feature of the celebrations of the centenary year. The principal speakers on this occasion were President James B. Conant of Harvard University and President Robert G. Sproul of the University of California.

In Chapter IV of this volume will be found a program and the printed addresses delivered on this occasion.

On Saturday, November 4, 1939, a centennial convocation sponsored by the Alumni Association was held in Jesse Auditorium. The principal speaker on this occasion was Judge Kimbrough Stone. The timely address delivered by him is a clear analysis of the meaning of the University program and the relationship of the organized alumni groups to this University program.

In Chapter V of this volume will be found the printed address delivered by him on this occasion.

One of the outstanding features of the centennial celebration of the University of Missouri was the attempt to carry out the spirit of the resolution of the Board of Curators of July 14, 1938, namely, that all celebrations contribute to the development of higher education in the state of Missouri. For that reason, it was
felt that a number of programs commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the University should be held through the state in communities where the spirit of the citizens and of the alumni of the University made such celebrations desirable.

In Chapter VI of this volume will be found a list of these meetings, along with some features of the programs that were outstanding. Inasmuch as the local community, Columbia, Missouri, has taken an active interest in the University from its very founding, the celebration held under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce of Columbia, Missouri, on November 2, 1939, deserves special mention. The addresses delivered on this occasion by Mr. E. Sydney Stephens and Judge North Todd Gentry deserve special notice. They contain much information which deals with the early days of the State University, and for that reason they are printed in full on subsequent pages.

In accordance with Resolution C of the report approved by the Board of Curators on July 14, 1938, suggesting that an attempt be made to secure meetings of annual conventions of learned societies and professional groups on the campus during the centennial year, various organizations of national scope were invited and the meetings of the following societies were held on our campus:

- The meeting of the American Philosophical Association, Western Division, of which Dr. Jay William Hudson was President.
- The meeting of the American Mathematical Society.
- The anniversary celebration by Forensic Activities.

As already stated in an earlier part of this report, the annual meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the Missouri State Teachers Association, convening on the campus on February 11, 1939, the exact date of the centennial anniversary day of the Geyer Act, was devoted to a consideration of the one hundred years of development of higher education and of public education in Missouri, and was devoted especially to a consideration of the history of our State University.

In Chapter VII of this report will be found a brief statement of the meetings of these various organizations, except that the
report of the meeting of the Department of Superintendence appears in Chapter I.

In 1935 it was definitely agreed by the Curators of the University of Missouri that Dr. Jonas Viles, Chairman of the Department of History at the University of Missouri, as official University Historian, should be commissioned to prepare a volume of the History of the University of Missouri from the day of its founding to and including the year 1939. This task was carried out with unusual historical faithfulness in the volume published by the University of Missouri in 1939 entitled "A History of the University of Missouri 1839-1939". A brief summary of the nature and contents of this volume will be found in the last section of this report. The writing of this history should in many respects be considered the most important outcome of our centennial commemoration activities.

In the appendix to this report will be found a reprint of a copy of the official program the University used on various occasions celebrating the centenary event. This program bulletin was of such an unusual and interesting nature that extra copies were eagerly sought by people who attended the meetings, and as a matter of historical record it is considered important to preserve a copy in this volume.

With the presentation of this report, your committee feels that its task is now complete. Not only has the work of organizing the various celebrations been one of great interest to those in charge of planning and administering the various events, but it has also been helpful in the creation of a deeper insight into the functions and purposes of our State University and in the development of a greater devotion to the cause of higher education in the state of Missouri.

Respectfully submitted,

THEO. W. H. IRION,
Chairman of the General Centennial Committee
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I

A CENTURY OF PROGRESS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI*

Dr. Frederick A. Middlebush,
President of the University of Missouri

ONE HUNDRED years ago today, an Act to provide for the institution and support of a State University and for the government of colleges and academies, was approved by the General Assembly of Missouri and signed by the Governor of the State. The commemoration of the Act which was approved one hundred years ago to the day, is indeed an historic occasion. Gathered here are the leading school administrators of the State, and in retrospect we examine what has been done during the last century to develop the ideas and the ideals of the men who were responsible for the measure which was given official sanction one hundred years ago.

As President of the University of Missouri, I am charged with the responsibility to discuss with you the progress which the State University has made during these one hundred years.

It would be a simple matter to become sentimental on this occasion; and there is always a temptation to cast a halo of glory about the acts of people one hundred years ago. We are all subject to the temptation to dramatize life and to make an even more or less ordinary situation appear to be heroic in nature. Because of this fact, much of history is invalidated, and many so-called historical accounts are inaccurate. Let us therefore acknowledge in a very straightforward way our indebtedness to the people who, one hundred years ago, had the forethought to create

*Address delivered before the meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the Missouri State Teachers Association in Columbia, February 11, 1939.
the State University and to plan an educational system for the commonwealth of Missouri. Let us also realize that the Act now referred to as the Geyer Act, was one which, at least to the reader of the present day, seems very involved and complicated.

 Apparently the Act passed the Legislature of 1839 without very much discussion. The chief interest, in fact, seems to have been in the matter of locating rather than in creating the institution. It would appear that the interest in the location of the University was so intense that it was located before it was created, or at least an Act was approved on February 8, 1839, providing for the procedure in selecting a site for the State University, while on February 11 of that same year, the Act creating the University was approved. If you have ever checked through this Act, you will find that it appears in five articles.

*Article 1* deals with the seminary fund and care and management thereof. *Article 2* deals with the University, its organization and powers. *Article 3* deals with colleges and the powers and duties of the trustees thereof. *Article 4* deals with seminaries and academies and the powers and duties of their officers. *Article 5* deals with the general provisions applicable to colleges and academies. A companion bill creating the public school system was enacted a few days earlier, but both legislative acts may be considered as part of the same educational program under the Geyer Act.

The emphasis on higher education is in accord with the general philosophy of education of that day, namely, that the elementary school merely gives instruction in the tools and instruments of learning: reading, writing, computational work in arithmetic, and other such instruments and elements of human learning. Citizenship training and real preparation of people for life in the State, was expected to come from the processes and endeavors of higher education. Academies were, of course, primarily for inducting people into higher education. While the type of University envisioned by the founding fathers was an institution of very limited character, this Act and subsequent constitutional and legislative enactments clearly provide for a constantly evolving institution designed throughout its historical development to meet the prob-
lems of each succeeding day and generation. In other words, the University was not looked upon as a rigidly fixed and static institution, but rather as an organization that would evolve as the society, of which it was an integral part, developed.

With this interpretation in mind, we can realize that the Act though in two parts, was in fact, one Act creating *the basis for* a system of public education in the State, a system which was to be effective in the life and activities of the State, a system which was to make a contribution to the development of the institutions of the commonwealth. Thus, the University of Missouri was immediately tied up with the educational system of the State; it was made as it were, the climax and culmination of that system, and had set, as its purpose, this service to the State of Missouri.

In contemplating, then, the progress of the University through the last one hundred years, this viewpoint must be kept clearly in mind. We are not discussing the development of an institution which could go on, unaffected by the things which occurred within the State, an institution which could plan its own practices and procedures simply on a purely theoretical basis; we are discussing, rather, an institution which from the very outset was tied up functionally with all the intellectual and cultural and professional enterprises of the State, and which was directly connected with the other educational institutions and agencies of the commonwealth.

It is impossible to give an account here, item by item, and event by event, of the development of the University during the last one hundred years. Nor would it be appropriate even to attempt to give such an account. It is much more important for us to grasp in the light of the functions ascribed to the State University from the outset, the large movements which have taken place and the extent to which these functions have been fulfilled.

In a sweeping way, let us attempt to make an appraisal of the progress of the University during the last hundred years in fulfillment of the ideals and objectives which were envisaged from the beginning.

I like to think of the University of Missouri as making its chief contribution to the culture of the State. At once, I should like to
qualify that statement by defining culture. I know that that word carries with it a traditional connotation, namely, that culture is something hard of achievement, very intellectual, and academic, and exceedingly abstract—something which deals primarily with literature, philosophy, languages, and the fine arts. I want to define culture this morning, as the way in which a people lives. The culture of Missouri is the way in which Missourians live, and the contribution of the University of Missouri is directly to the life of the whole State.

Beginning, then, with the early days of the University, we see that it is organized on the basis of a college, the College of Science and Letters, or the College of Liberal Arts, or as it is now called, the College of Arts and Science. It is not difficult to see that most individuals, when contemplating this fact—and I am sure there are many in this audience who belong to this group—feel that such a beginning seems totally inadequate in light of the fact that at that time, one hundred years ago, the State of Missouri was just coming out of its frontier position, with all the pioneer traditions and problems of life still predominating. Without stopping to think, one might easily, then, raise the question, under those circumstances, of what value are the cultural pursuits which constituted the core and center of that college curriculum? What have Latin and Greek and Letters to do with the felling of trees, the clearing of land, and the breaking of the prairie sod, the building of roads and bridges across our streams, the establishment of community government, the organization of schools, which were the pressing tasks of a pioneer society? And yet, on second thought, the attack is not at all absurd. When once a people has mastered its physical environment sufficiently so that a little leisure can be found, and more time can be devoted to the association of human beings with each other, and when the trails which wound their ways through the forests become more clearly defined as recognizable roads, when communication becomes better established, when these things happen, the human spirit is freed to pursue the more intellectual enterprises in which it glories, and in the achieving of which and the development of which is its chief triumph. It is then that man turns back to the cultural achieve-
ments of the past to discover what can be found there to stimulate his intellectual interests and make life more livable and intelligently organized.

It is to be noted, also, that the Nineteenth Century is particularly the century of the development of the sciences, and in 1839 these sciences had not yet progressed far beyond the apprenticeship stage. Also, all the technical knowledge and the intricate details which go into technological and professional life of the present day did not exist at that time, and for that reason could not be made a part of higher education. It is therefore no wonder that people in the midwestern states turned to the substantial things which had come to them from the past, and if you please, from abroad and from our Eastern Seaboard. The quip of Charles Dickens that out here in the Middle West and Far West, people throw up a few log huts and call it a university, came very near being the truth. But these small institutions did exemplify the strivings of the human spirit toward finer achievement, toward the creation of a better life.

The progress of the University has been that of developing this liberal arts college, or the College of Arts and Science, trying to develop departments of human intellectual endeavor and of staffing these departments with scholarly individuals who could make real contributions to the intellectual life of the State, bringing them from whatever part of the world in which they may be found, and asking of them only one thing, that is, that they give the best they have of intellect and of scholarship to the State of Missouri.

Naturally, with the development of the sciences, the emphasis in this College has shifted greatly from the emphasis on languages and philosophy and literature to an emphasis upon the biological and physical sciences. And I am sure that the majority of those present this morning will not deprecate the significance of this development of the College of Arts and Science. After all, in the more practical pursuits of the present day, we must train people to fit into life, and a large part of their training must still come through those efforts which we speak of as the efforts of the Liberal Arts College.
After one hundred years of history, the University of Missouri can point to many scholarly achievements in this Division of the University and to many outstanding men who have become leaders, if not while here on this campus, at least during their lifetime, in the scholarly pursuits of America.

An institution, however, which is so closely knit into the life of a State, and which is so much a part of the very aspiration of the State, cannot long ignore the many outstanding institutional activities of the State. And so it is that very shortly, in this State and throughout America, the different professions began to clamor for recognition in the program of University work. This is a sure sign also that, as a people, we were evolving out of a pioneer society with its emphasis upon the individual as a “jack-of-all trades” into a society which was beginning to place high value upon the trained “professional man” or “expert” in his chosen field. Heretofore, in our American institutions of higher learning, the nearest approach to “professional” training had been in the field of the ministry. Now, and especially in our state universities, the demand is felt for the professionally trained doctor, teacher, lawyer, engineer, farmer, etc. This demand, as you well know, has continued down to the present and has been met by the establishment of our ever increasing number of professional schools, journalism and business administration being the more recent.

That not much progress was made at the University of Missouri during the first half of the Nineteenth Century, is easily understandable when one realizes the tragic social and political upheaval we were passing through as the nation drifted gradually toward the sad years of our Civil War. But even during the war days, some educational advances were made, and certainly, immediately upon the close of the Civil War, energetic steps were taken to redeem the institution and to make up for some of the lost time.

Through the Morrill Act, the national government sought to help in the development of technical training in agriculture and mechanic arts and also in military science. It is to the credit of the University of Missouri that it recognized the significance of this work in relation to the life of the State and built into the University fabric a Division of Agriculture and a College of Engineering.
Law and Medicine, too, were soon recognized as professions which sorely deserved recognition in the University program. These courses of training were introduced into the University program, not so much to help young people to find work and to be able to make a living in later years, or even to accumulate wealth. They have a place in the University in order that young people may be trained to take effective part in the work of the State, and that young people may not only learn how to work effectively in various practical pursuits of life and in the various learned professions, but also that they may be imbued with the proper spirit—the spirit of building a life that is worth while, a life that will contribute to the welfare of the citizens of the State. Their responsibility is a public responsibility and not simply an opportunity for self-advancement.

Education and the training of teachers became an interest of the University at an early date. At this point, however, I want to say parenthetically that education in Missouri is advanced not only through the training of people for the teaching profession, or through the training of educational leaders, but it is also advanced through all the other professional schools. Wherever the University of Missouri trains effectively lawyers, doctors, engineers and journalists, it also trains people, who in their various communities, can grasp and understand the meaning of education, and from the standpoint of the layman can give help, and encourage and give public support to the development of education especially within the local community. Through the hundred years of its history, the University of Missouri has given this type of support to the development of the educational program of the State. Who are the men and women in your local community who make effective school board members? Who are the leaders of organizations and societies within your communities which support the schools? They are usually the people who have received a thorough-going education, an education which puts them in the frame of mind to support a state educational program, or who, having been denied such opportunities, nevertheless, have a lively appreciation of the value of an education. Such an education is achieved in all of the Divisions of the University.
More directly, however, the University undertook to train teachers and school people and school executives and administrators, beginning with feeble efforts in 1856, efforts which lasted through approximately three years. Then the program was disrupted by the Civil War, but the efforts in this direction were continued and developed on a larger and more permanent scale, beginning with 1867.

The first president of the University, President Lathrop, thought that there was no more important function of a State University than the training of school teachers. He loved to refer to the University as "the school of the schoolmaster". In 1867, when Dr. Read was serving as president of the University of Missouri, again the teacher-training program of the University received very sympathetic attention. It was, in fact, during his administration that the College of Normal Instruction was organized, a college which during several years enrolled, considering the total enrollment of the University, a very large part of the student body. At the end of his administration and during the succeeding administration of the University, the interest in the Normal College subsided, and the work in education was gradually reduced to that of a department, and afterwards, it was not even organized as an independent department but was placed in the department of English. This situation continued until the administration of President Jesse.

At the beginning of President Jesse's administration it became quite apparent that if the University was to keep itself in direct useful contact and affiliation with the cultural enterprises of the State, it must also keep in close contact with the educational work and public educational system of the State. President Jesse, at the very outset of his administration, recommended the establishment of a strong department of education. But many factors intervened, among them being the destruction of the main building of the University, the necessity of securing an appropriation, and in fact, securing the approval of the Legislature for the continuance of the University at Columbia. These things caused a delay in his plan, so that the real expansion of the work in educa-
tion at the University came at the opening of the Twentieth Century.

In 1903, Dr. A. Ross Hill was appointed Dean of the School of Education, and after a year of investigation and traveling in the State, and visiting schools and other educational institutions, he finally reorganized the work in education, establishing what was then called the Missouri Teachers College at the University of Missouri. This college forms the basis for the present plan of training teachers and educators at the University of Missouri and promoting the educational program of the State, with the single exception that in 1909 the organization was changed so that instead of having a Teachers College on the campus, enrolling freshmen and sophomores, the organization was put into harmony with the then prevailing trend of professional training, not only of teachers, but in other professions as well, by converting the College into a School of Education, enrolling only juniors and seniors.

Of far more importance, however, than the external organization of the School of Education was the establishment of the laboratory school, designed as a place where prospective teachers might do apprentice work and also a place where research and experimental efforts might be promoted looking towards the development of new plans and ways of carrying forward the educational work in the public school system. This work was at first promoted under the direction of Dr. J. L. Merriam, and until 1937, was carried forward, as many of you know, under very great physical limitations.

The fact that the State and the Board of Curators have had erected this, one of the largest buildings on the campus of the University, for housing the laboratory schools, is material evidence that the University is definitely committed to the policy of practical as well as theoretical training for teachers.

Attention is also drawn to the fact that a substantial program of graduate work in education has been developed by the University of Missouri. It stands out as one of the best planned and most comprehensive programs in the Middle-West. Taking advantage some years ago of the reorganization of the Graduate
School, the School of Education began to promote a real graduate program, beginning with about 1920, and since that time, between 1400 and 1500 students have worked out the requirements for Masters Degrees in Education in the University. Including the class of this year, 1939, the number will be well above 1500. This does not include those who had degrees conferred upon them before 1920. The significant thing about this program is that it has been growing from year to year, and the school people of the state have caught the spirit and the significance of this program, so that at the present time it is more extensive and larger than ever, touching more school people and school administrators in the State than in any previous period of the history of the University. Many of you were candidates here and had these advanced degrees conferred upon you by this institution. You will testify with me that this graduate work is one of the large factors in the development of a better administration of education in the State of Missouri. Many of the interests which are being promoted now in your professional organizations, as well as through the Missouri State Teachers Association, have grown out of the fact that we have a well trained body of school administrators in the State of Missouri, and that we are insisting on still further and better training, not only of administrators but of teachers as well.

Work leading to the Doctor's degree has not been neglected. Beginning with 1916, when the first degree Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Education, was conferred upon Mr. Abner Jones, under the direction of Dr. J. D. Elliff, the University has conferred through the School of Education, 54 Doctors degrees with a major in Education. Thirty-six of these 54 degrees have been conferred during the past eight years. This fact is indicative of the trend toward still further advanced training on the part of the school people of the State of Missouri. Those who have charge of the supervision and inspection of the schools of Missouri will testify that this graduate program has had far-reaching effects in developing the educational program of the State.

It is hardly necessary to continue a recital of this story, because you, the school people of the state are acquainted with it. There
are other ways in which the University and the School of Education of the University have influenced education. Individual staff members have cooperated with school authorities of various communities about their problems. This type of service should be continued in the future but should probably be improved by better organization, so that the work is not carried on in a desultory fashion. Such a program as the cooperative testing program which has been worked out in connection with the Educational Conference and the University of Missouri has been of assistance not only to higher education in the State, but also to a better understanding of the student personnel in high schools of Missouri on the part of high school administrators and teachers.

Such organizations as your organization here, I hope, receive much assistance and inspiration from the University, especially from the School of Education, as we receive from you. Last fall, we had the pleasure of entertaining the High School Principals group here on this campus, and it was my pleasure to meet with them at their annual banquet. I understand that out of this meeting has grown a study program which has been promoted in various study groups throughout the State, a thing which will make for a better understanding of education and a greater professionalization of the high school teachers and principals of the State. Last year, I understand the elementary school principals of the State organized into an association and that they have been working with men of the staff of the School of Education to carry on a program similar to that promoted by the high school principals.

It should be noted that the University must rely in a great measure upon the help of the administration of the School of Education and the staff of the School of Education in promoting the educational interests through the various professional organizations in the field of education, precisely as the School of Journalism works with the press of the State and the College of Agriculture with the agricultural interests of Missouri.

Looking out upon the future, as the University enters into its second hundred years of history, it would appear that we can feel confident that the educational program referred to above will be carried forward even more effectively than at any time in the University's history. But we are concerned, also, with developing
research and useful service projects, which should be of far-reaching value to the school system of Missouri. And at this point it might be well to draw attention to the real meaning of the service which an institution such as this may render. I think probably a concrete illustration will suffice.

The College of Agriculture has developed its research and service functions very extensively. Now the College of Agriculture does not go out and plow the land for the farmer or harvest his grain. But the College of Agriculture does attempt to carry on research work and experiments showing him how to improve his crops and conserve and restore the soil. It does try to teach the farmer how to fight insects and pests and how to overcome animal diseases. Many other such projects are being carried out from that College into the State. Similarly, the School of Education of the University cannot serve the teaching profession by solving every concrete little problem in every community for every school administrator. Such a conception of the function of a university is fundamentally in error. The School of Education can, however, as I see it, work concretely and realistically in assisting in the solution of the educational problems of the state, bringing to the profession the best knowledge and the best experience which can be gained through a well organized project here at the University. At all times, a state-wide view of the function of education must be maintained, and every effort must be made to maintain the outlook which the University acquired in the very Act of its founding, namely, that it is an integral part of the life of the State, and that all of its efforts must be bent in the direction of developing the life of the State. In this respect, we hope that you will find that the University is entirely cooperative with the other educational agencies in the State. We also hope that the cooperation will be mutual and that you will continue to give your support to the educational projects and enterprises which the University is promoting. All of this is not for the glory of the University or your own individual glory, but so that we may be worthy of the trust which was placed in our keeping when we were called upon as a profession to apply human intelligence to all of the phases of individual as well as organized endeavor of the State of Missouri.
FOUNDERS' DAY BANQUET

A FOUNDERS' DAY BANQUET was held on Wednesday, February 14, 1939, at 7:00 p.m. in Rothwell Gymnasium. Mr. John H. Lathrop, vice-president of the Board of Curators and grandson of the founder of the University, presided.

Mr. Lathrop: The meeting will please come to order. Everybody will rise and stand while the Cadet Band plays the national anthem. Then please remain standing while the invocation is pronounced by Dr. Carl Agee, Dean of the Missouri Bible College.

(The National Anthem—The Star Spangled Banner.)

Dean Agee: Our gracious Father, we pause here as we begin this memorial celebration, to acknowledge Thee as the source of all truth and wisdom. We thank Thee for those legislators of a hundred years ago who looked far into the future and saw that democracy must be under-girded by education. We thank Thee for the vision of those men and for the idealism that has characterized their successors. We thank Thee for the generous treatment of this institution by those who have led in the law-making functions of our State. We thank Thee for the men who have led in the work of administration and teaching in this University. We thank Thee for their vision and their scholarship. We thank Thee for this present group of men and women who lead.

We pray Thy blessing upon this occasion and all the occasions of this coming year that shall commemorate these momentous acts. May Thy blessing be upon us. May we acknowledge Thee as the giver of every good and perfect gift and may we be guided always into the larger and more abundant life by Thy good spirit.
Bless this food to our good and thus may we rejoice when doing Thy will, for we ask it in the Name of Christ. Amen.

MR. LATHROP: Governor Stark, Members of the Sixtieth General Assembly of the State of Missouri, and other Honored Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: In the absence of Senator McDavid, the President of the Board of Curators, it is my pleasure and privilege to welcome you all here to this the first of our celebrations in commemoration of the founding of the University of Missouri.

A few days ago, February 11th, 1939, marked the one hundredth anniversary of its birth. One hundred years ago,—February 11th, 1839,—marked the passage of the Geyer Act by the Tenth General Assembly of this State. In a spirit of gratitude and in recognition of the wisdom of the Tenth General Assembly, it was the wish of the Curators to have the members of the Sixtieth General Assembly and the State officials join with us and with the University in celebrating this memorable occasion. I want to say on behalf of the Board of Curators that we deeply appreciate your presence here tonight.

Emerson said in one of his essays, “An institution is the lengthened shadow of one man.” But when we think of all the lives which have been devoted to the advancement and welfare of this University, when we think of all the people who by word and deed have aided the University throughout the years, I think we shall have to amend Emerson’s statement and say, “This institution embodies the lengthened shadows of many splendid men and women”,—shadows falling like a benediction upon these broad grounds and hallowed halls.

And while we pay tribute to those who have done so much for the University, let us not forget that Higher Being but for whose help and guidance this University might never have existed or survived.

With this thought in mind, I am going to repeat to you the opening sentence of the inaugural address of my grandfather when he became the first President of the University in 1841. He used these words: “Our first accents, friends and fellow citi-
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zens, in this spacious temple of truth, and of wisdom, are due to that great Being whose voice is truth, whose essence is reason, whose temple is all space. Let these accents arise in thanksgiving; for hitherto hath God helped us. Let them arise in supplication that He who has builded the house may deign to make His abode in it; that the ministration of this temple may honor God and bless man throughout the years."

While our program appears to be somewhat long, I wish to assure everyone present that by mutual agreement the remarks of those who address you are to be brief, so we will be able to adjourn at an early hour.

We are greatly honored by the presence here tonight of the chief executive of our State. Governor Lloyd C. Stark has been a warm friend and supporter of the entire state educational program. His presence here tonight, busy as he is, attests his interest in our schools, our colleges and our University. Governor, it is a great pleasure to have you with us tonight, and we shall be glad to hear from you.

Governor Stark: Mr. Toastmaster, President Middlebush, Members of the General Assembly, Distinguished Guests and Friends of the University of Missouri:

I consider it a very great privilege to join with these other friends of the University of Missouri in celebrating the centennial of this great educational institution.

I think it is particularly fitting that, on this occasion, the presiding officer, who is a member of the Board of Curators, is a son of a former member of the Board and a grandson of the first President of the University.

I congratulate Mr. Lathrop, not only upon his distinguished lineage, but also upon his own noteworthy service to an institution so closely identified with the personal history of his family.

The University of Missouri, in my opinion, has always been fortunate in the caliber of the men who have served it as Curators. It is hardly necessary to point out that this service frequently has entailed considerable personal sacrifice on their part. I can bestow no higher praise on the present members of the Board
than to say they are aware of the traditions associated with their trust and are upholding those traditions in splendid fashion.

At this time, I would like to say how much we regret that the President of the Board of Curators, Senator Frank M. McDavid, is ill and cannot be with us. I want to pay him the compliment he so well deserves. For almost a generation, he has served as a member of this Board, and only serious illness prevents him from being here tonight. No man in the State has striven harder or has done more for the University of Missouri, and for education in general in this State, than has Senator McDavid.

Looking back down the vista of one hundred years of Missouri History, we can envision the pride with which the citizens of the newborn State seized upon the opportunity afforded them by Congress to establish what was officially described as “a state university or seminary of learning”.

The author of that act must have been aware that the word “seminary” itself means an institution of higher learning. But it has another definition. It is also defined as “a plot where seed is sown to raise plants for transplantation.”

So here, then, was the real purpose of the fledgling university: to transform the raw material of the frontier population into a cultured, progressive citizenship; to bring to fruition the seeds of knowledge and distribute that precious gift throughout the State. I believe the University has done its work well.

It was by the sale of public lands that the original grant for a state university was obtained. Over a period of seven years, these sales brought an accumulated total of $70,000, and the Legislature took action. The Act creating the University and authorizing a commission to select the site was approved on February 11th, 1839. It was four months later that Boone County won out over four other central Missouri counties in spirited bidding for the privilege of having the University located within its borders.

On July 4, 1840, the cornerstone was laid for a two story brick building, forerunner of the imposing edifices which now comprise the “Quadrangle”.

Today Missouri has no frontier in the sense of a wilderness to
be conquered and made habitable. It has no public lands for sale to eager emigrants from the populous east. But it does have other frontiers to challenge our courage and resourcefulness,—frontiers of human need, of public education, of public health. This University is helping meet these new challenges. It is identified with every phase of the State's development.

From its College of Agriculture come solutions to pressing farm problems, and men and women graduates trained to preserve and enhance Missouri's reputation as a major agricultural state.

From other classrooms and laboratories come specialists in Medicine, in Law, in Engineering, in Journalism, in Social Science, and in many other arts and sciences.

The fight against ignorance and its attendant evils is a never-ending one. I think it is not an overstatement of fact to say that democracy has survived and grown stronger in our nation chiefly because of the facilities for mass education. The concept of an equal educational opportunity for all is irrevocably linked with our democratic form of government and the ideal of "government of, for and by the people".

I have said before, and today I am more convinced than ever, that good government rests upon the foundation of an enlightened and informed electorate. It would be futile for any elective official or any constituted authority, whether of the executive, legislative or judicial branch of government, to attempt to remedy evil conditions affecting the welfare of the people without the backing of the people themselves.

We do have in Missouri a citizenry which not only refuses to tolerate persistent flouting of law and order, but which demands of its public officials that they exercise the powers vested in them to safeguard public morals, by bringing evil-doers swiftly before the bar of justice.

For this healthy condition of the body politic, I think we can thank popular education, together with those other vital forces for human progress—religion and a free press.

The University of Missouri is the cornerstone of the State's educational system. During its century of existence, it has faithfully mirrored the cultural, intellectual and physical growth of
the State. When the University opened its doors, it was, to all intents and purposes, a gentlemen's school. The curriculum was classical, with emphasis on such subjects as Latin, Greek, History, Literature and higher Mathematics. We must remember that few besides persons of wealth attended higher institutions of learning in those days. It was not until a few years later that any State support was available for the public schools, and we must conclude that one of the things which helped establish a tax-supported public school system was the inspiration afforded by the newly created center of learning in Columbia. As Missouri passed from the role of a frontier state into that of a populous commonwealth, with a balanced industrial and agricultural life, the University changed also. Without sacrificing its high cultural rating or lowering its standards, the University adapted itself to the changed conditions and boldly accepted new tasks to perform.

I think every citizen of this State can reflect with pride on the record of these hundred years of progressive service. One does not have to be an alumnus of the University to thrill at the strains of "Old Missouri", to experience the feeling of reverent awe which the famous columns inspire. Nor does one have to be an Old Grad to gain a new and invigorating faith in the future of our State and nation, at the sight of eager young students gathered on this campus from every section of Missouri and from other states and foreign lands.

So, tonight, I would like to salute the University, the Board of Curators, the faculty and the thousands of loyal Missouri alumni, with my sincere congratulations upon the accomplishments of the past century, and to express my confident belief that greater achievements lie ahead! I thank you, very much.

Mr. Lathrop: Senator Frank P. Briggs has been selected by the presiding officer of the State Senate to speak for that body. Senator Briggs is a graduate of the School of Journalism of the University and served with distinction as Chairman of the Commission appointed by the Fifty-ninth General Assembly to make a survey of public education within the State. Senator Briggs.
Senator Frank P. Briggs: Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Stark, President Middlebush, Distinguished Guests, Members of the Sixtieth General Assembly, Ladies and Gentlemen:

When I accepted the invitation of Governor Harris to be here tonight and represent the State Senate, I did it with a feeling of unworthiness, because in that body are thirty-three men more able to perform that task than am I. But I accepted, knowing this is a human University,—for, in 1915, when I was awarded a diploma from the School of Journalism, Walter Williams, who was at that time Dean of the School, put a big blot on his name on the diploma that was handed to me. I attempted to take him to task for that and he said, "Be not dismayed. The University returns to the student the same sort of work that the student gives to the University."

So it is that I come to you tonight, to try to bring to you some more of that blotted work.

Mr. Toastmaster, one hundred years of eventful history, dealing with the making of worthwhile citizens, is sufficient to attract the admiration of any group, anywhere, but when that history is recorded by the University in your own home state it attracts, I believe, not only the pardonable pride of loyalty but it brings to the minds of those who ponder upon it the knowledge that there is a heritage which cannot be lightly cast aside in this day of rapidly changing ideas and ideals.

I have been all but fascinated in studying the early history of the University. In fact, the introduction and the passage of the Geyer Act in the General Assembly of Missouri, in February, 1839, brings to members of the Legislature a most interesting study in itself. This bill, introduced in the House and perfected in the Senate, set up the educational system of this State and organized the University of Missouri for the use and advancement of the future generations.

Unfortunately for the cause of education in those days, there were no adequate funds to carry out this plan and public sentiment at that time was not such as to offer support and cooperation in the establishment of this system. Much time could be consumed in discussing this Act but I have never been one to
worship antiques or clinging to old regimes, and while I would not in any sense derogate from the early history of the institution, which we are tonight honoring, still I feel that we as State officials and as educators throughout the State should let the dead past bury its dead and look forward to the greater University of Missouri, which we hope will continue to grow throughout the centuries that are to come.

As Chairman of the Governor's Commission on Education in the Fifty-ninth General Assembly, I was privileged to work with other legislators and with several distinguished educators who are honoring this assemblage with their presence tonight, and in this work we found strides had been made by the University to which we could point with the pride of Missouri citizenry. We found that of the forty-two state universities in these United States only fourteen have reached the degree of perfection which enables them to be members of the Association of American Universities. Our University of Missouri is one of those fourteen and appears in this selected list with the greater institutions of learning of the nation which are making the most significant contributions to the welfare of the citizenship from the standpoint of graduate work and research.

This Commission also found that our University of Missouri ranks seventeenth in the list prepared by the Committee on Graduate Instruction of the American Council of Education in 1934, showing the relative standing of graduate work in the several institutions of higher learning in the United States. While we were happy to find that the University ranked high in this list, we were disturbed to ascertain that even though our University of Missouri was given sixteen departments which were adequately staffed and equipped no one of these departments was rated "most distinguished." And, President Middlebush, may I say to you, speaking not as a member of the State Senate but as a citizen of the State, I do not believe the citizens of Missouri will ever be satisfied with anything but the best, here at the University of Missouri.

By way of illustration, I might inform this assembly that the University of California was given 31 departments staffed and
equipped adequately and of these 31 departments 21 were rated "most distinguished"; Columbia University, with 28 departments adequately staffed and equipped, had 21 rated "most distinguished"; and Princeton University, with 17 departments adequately staffed and equipped, just one more than our own University had, had 14 rated "most distinguished". This means that in order to improve the standing of the University of Missouri, the institution which I believe we and all loyal Missourians desire to see improved, we must secure and hold men of outstanding scholarship and provide for the development of library and laboratory facilities for teaching and research, so that our Missouri youth may be in a position to avail themselves of the very best services in the educational field without traveling to other states for this service.

How to do this remains for the wisdom of the future generation to solve, but as we pass through this period of solution it is my hope that the spirit of loyalty may surround the University of Missouri, its Board of Curators, and its executives so that they may know without the slightest doubt that the University of Missouri is in fact as well as in name THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI. I thank you.

Mr. Lathrop: Dr. John G. Christy, Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Sixtieth General Assembly, has come tonight as the representative of that body. He will now address you.

Dr. Christy: Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Stark, President Middlebush, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Speaking as one representing the House of Representatives, permit me to say that we consider it a distinct honor to be invited here tonight upon the occasion of the Founders' Day Banquet of the University of Missouri. After this wonderful repast and fine entertainment, I think the University of Missouri need not worry overmuch about its appropriations!

Dr. Middlebush was rather concerned as to whether the House membership would be present and I told him he need not worry if there was to be a meal served. I reminded him of a couple who
applied to a minister to have a marriage ceremony performed. The reverend gentleman explained, “I am due in my pulpit now but if you will come to the church I will marry you after the services.” The young people agreed and became a part of the congregation at the meeting. Just as he was about to close his sermon, the good pastor remembered his engagement with the young people so he at once made the announcement, “If there are any in the house who wish to be married, they will please come down to the front.” To his consternation and amazement, thirty-six women and twelve men came forward! That applies to the members of the House of Representatives on an occasion such as this.

My friends, I have been singularly honored this evening. I have had an opportunity that I wish every one of you might have had—to sit at the left of the son of Major James S. Rollins. Mr. Curtis Rollins graduated from the University in 1876. I have not had a more pleasant evening than sitting here and hearing him trace the history of Missouri University from the time the faculty consisted of ten members until the present time, listening to a man who has known all but three of the Presidents of this grand University. If each of you could have had that privilege, you would now have a pride in this institution which you have not had before. I think tonight, as we pay our homage to the University, we should think of the man who was responsible, who had the vision and concept of what this University might become. Along with this, however, as Senator Briggs has said, we should also think into the future. Let us picture the University of Missouri not as standing still but as marching on and onward, until the day comes when it stands not third nor second on the list, but first among the Universities of America. I thank you.

Mr. Lathrop: Dr. Christy has generously suggested that Mr. John D. Taylor, of Keytesville, also speak on this program for the House of Representatives, of which he is now a member and Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Mr. Taylor is known to all the school people in the states as a man who has a deep appreciation of the value of publicly supported education.
If I am not mistaken, he is a graduate of the hard School of Experience, but that very fact seems to have given him an exceptionally clear understanding of the problems of and the benefits to be derived from our public school system. I take great pleasure in introducing Mr. John D. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Stark, President Middlebush, Distinguished Guests, Members of the Assembly, Ladies and Gentlemen:

After looking over the program and seeing the names of the other speakers at this Founders' Day Banquet, celebrating the 100th anniversary of the University of Missouri, I find that every other speaker on the program is a graduate from this or some other great American University. I find myself in the anomalous position of being the only uneducated person on the program. That may not be such a bad idea after all. You know the patent medicine vendors throughout the ages have illustrated the wonderful effects of their products by the "before and after taking" pictures. You have before you tonight a concrete example of before and after taking university degrees.

Since arriving here I have heard a very unfortunate incident that occurred this evening; one that might be regrettable were it not for the fact that we recognize the principle that self-preservation is the first law of nature. Lieutenant-Governor Harris drove over from Jefferson City tonight accompanied by Senators Casey and Kinney (the two Mikes). They accompanied him upon his express invitation, but when they got to the city limits he stopped and insisted that they get out and walk into town. When they remonstrated at such treatment he said, "but you boys know I live here".

For thirty years it has been my privilege to know most of those who have contributed to the up-building of this great university. I would feel that I was derelict in some measure, at least, if I did not mention the names of three men, none of whom are University men, who, in my humble judgment, have contributed more to the welfare of this institution through their actions in the Legislature than any three men in Missouri—Senators Casey, Brogan and Kinney.
I remember very well the last opportunity I had to visit the bedside of the late Walter Williams that he mentioned these three distinguished men and how much they had contributed to the welfare of the University during his administration. He expressed a desire to see them again and when that wish was conveyed to them not one day elapsed before they came and spent a glorious time with this wonderful man in the last few days of his life.

I have, in the course of thirty years, seen a wonderful change in the attitude of the people of this State toward the University. I have served on Appropriation Committees when the Board of Curators and Faculty men came before our Committee in fear and trembling. I have seen the time that men, because of their lack of understanding and appreciation of this great institution, said things, asked questions, and conducted themselves in such manner that it was embarrassing to the people who came there and embarrassing to the members of the Committee. I have seen manifest prejudice against the institution. But as the years have gone by, because of the high character and standing of the men connected with this fine institution, and their work with the young men and young women who have gone out and joined the ranks of everyday life and who have contributed to the building up of the State of Missouri, that spirit has entirely changed. I think I can say that the happiest session of the Appropriations Committee of the Missouri House is on the day when the representatives of the University of Missouri and Teachers Colleges appear before the Committee. I know it adds more to the pleasure of our work than any other one thing that occurs during the entire session.

There has never been a time in this State that we have not believed sincerely and honestly in equality of educational interests and educational opportunities for every individual within our borders. That is the sense of the people of Missouri today. Sometimes a problem arises that gives us some concern. But there has never been a time in this State when the people have not been fully prepared to meet every exigency. We have pledged ourselves to do the things that are for the best interests of the people of this State. I say for myself, and I believe for every member of the General Assembly, that we intend to carry on and to do
the things that are for the best interests of all the people. I pledge myself from here on to the end of my time,—and I believe I may safely pledge every member of the Missouri Assembly that we are going to keep this fine institution sacred for the purpose for which it was created and founded. We are going to preserve the traditions of this institution that have grown up through all these years, and at the same time will see that even-handed justice is meted out to everybody in the State.

It has never been my opportunity to have the privileges of this University, but in the thirty years of public life I feel the greatest privilege I have had has been, in my small and humble way, to contribute to the welfare of this great institution and to every educational institution in the State,—and that will be my course so long as I may serve the public. I thank you.

Mr. Lathrop: There are many distinguished persons here tonight upon whom I should like to call, but time forbids that I ask them all to speak. However, the occasion is such that I wish to introduce them to you. The first is Lieutenant-Governor Frank G. Harris, an alumnus of the University and a native of Columbia. Mr. Harris.

The next is Senator Joseph H. Brogan, President pro tem of the Senate. Mr. Brogan.

As Dr. Christy said a few minutes ago, when he was speaking to you, a great public spirited citizen in the early history of Missouri was Major James S. Rollins. He was a member of the Tenth General Assembly which passed the Geyer Act. Later he was a Representative of the people of Missouri in the halls of Congress. Throughout his long distinguished career, he served the University and many other public interests, devoted to the welfare of the people. With Dr. Christy, I agree it is a wonderful thing to have with us his son, Mr. Curtis B. Rollins. Present also is his grandson and namesake, Senator James S. Rollins, who for some years was a member of the State Senate and also a member of the State House of Representatives. Mr. Curtis Rol-
lins and Mr. James S. Rollins, may I ask you to stand so the people here may see you.

Dean Isador Loeb, of Washington University, is a graduate of Missouri. He was Dean of the School of Business and Public Administration and a Professor here from 1895 to September 1st, 1925. Following the retirement of Dr. Jones from the Presidency of the University, Dean Loeb served as Acting President in a very effective way during one of the transition periods in the University’s history. Dean Loeb.

Dr. Stratton D. Brooks came to the University in 1923, as President, from the Presidency of the University of Oklahoma, and was with us until the latter part of the year 1930. Dr. Brooks.

I should like also to introduce the members of the present Board of Curators who are here. As has been said, Senator McDavid, President of the Board, is ill and cannot be here. Mr. George Willson is on his way home from South America and Mr. Harold Moore is on a business trip out of the State. We have here the other members of the Board and I will ask them to rise as I call their names and remain standing until I have called the names of all of them: Mr. H. J. Blanton, of Paris, Missouri; Mr. Charles Cox, of Rock Port; Mr. Earl Nelson, of St. Louis; Mr. James A. Potter, of Jefferson City, and Mr. J. H. Wolpers, of Poplar Bluff.

One of the most interesting reports issued by any department of the State of Missouri, is that prepared by the State Superintendent of Public Schools, the Honorable Lloyd W. King. The scope and effectiveness of the work done by his department under his supervision almost astounds a person who is not entirely familiar with it. Mr. King is here to speak for the public schools of Missouri. Mr. King.

Mr. King: Vice-President Lathrop, Governor Stark, President Middlebush, Members of the General Assembly, Members of the University Family, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Like Senator Briggs, I am humbled by the task that has been assigned to me when I consider that I am to bring greetings to
this institution and am to speak for the public school system of Missouri, because public education is the State's greatest enterprise. When I bring to you greetings from the public schools, these greetings come from seven hundred twenty-five thousand boys and girls who are enrolled in the public elementary and secondary schools, from twenty-five thousand public school teachers, and from innumerable members of boards of education. The University of Missouri, the five Teachers Colleges, and the public elementary and secondary schools, all are considered parts of the great public school system of the State of Missouri.

We in Missouri are proud of the manner in which the University of Missouri is articulated with the other parts of the public school system. We acknowledge our appreciation of the leadership of this institution in the past, and we particularly are grateful to its President for the interest he displays in elementary and secondary education and for the cooperation he gives to all of us who are engaged in work in these particular areas.

In the short time I am permitted to speak, I trust I may talk to you rather intimately because, as an educator, this particular occasion seems to me to be most significant! It is an event that should stimulate rather serious reflection.

Not only does this year mark the hundredth anniversary of the University of Missouri, but also it marks the centennial of public education in Missouri. One hundred years ago the office of State Superintendent of Schools was established. The gentleman who first served in that capacity did not remain long in office; there were times during the next quarter century when Missouri did not have a State Superintendent of Schools, and it was not until after the Civil War that the office of State Superintendent of Schools was permanently established. Nevertheless, this year marks the hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the office which I now hold.

It would be interesting, if we had time, to consider the conflicting points of view in reference to education that have been held during that period of time. There was a struggle in the Legislature to make the public schools free, to get people to understand that the State, itself, was the educational agency and that education
was a State function in this particular form of government. There was a struggle for articulation of the elementary and secondary schools, there was a struggle against sectarianism, and there was a struggle for accreditation.

From all these struggles have emerged certain fundamental considerations concerning public education in Missouri. First, there is the growing conception that education in Missouri is more than merely one of the many functions of the State. Education differs from the typical functions of government; it is not only the responsibility of the State but it is so essential to the perpetuation of the State that it is, in itself, inherent in the very nature of government.

Education cannot be biologically transmitted. Our children cannot inherit from us the education that we have nor the experiences that we have had. Therefore, it is necessary that definite provisions be made to bring about the educational process.

With these fundamental considerations as a basis, may I suggest tonight, as we think of the next hundred years, that we dedicate ourselves to an understanding of the imperative need for education in the particular type of government which we are attempting.

I wish I had time to impress upon you that democracy is the most difficult type of government to make work, that we are proud of our experiment in democracy, and that we are desirous to have it succeed. It can succeed only if we understand that education is essential to the perpetuation of a democracy. It is obvious that in a democracy the people, since they choose the direction in which they are to go, must be capable of making intelligent choices.

I bring to this institution the greetings of the school people of Missouri. Most of us are alumni of this great institution. All of us love it. As we bring greetings tonight, we ask you to continue to support the educational interests of the state. We ask for that continued support in order to make possible the optimum development of the capacities of the individual girls and boys of Missouri. Most fundamentally, however, we ask for it in the name of the perpetuation of the State of Missouri.
Mr. Lathrop: You are all familiar with the important work of the State Historical Society. As probably most of you know, a part of the library at the University has been assigned as quarters for this society. Senator Allen McReynolds is with us tonight. He is President of the State Historical Society, and is our next speaker.

Senator McReynolds: On behalf of the State Historical Society, I bring greetings to our foster mother, Missouri University, upon this hundredth anniversary.

As most of you know, the State Historical Society of Missouri was conceived in the very shadow of the University. It found its origin in the teachings of this great school. Its founders, Dean Loeb, who sits upon my right hand, Mr. E. W. Stephens and Mr. Walter Williams—both of whom have gone to their reward—were inseparably identified with the work and history of this great University.

Those who have preceded me on this program have told you that the University found its legislative birth in the Geyer Act. They have told you something of its hundred years' history. May I tell you only briefly of the conception which preceded its birth under the Geyer Act.

The first public recognition of the school is to be found in the original act of admission, which was passed by the United States Congress and approved March 6th, 1820. Among other things, this act contained a provision setting aside "thirty-six sections of land or one entire township ... together with other lands heretofore reserved" for the endowing of a "seminary of learning". This section, along with the other sections, appropriating public lands for schools and roads, was approved by the State in the Ordinance of Acceptance.

Nearly a score of years passed between the passage of the Act of Acceptance and the actual birth of the school. In the meantime, at least two of the Governors of this State, in addressing the General Assemblies, insistently directed attention to the necessity of complying with these provisions of the Act of Admission. Alexander McNair, the first of Missouri's Governors, con-
tinually directed the attention of the General Assembly to this provision in the Act of Admission. From time to time in his messages, Governor John Miller directed the attention of the General Assembly to the establishment of this "Seminary of Learning". You will remember, of course, John Miller was the only Governor of Missouri who served more than four years. Succeeding Governor Abraham J. Williams, who died in office, Governor Miller served altogether a period of seven years, and his State papers indicate him to be a man of discretion and wisdom.

Finally, in 1828, Governor Miller reported to the General Assembly that "he has selected Commissioners who were to set aside the land provided for in the Act of Admission". He further reported that these Commissioners have traveled the State from one side to the other, to use his own terms, "in very inclement weather", going from the Mississippi on the east to the western border of the State, and back to New Madrid again, and setting aside for the use of this State institution, then without location, the original land authorized by the Act of Admission and the Ordinance of Acceptance. Our information is that some seven thousand acres of this particular selection is to be found today within the corporate limits of Kansas City, Missouri. How unfortunate that the Board of Curators of this institution does not own this same land at the present time.

The land was set aside and these resources provided for the establishment of Missouri's University. The institution conceived in the Act of Admission found its birth in the Geyer Act.

In his message of 1840, Governor Boggs reports to the General Assembly the establishment of the University. He says that after much delay he is happy to say that after vigorous contest as to its location, Boone County was finally selected, and that the first building of the institution is under construction, and that in the ensuing year he hopes the University will be open for the reception of students. His message indicates that the power of appointment of the Board of Curators rested in the General Assembly.

Governor Boggs points out that some of the men selected as Members of the Board of Curators resided at such a considerable distance from the school as to make it impossible for them to
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attend the meetings of the Board. He expresses the opinion that it would be wise to select men who are located adjacent to Columbia where the University is situated. He also advises that, in his opinion, the Members of the Board of Curators should be compensated for this important work. How great the contrast today, when ease of travel permits the selection of Members of the Board from every part of the State, and the honor of service on this Board affords adequate compensation for the services rendered.

I have been much interested in what has been said here by the previous speakers. Your toastmaster referred to the statement of Emerson that "An institution is the elongated shadow of a single man", and the toastmaster modified Emerson’s statement by suggesting that the University of Missouri is the elongated shadow of many men.

May I be permitted to modify the statement of the toastmaster by suggesting that the great University of Missouri, with its manifold opportunities and activities, represents the consummation of educational effort in this great State of ours; and that this great school finds its warp and woof in our common school system, our high schools and intermediate colleges. From the strands of all of these activities and from the contributions of the men and women of Missouri, who have played their part, both as instructors and as students, have been woven the rich fabric of the University’s life. It also represents, if you please, the promise of our future citizenship. In its halls, Missouri’s leaders of tomorrow are to be found. It has prepared the leadership in this State for the last half a century and the leadership of tomorrow will likewise find its inspiration and hope within the walls of this old school.

My friend, John Taylor, tells you that during the time of his service in the General Assembly, he has seen a marked change in the reception accorded by the Appropriation Committees of the Legislature to the representatives of the University. I can tell my friend John the reason for that change. Graduates and former students of the University now play an important part in the legislative halls, and the University has earned a well-
deserved recognition from the members of the General Assembly. In conclusion, my friends, may I say that the University of Missouri is peculiarly a Missouri institution. The major portion of its students are citizens of this great state. Within the ranks of those students will be found the promise and the hope of our citizenship for the future. God grant this great school may continue to serve this State of ours and live to celebrate many centennials. I thank you.

Mr. Lathrop: The University of Missouri has always maintained close contact with the State Teachers Colleges, and also with the other institutions of higher learning in the State. I am glad to be informed that the Presidents of all the various State Teachers Colleges are with us tonight. Bringing greetings to the University upon its hundredth birthday, President Uel W. Lamkin, of Northwest State Teachers College, representing all the State Teachers Colleges, will be our next speaker.

President Lamkin: Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Stark, President Middlebush, Members of the Sixtieth General Assembly, and other Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: May I depart just a moment to suggest a difference between today and yesterday. Do you recall that Superintendent King said that the State Superintendent of Schools who was appointed one hundred years ago did not persist? I remember in 1938 the State Superintendent of Schools, however, did persist, and I remember, too, that in 1918 the State Superintendent of Schools did not persist,—because he was asked by the people of the State of Missouri to desist.

To those who know, the mutual co-operation and understanding that exists between the state institutions of higher learning in Missouri is extremely gratifying. Ever since the organization of the Educational Conference, in which group there appear the State University, the five State Teachers Colleges, and the State Superintendent of Public Schools, there has been a closer working arrangement than exists in most states where the higher institutions
are legally united. To this Conference are brought problems of common interest. Although action is not administrative but advisory, agreements entered into have been uniformly observed.

To this Conference there have been brought problems that affect such things as uniform standards of admission, standard requirements for graduation, qualifications of faculty, transfer of credits, and the standardization of educational procedures. Matters such as might have been included in legislative enactment, such as control administrative details, enforce conformity to budgets, and the like have been strenuously avoided in the discussions of this professional group. As a result, the Teachers Colleges of this State are in a better position to congratulate the people upon what they know of the University of Missouri, and have a more substantial basis for knowing the great work that this University has done in the one hundred years of its existence.

Mindful of the demands of modern business, conscious of the stress and strain of increased enrollments, willing to share the responsibility which is theirs in the scheme of higher education in the State, the Teachers Colleges crave the leadership of the University of Missouri and of its able and distinguished President.

Dedicated to the education of a single profession on behalf of the State as a whole, they wish the fullest development of all the schools and colleges which comprise the University. They hope for a strengthening of its research activities,—the peculiar function of a University,—and they believe in an extension of its field service, which means so much to the prosperity of the people of the State.

In no sense rivals, in every sense stimulating each other to good works, the Teachers Colleges join with the independent and denominational colleges of Missouri in pledging their support to the development of higher education, following the leadership of the State's greatest school, the University of Missouri.

Mr. Lathrop: Nearly all of the Presidents of the Missouri College Union institutions are with us tonight, and President Franc L. McCluer, of Westminster College at Fulton, Missouri, has been chosen as their representative and spokesman on this occasion. Dr. McCluer.
President McCluer: Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Stark, President Middlebush, Members of the Board of Curators, Members of the General Assembly, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a happy privilege to speak for the members of the Missouri College Union in bringing congratulations and best wishes to the University of Missouri on the celebration of her One Hundredth Anniversary. The members of this College Union, and the citizens of Missouri may well rejoice in the history and achievement of this institution. We look to the University for leadership in the search for truth and in the maintenance of that freedom requisite to the security of democratic institutions.

Public education, which is the very genius of democracy, is the surest safeguard of our commonwealth against reaction, confusion and political corruption. The founders of the great commonwealth of Missouri knew perfectly well that in any democracy worthy of the name there must be a system of free public education. So, here at the head of that system stands the University of Missouri, a chosen and dedicated place where youth, selected by their fitness, and their own ambition, come for training in the fundamental business of thinking. And they seek this spot as a place free from fear and prejudice, and even to a large extent from the exigencies of physical toil where they may pursue the great adventure of knowledge and thought. In this sanctuary of freedom, surely they shall find a new faith in the integrity of the human mind, a new loyalty to truth, a new devotion to liberty, a new warming of the heart by the spirit of charity.

Democracy, itself, depends on such freedom. It can succeed, it can exist, only where its citizens assert the right and assume the responsibility of thinking for themselves, rather than accepting their thoughts from set molds. Devoted to freedom, loyal to truth, the University is keenly aware of its responsibility to the new day. Here the student, in directing his mind to rigorous study, in disciplining into their proper places material and outside interests, shall acquire qualities of leadership which society so urgently needs. Dr. Isaiah Bowman has wisely said, "It is the individual working in freedom, who thinks and dreams, and struggles, and creates." This thinking can be nurtured only in
an atmosphere of freedom. Certain European states are giving us fresh proof of the fact that when government dictates thinking, men’s liberties are destroyed, and those who accept that dictation must cease to think for themselves. It is the obligation of the government to establish a great university, to maintain it in freedom, to support it with enthusiasm in its changing needs and in its new opportunities. No fear of new discovery of the truth, no consideration of expediency, no avowed or subtle restraints over the free exercise of the human mind must hinder the University in its great mission.

All hail, then, to the University of Missouri,—a free institution, whose achievements, throughout one hundred years, whose vigorous and significant living today, give promise of even more glorious achievement in the years ahead. In loyalty to that truth which shall make men free, in devotion to ideals that shall make a free community great, the University of Missouri commands the respect and the confidence of the citizens of this state and of the nation. It is, therefore, with great pride and happiness that the Missouri College Union expresses to the Board of Curators of the University, and to you, President Middlebush, our sincerest congratulations and felicitations on this happy occasion. Thank you, very much.

MR. LATHROP: A few years ago, it became the duty of the Board of Curators to select a President of the University. We found in our midst a man who, by character, ability and training, was eminently fitted for that position. Dr. Frederick A. Middlebush has more than lived up to our expectations. To him has been handed the torch of light and truth to carry onward and upward in these first years of the second century of the University’s life. We feel sure that the University, under his guidance, will grow in stature and will contribute more and more to the welfare of the people of Missouri. Dr. Middlebush.

PRESIDENT MIDDLEBUSH: Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Stark, Members of the Sixtieth General Assembly, Honored Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:
It is my assignment on this program to "pronounce the benediction". In behalf of the University, I wish to express our appreciation of the generous messages of greeting and good wishes which have been tendered here on this historic occasion.

We may all take great pride in the progress Missouri has made in the past century and the achievements realized. The State University is but a part of this forward-looking and progressive development of the entire State.

We do well in pausing now and then, as we are doing today, to honor the men of the past, who were men of vision, and to reexamine the high principles and ideals which motivated them. By so doing, we are better able to keep our future course clear and true. The record of the past is now written and it is a part of Missouri's history. Our generation, in its turn, can only make its contribution by a job well done in the years to come. This is the concern of every one of us here this evening and of those whom we, for the time being, represent.

An institution, such as this University, which is so closely knit into the very life of our State, cannot long ignore, any more than can our institutions of government, the manifold development of the people of our State. Neither can the University get very far beyond, in any of its development, the limits of popular support. Its future at all times will be conditioned and limited by that fact. The University is an institution created by the laws and Constitution of Missouri. It will always operate, as it has in the past, within the legal framework set for it. But the University, as is the case with our entire educational system, is also in a larger and less technical sense, the creation of a great human society which it is designed to serve, to the end that Missouri boys and girls may be trained for more useful citizenship. This great aspiration has been well put in the words of the Ordinance of 1787: "Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Ladies and gentlemen, speaking in behalf of the faculty of the University, I can assure you that we appreciate the public trust that is placed in our keeping, and that the high ideals of public
service which have guided this University through the past century will continue to be our guide in the future as we enter upon the second hundred years of our history.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we are adjourned.
III

STUDENT CELEBRATION

WHILE THE ENTIRE student body at the University participated in the other phases of the Centennial Celebration, a special student celebration was held in connection with the annual Tap Day ceremony at 11:00 o'clock on the morning of May 2. The student body assembled around the Columns to witness the student Centennial program.

Robert Black, student president, presided at the meeting. Following an introductory number by the University Cadet Band, he introduced Dr. Albert K. Heckel, dean of men, who after a short talk, introduced the new members of the three senior honorary societies, Mortar Board, QEBH, and Mystical Seven.

Mortar Board “tapped” the following: Elizabeth Florence Crow, Hematite; Bobby Jane Geisert, Washington; Mary Elizabeth Hinman, Orange, New Jersey; Katherine Johnson, Carrollton; Frances Kerr, Webster Groves; Ruth Morgan, Columbia; Ruth Safran, Perth Amboy, New Jersey, Ortrude Schnaedelbach, St. Louis; Ellen W. Stine, Columbia; Mary Jane Yates, Sheridan, Wyoming; and Elizabeth Ann Hartley, Savannah.

QEBH “tapped” the following: Thomas Deacy, Kansas City; Chauncy Stanberry, Mexico; John Lobsiger, Gary, Indiana; Sam Walton, Columbia; Harry Barger, Sweet Springs; Donald Galamba, Kansas City; Chester Hill, Youngstown; Ralph Tucker, Kansas City, and William Gill, Webster Groves.

Mystical Seven “tapped” the following: Dwayne Smith, Kansas City; Christopher Joseph Kersting, Poplar Bluff; Dudley June Bidstrup, Beaman; Joe Capps, Liberty; A. H. Rolph Fairchild, Columbia; August Elbring, Clayton; and Robert Sight, Columbia.

Student President Black then paid tribute to the members of the faculty who were the oldest on the University staff in point of service, introducing 15 of the 16 members of the faculty so
Student President Robert Black introducing the members of the faculty who were oldest in point of service.

President Middlebush addressing the Student Centennial gathering.
honored. Dr. J. W. Connaway, Professor Emeritus of Veterinary Science and a member of the faculty since 1888 was unable to attend the ceremony because of poor health. Other members of the faculty introduced and honored by the student body were as follows: Dr. Benjamin F. Hoffman, Professor Emeritus of Germanic Languages, on the faculty since 1887; Dr. T. J. Rodhouse, Professor Emeritus of Civil Engineering, who joined the faculty in 1897; Dr. Joseph D. Elliff, Professor Emeritus of High School Administration, a member of the faculty since 1904; Dr. W. C. Curtis, Acting Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, on the University faculty since 1901; Dr. F. B. Mumford, Dean Emeritus of the Faculty of Agriculture, a member of the faculty since 1895; Dr. M. F. Miller, Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture, who joined the faculty in 1904; Dr. Charles W. Greene, Professor Emeritus of Physiology and Pharmacology, who joined the faculty in 1900; Dr. H. M. Belden, Professor Emeritus of English, a member of the University faculty since 1895; Dr. Walter Miller, Professor Emeritus of Classical Languages and Archaeology on the faculty since 1891; Dr. Sidney Calvert, Professor Emeritus of Organic Chemistry, who joined the faculty in 1894; Dr. O. M. Stewart, Professor of Physics who was first appointed in 1901; Dr. Herbert M. Reese, Professor of Physics who received his first appointment in 1904; Dr. Jonas Viles, Professor of History, on the faculty since 1902; Dr. A. H. R. Fairchild, Professor of English, a member of the faculty since 1904; and Dr. Hermann S. Almstedt, Professor of Germanic Languages and a member of the University faculty since 1904.

President Frederick A. Middlebush was then introduced and delivered the principal talk. Dr. Middlebush brought out the student point of view in the development of the University. He quoted from a report of the Governor of the State which was made when, in 1879, women were first admitted to the University, pointing out amusing and antiquated customs then in practice. From old records he gleaned interesting and humorous passages concerning the regulation and discipline of the student body which included forbiddance of such actions as entering billiard and drinking saloons, carrying concealed weapons, using intoxicating
liquors, sending or receiving a challenge, smoking in buildings around the campus, and leaving town without the permission of the President of the University.

Dr. Middlebush pointed out the comradeship that exists between the students and faculty members of the University, saying "It is a great Missouri institution of long standing and I hope it will continue throughout the ages." He closed by acclaiming the high rank of the University and expressed the hope that the traditions and ideals which have formed its foundation will be continued in the future.

Following Dr. Middlebush's address the student president-elect, Chauncy Stanberry, on behalf of the student body announced a campaign to raise funds for a stone bench to be given to the University by the members of the Centennial Class.

* * *

The Centennial Week activities in the fall including the Centennial Convocation on November 1, the Civic Celebration on November 2, and the Alumni Celebration on November 4, were climaxned with a student Centennial ball on the evening of November 6.
IV

CENTENNIAL CONVOCATION

THE CENTENNIAL CONVOCATION was held in Brewer Field House on Wednesday, November 1, at 10:00 p.m. Dr. Frederick A. Middlebush, President of the University, presided. The invocation was given by the Right Reverend Joseph Corrigan, Rector of the Catholic University of America.


Almighty, Eternal God, Who hast shared with us, in our finite capacity, the power of intellect enabling us to know Truth, and the power of will that we may choose the highest and best, and so keep ourselves acceptable in Thy sight, we ask Thy favoring inspiration on this Convocation here this morning.

Grant that the deeper significance of this beautiful scene complete the splendor of this Centenary Celebration.

Those who gather here to honor a hundred years of a university's contribution to teaching and research are themselves of the great apostolate of Truth engaged and dedicated to pushing ever forward the frontiers of knowledge.

Keep us all loyal to our great calling, conscious of our Nation's need of an enlightened leadership of the people.

Keep us ever mindful of our responsibility that the teaching, percolating down from the university level to the rank and file of our people, be such as to strengthen and encourage them in their defense of the principles on which this Nation took its rise.

Make us strong to teach our Nation the valid way to pass on to another generation of freemen the liberty our fathers won, and which has come down to us safeguarded for a hundred and fifty years, and is now in our keeping.

Make this University of Missouri, already a living witness for a hundred years of our people's devotion to education, an ever
greater power in its search for the truth, the good, and the beautiful. We ask this blessing, Eternal Father, through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

President Middlebush: The Convocation exercises of this day are held as a part of the academic side of the University’s Centennial Celebration. As all of Gaul was divided into three parts so have we divided our Centennial Celebration. We have endeavored to plan a series of celebrations that would disrupt as little as possible, the regular program of University work which is considered our first obligation even on our One Hundredth Birthday.

In February of this year the Board of Curators, public officials, members of the General Assembly and others participated in a Founder’s Day Banquet commemorating the passage of the Geyer Act on February 11, 1839, which created the legal framework for Missouri’s State University.

Students and Alumni made provision for their part in the general celebration.

To the committee in charge, it seemed best that the academic celebration should be held, if possible, in conjunction with the annual meeting of one of the national associations concerned with the progressive development of our national program of higher education. Therefore the Association of American Universities was invited, three years ago, to hold its 1939 meeting on this campus as part of our celebration.

I want to express to the Association and its members and their invited guests our appreciation of their presence here. This has been one of the best attended meetings of the Association held in recent years and during the sessions of the past few years we have been able to give a great deal of thoughtful consideration to many problems of concern to all of these institutions of higher learning.

Our program this morning is a part of the Association’s general program. It is concerned with the unique obligations today imposed upon the universities of America in a rapidly changing and troubled world.
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Two university presidents representing, on the one hand the oldest privately endowed university of this country, and on the other, one of the largest and best respected of our state universities, have been invited to address you.

The first speaker, while assuming his high office as one of our younger university presidents, had already attained an enviable reputation as a scholar in his chosen field, respected as one of the great chemists of our day. In his election to the presidency of his university I fear that the field of chemistry has lost one of its ablest men, but Harvard University has held true to its line of distinguished presidents. I take great pleasure in introducing to this audience Dr. James Bryant Conant, President of Harvard University, who will speak to you on the subject:

The Contributions That an Endowed University Can Make to the Life and Growth of a Nation.

President Conant: I am speaking on the topic “The Contributions that an Endowed University Can Make to the Life and Growth of a Nation.” Now, although I come to you as the administrative head of a privately endowed university, I should prefer to leave the word “endowed” out of this title and speak about all our American universities, state supported and privately endowed alike. They all have the same mission; they must in the long run prosper or suffer together. But there are a few special functions which I think the endowed universities are in a peculiar position to fulfill—which, indeed, it is their duty to fulfill—and I shall mention them briefly before going on with the broader subject.

In the first place endowed institutions often provide better opportunities for a certain type of experimentation. On the whole a board of trustees of a private institution can embark on certain undertakings which would be difficult to launch in an institution where every few years the president must seek a new appropriation from the legislature. This is particularly true in regard to those aspects of education and research which are not utilitarian in nature—those scholarly and scientific pursuits which to the
short-sighted appear useless but which history has repeatedly shown to be the most pregnant with possibilities for the future.

In the second place, it is usually possible to limit the size of the student body and the range of the institution's activities. This concentration on a few definite objectives without being subject to the forces of expansion has advantages and under proper conditions should permit the privately endowed institutions to lead the way in certain directions.

Finally, I believe the endowed colleges have a unique role to play as truly national centers of learning. Their resources are available for the education of a student body composed of youths from all parts of the country. The institution supported by taxes, on the other hand, must quite properly have a more local constituency. For many years a number of the privately endowed colleges have been centers to which students have come from all the states of the Union. In these centers the sectional outlook of many individuals in each entering class has been disintegrated by four years of college life.

Let me just mention the conditions at Harvard as an illustration: the freshmen all live together in the Yard and have common dining facilities. The boy who comes from afar without friends is soon at home. And for the next three years the undergraduate lives in one of the seven Houses—a social and intellectual unit of comfortable size, in contact with all the diverse life of a great university. He lunches and dines day after day with youths whose abilities, tastes, and backgrounds include a wide range. This social life is a strong solvent for parochial prejudices, I can assure you. Such round-table discussions of the country's problems as take place among the students assembled from all quarters of this continent are among the most potent of educational forces. From such informal conferences develop citizens with a truly American viewpoint.

In short the endowed colleges and universities, it seems to me, have a clear duty to be as national in scope as possible. They should be mixing pots, as it were, where students from all parts of the nation may come to understand one another. But the question of geographical distribution is only half of the story in
a democratic country. In common with the state colleges, the privately endowed institutions must see to it that their students are recruited from families with varied financial backgrounds. We must provide through an adequate scholarship policy for the boy of ability and character who on leaving high school cannot obtain the funds necessary for his education. The selection must be made with great care; not marks alone, but a measure of real capacity must be our guide and the stipend should be so large that no talented youth is deprived of an education. All of our colleges and universities must beware of the accidental and irrelevant factors of an economic and geographic nature which now determine too much the composition of the student body. I know that, today, in spite of our publicly supported systems of education, there are boys and girls of great promise who fail to find adequate training and are lost for the future needs of the country. What we must continually strive toward, it seems to me, is that ideal expressed more than 100 years ago by Thomas Jefferson when he spoke of “culling from every condition of our people the natural aristocracy of talent and virtue and preparing it by education at the public expense for the care of the public concerns.”

So much for the endowed universities and their special functions and duties,—duties as pacemakers in certain types of educational endeavor,—duties we trust they will be able to perform in the future, as I think all will admit they have performed them in the past.

Now may I turn to the broader problem—the future of all our universities and their role in the country in the century in which we live. A university has a twofold mission—education and research, or in the language of the founders of Harvard: “to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity.” “To perpetuate learning to posterity,” in short, to educate each succeeding generation—that is the first task of a university, which it performs through its liberal arts college and its professional schools.

The never-ending debate about education is still going full blast today as in all ages. I won’t attempt a lengthy discussion of the aims and methods of college and professional training, but I
should just like to emphasize one or two aspects of the problems which are sometimes overlooked. High scholastic standing in college is on the whole at a discount in this country,—we may as well admit it even if we don't like it. This is unfortunate, and tends to befog any discussion. It is in part due to a misunderstanding, I may almost say prejudice, on the part of the public at large. Even the most skeptical critic of Phi Beta Kappa would probably admit that there are many walks of life where real intellectual capacity is required,—where what is commonly called brains counts heavily. The law is a good example, and in this case particularly there is overwhelming evidence to show that the intellectual capacity needed in the profession is closely correlated with the sort of scholastic ability demonstrated in undergraduate work. On the other hand we all realize that this type of intellectual capacity isn't the whole story: imagination, originality, a spirit of adventure, stamina, courage,—a man must have all these in addition to brains in order to be a successful and useful citizen. And these factors are not usually measured by college examinations. There are faults in our educational machinery and we must admit that too often academic prizes go to students of mediocre ability who have good memories and the willingness to do hard plodding work. But the situation is very much better than it was thirty years ago, indeed is every day improving. Much more remains to be done on the one hand in improving our tests and examinations and on the other in stimulating our students to show their inherent ability. If we could persuade all our youths in college that the four years were a real trial heat and not just a jog around the track, the brilliant loafer would disappear. Then too we must study and record the human limitations of each individual as well as his special intellectual ability. With wide information, real advice and guidance would help each man to find his proper groove in life. At least half of higher education, I believe, is a matter of selecting, sorting and classifying students. If a young man in college can be made to show what power is really in him, it is possible to decide many matters relating to his further professional education. Certain types of advanced work are a clear waste of time for certain types
of students. I am a great believer in the selective process in education at every stage but we must judge a boy’s potentialities from his strong hand, not by averaging strengths and weaknesses. For example, if a boy has very little mathematical ability but real intellectual capacity along other lines, he is a good risk and should proceed with his education but not in the sciences. A carefully geared selective process of education is in the long run both the most humane and the most democratic (always assuming that it is intermeshed with an adequate scholarship policy).

The question of what constitutes a liberal education is much too complicated to consider in this brief talk. I leave it aside with only the remark that while I do not believe college education should be vocational, yet I am not worried about the boy who devotes much of his time to one subject because he is enthusiastic about it. Under proper influence and in the proper atmosphere he will obtain a liberal education by the only process which is really effective, self-education continuing throughout life.

So much for the educational side of a university. How about the other half of the phrase I quoted,—how about the advancement of learning? I say learning rather than knowledge, for I should like to include under one title not only the increase in our positive knowledge, the advances made in all science, but also the study and interpretation of those cultural values which come to us from the past. There never was a time when it was more essential to convince every youth who enters our academies of the importance of a knowledge of history:—of the truth of the ancient saying, “To be ignorant of what occurred before you were born is to be always a child.”

But let me ask you to consider what we owe in such matters to the labors of the scholars of the last one hundred years alone. Let me suggest that each of you devote a few moments to imagining what sort of a world we should be living in today if some demon could be summoned to blot out all the advancement of learning that has taken place in our universities since 1838. At that time, only a century ago, it was believed that the world had been created four thousand years before Christ; many even at-
tempted to define the moment as precisely as did a seventeenth
century Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge who fixed the time as nine
o'clock in the morning of October 23, 4004 B.C. To be sure, the
science of geology which had arisen during the last of the
eighteenth century had begun to make manifest some of the diffi­
culties in the older chronology, but there was not the faintest
idea of the tremendous periods of time involved in the evolution
of the earth's crust. Louis Agassiz, the Swiss naturalist who came
to the United States in 1848, was the first to suggest that there
had been ages of ice and to demonstrate their existence. A century
ago no fossil remains of man had been discovered; stone imple­
ments and other evidences of a long childhood of the human race
were not suspected. The sciences of anthropology and archae­
ology lay in the future.

History was thought of as the record of man's activities extend­
ing back, perhaps, to not more than a thousand or so years
before Christ. Man's past was believed to be limited by the
written documents which had survived, for archaeological excava­
tion as a method of studying the culture of ancient civilizations
was unknown. What such excavation has meant to our under­
standing of the history of the human race can hardly be over­
estimated. Our knowledge of Greece and Rome now stands in a
perspective undreamed of by those generations of scholars who
had only manuscripts to study. This extension during the last
century of academic history of our vision of the life of man and
the works of his spirit is in itself a monument to the labors of
the learned world.

An occasional glance over the shoulder toward the past seems
to be worth-while. Education is certainly one of the matters of
utmost concern to any land and particularly to a democracy.
Private education, public education, school, college and university
education, adult education,—around each of these words hovers
a multitude of controversial questions. Can any good citizen of
this country fail to take an interest in the educational problems
of his community?

But before one even starts on a discussion of the many debated
topics in school and college curricula, it is necessary to decide
one’s fundamental philosophy. Has our American idea of democracy of opportunity through education been worthwhile or not? Has our zeal to abolish illiteracy on the one hand and to promote the highest learning on the other been a thrust in the right direction? Fundamentally for many it comes down to something almost as simple as this: are you enthusiastic about what the human mind has accomplished in modern times or are you against it? Before you answer this question may I ask you to take a considered view of the last few hundred years and then turn and face the future. Only when we contemplate what human effort has accomplished can we understand the significance of what may lie ahead. Notice, please, I say, “may lie ahead.” There is no guarantee of its certainty but on the other hand only the most superficial thinker would imagine that we had reached automatically the end of a journey. We have only begun the process of understanding the animate and inanimate world of nature; we have only scratched the surface of our interpretation of man’s history and culture. The so-called “social sciences,” which include education, are in their infancy. For example there was not a single professor of economics in the United States before 1871. Consider how recently whole new vistas have been opened to our view and how little opportunity there has been as yet to explore these fields. Take the development of physical science as an analogy. Newton more than two hundred years ago completed the solution of the basis problems of mechanics but he spent a great deal more of his time on chemistry. He did not, however, succeed in making any progress whatsoever through the bewildering alchemy of his time. A hundred years of further slow germination was necessary before this particular science was ready to flower. If we can learn anything from such history it is surely that in the past patience and courage have won victories for the life of the spirit. Can we believe that in the future it will be otherwise?

And when we turn to science we have, of course, an even more dramatic contrast between today and the past. When I asked you a few moments ago to imagine what 1938 would be like without the last hundred years of scholarly and scientific research,
it was not the equivalent of asking you to re-live the life of a hundred years ago: that is quite a different story. I take it that much of our history has been quite independent of any intellectual or cultural forces generated in the universities of the world. The population would have increased, the country would have been settled, cities and towns constructed, and wars waged without benefit of the learned world. But without Faraday, Clark Maxwell, and a host of others we should have no science of electricity and therefore none of the benefits of its application on which we have come to depend. Would you care to employ a doctor who was deprived of all the knowledge of bacteriology which developed from Pasteur's first study of fermentations at the University of Lille? Would you wish to enter a hospital which had never been permitted to hear of the remarkable discovery in pure physics made by a professor in the little town of Würzburg,—the discovery of the X-rays? Neon signs may or may not be considered an asset of this modern civilization but helium balloons certainly promise to be. Do you realize that the discovery of these gases, present in minute traces in the air, came about because a professor in London University was worried about the weight of a quart of nitrogen, the common inert constituent of the atmosphere? Here was a scientist apparently wasting his time over a discrepancy in the weight of nitrogen prepared from the air or from certain chemicals,—a matter of a small fraction,—and yet from his curiosity came the discovery of helium, neon and the other rare gases.

There is a real danger that even those who are interested in advancing learning will be too practical in their judgments. The word research is so misused in these days as to have lost almost all significance. People are inclined to measure the value of a scientist's or scholar's work by its immediate utility. Nothing could be more foolish or short-sighted. Many of the most precious aspects of our present civilization have resulted from the labor of those who interested themselves only in useless knowledge.

But that is all in the past, it may be argued. Enough is enough—why continue this expensive and upsetting process of advancing knowledge? We hear some such mutterings, some talk of a
scientific moratorium, some shaking of the head about professors and their queer ways that threaten to ruin the world. But how many, having given any thought to the problem and having examined the historical record, will come forward and say, "Yes, this must all stop"? Day after day, year after year, the universities of this country are making important contributions to all branches of learning. Is this worth-while or not? It is for the country to answer. And in spite of momentary faltering and fears I for one have no doubt of what the eventual answer will be.

In 1925 I was in Germany. You may recall that this was just after the hideous inflation. The inflation was over, but not the misery it had left behind. I believe it is impossible for most of us to realize the devastation of the period,—the poverty on all sides. And yet one day in a town in Southern Germany, I saw a large poster announcing an appeal for money,—an appeal for funds to build a new dirigible. Not for militaristic or commercial purposes, but as a continuation of a great German adventure in Science. Remember the poverty of the country, and remember also that it was the Germany of the Weimar Republic, a Germany still devoted to freedom of thought and science, and note the words of the appeal as I recall them.

"A country is poor only when its people are no longer interested in supporting great enterprises for the advancement of knowledge." Those brave words, gentlemen, sum up for me the spirit of enlightenment in a modern democracy. Though they come from another continent and a more ancient culture, yet they express, I believe, a spirit not alien to this great country of ours. If you agree with me in this you will be for the long pull an optimist about the future of American civilization.

Presentation of University History by the Author,
Dr. Jonas Viles, Professor of History

Dr. Viles: In this centennial celebration it has been my privilege to write the history of our first hundred years. It is the history of the evolution from the old classical college to our university of today, with its modern standards of scholarship and research and
of professional training. It is the story also of broadening concepts of the functions of a state university and of its services to the people of the state.

My task has been a pleasant one, deepening and strengthening my respect for our institution and its honesty and intellectual integrity. It is an honorable record which I now present to you.

President Middlebush: Dr. Viles, It is with a sense of deep obligation to you and your associates that I, acting in behalf of the University of Missouri, accept this record of one hundred years of useful service. May this history furnish all of those who are responsible for the continued progress of the University, with a helpful and sure guide for our future development which must always rest on the solid foundation laid in the past.

In making this record available to us, you have rendered the University a great service, for which we express our deep appreciation.

The next speaker also came into the presidency of a great university as a young man. He has brought to that high office the practical application of a unique combination of qualities, fine business sense, a lively appreciation of the real tasks a modern university has set before it, and a spirit of high idealism. I take great pleasure in introducing to you Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, President of the University of California, who will speak to you on the subject:

Can Democracy Survive Without Indoctrination?

President Sproul: The feeling of satisfaction which I bring with me to this occasion is deep and profound. There is in it, of course, a little of that homely pleasure which almost all of us derive from any opportunity to talk for half an hour or so to an appreciative and attentive audience. But transcending this ebullition of human nature there is a clear consciousness of participating in and perhaps contributing to an historic event.

The United States is still a very young nation. Few of its institutions have as yet achieved the dignity that must have been
Methuselah's, even in his early youth. Particularly may this be said of state universities. The number of universities of this kind founded earlier than the University of Missouri could almost be counted on the fingers of one hand, and there is thus given to this centennial celebration a significance which cannot be gleaned from the simple statement that February 11, 1939, was the one hundredth anniversary of the establishing of a public university by the legislature of the State of Missouri. I am no worshipper of old age, per se. But I have a deep respect for the experience that only age can supply, and for the stability that wisely selected and honored traditions can bring to a human society.

Were Harvard University a creation of this generation instead of the heritage of three centuries of human endeavor, we would not respect it as we do, were its faculty twice as distinguished, its facilities many-fold greater. No lasting human endeavor can be completed over night. Only time can reveal where we have builded well, and where we have been in error. The people of the State of Missouri are to be congratulated on what they have accomplished. Their contribution to one of the most interesting educational experiments in the history of mankind, the public university, is a large one. The University of Missouri is a sign unto us of what patience and perseverance can accomplish. We need such witnesses in this age of skepticism and skepticism's corollary, fear. We need to be reminded that the greatest achievements of men come to fruition not in the generation that conceived them, but in generations yet unborn. The founders of this university worked in accordance with that principle; so should we.

But even these reflections do not convey to you the personal satisfaction that I feel in being here today. This is a birthday party. And I am here as a representative of one of the University of Missouri's younger sisters, the University of California, able to claim only seventy-one years but large and husky for her age, extremely precious we believe—nevertheless, still in her infancy. Some day, if higher education in our state can win the race with catastrophe, as represented by Ham and Eggs and other crackpot schemes, the University of California will celebrate her one hundredth anniversary. I may be there—Providence willing—
and I consider myself most fortunate to acquire the experience in centennials which the University of Missouri so kindly affords me.

The University of Missouri was closing her rather hectic third decade of educational service when the University of California was nothing more than a paper charter. Among the earliest gifts to our library was a Catalogue and Announcement of the University of Missouri for the year 1870. I asked to see that catalogue a week or two ago and from it I gathered something of the spirit of the pioneers who fought for this institution and laid its substantial foundations. There is something most impressive about the fact that when the idea of a university was proposed, the frontier settlers of Boone County, less than 14,000 in number, and many of them unable to read or write, raised $117,900 to make the proposed university a reality and to have it located in their midst. They recognized the need of a university. They understood, as did President Conant's Germans, that "A country is poor only when its people are no longer interested in supporting great enterprises for the advancement of knowledge."

For them, moreover, a university was a cultural center in the broadest sense of the term. That is indicated by the rules of conduct for students which were still carried on the books in 1870. There I found this simple straightforward statement: "The discipline of the University is intended to be mild and suasive—as far as circumstances permit. If, however, students manifest such moral obliquities, or such idleness as renders them unworthy members of the body collegiate, they are returned to their friends without exposure—when it is practicable to do so." The rules of conduct explicitly stated that the institution existed for the "good and virtuous, not for the idle and disorderly, or the vile and vicious." It was forbidden to carry concealed weapons, to enter a saloon or billiard hall on any pretext whatsoever, to indulge in profane language, to smoke anywhere on the grounds, to whittle any of the buildings, to spit on the floor, to make unseemly gestures in the classroom, or to indulge in any wicked and immoral practices and habits not countenanced by cultivated families.

From these early beginnings, through a civil war, a number of depressions, and at least two disastrous fires, the University of
Missouri has steadily grown and developed to its present position of eminence.

In alluding to some of the humorous elements in the history of this institution my purpose is not merely to add a bit of gaiety to this ceremonious gathering, but, more pertinently, to illustrate how funny serious problems of the past can seem to us now, and to remind ourselves thereby that many of the present problems of the university and of society, over which we wrangle and debate, will equally be cause for laughter to our successors. So, "if eventually, why not now?" There are too many people wandering about our campuses who have mislaid their sense of humor. We find them among the youths of today who are appalled by the mistakes of the older generation, and among members of the older generation who are appalled by the effrontery of youth.

That the immediate future is laying upon the universities an important mission cannot be gainsaid. Nor am I able to reassure the University of Missouri by quoting the old bromide that "the first hundred years are the hardest," for I am by no means sure that it is applicable. Has any nation ever been more self-satisfied, more self-confident, more happy-go-lucky, than the United States of America during the past century? Not even World War Number One shook that careless confidence. But the swift events of the past decade, both internal and external, have brought us up sharply, and with an unwonted seriousness we are questioning many of the ideals and objectives to which we had given a facile and tacit, if not explicit acceptance. The task now confronting us is a sober re-evaluation of these ideals and objectives, and a renewal in the hearts and minds of the American people of the pioneering self-reliance of their forebears. From a thin line of thirteen states on the Atlantic seaboard, Americans of many origins have builded a nation across a continent to the shores of the Pacific, writing as they pressed on and on the American saga of freedom, equality, and opportunity. Along that march they paused to build here and there a university—sometimes public, sometimes private, but dedicated, all of them, to the same high purpose: education for democracy. Purely for purposes of con-
venience we may say that public universities are concerned with mass education, and that private universities are restricted to selective education, but both have more tasks which must be carried cooperatively than they have tasks that can be performed separately. Today, in their hour of need, the people are claiming from these universities the leadership they have every right to expect in the difficult work of re-evaluating our inheritance and of re-establishing a nation's self-confidence.

The American democracy is not feeling at all well. It is extremely depressed and the depression has given it a headache. Those who should know say there is nothing fundamentally wrong with it, but when a person thinks he is sick for all practical purposes he is sick. And it is the same with a nation. The United States of America has allowed itself to get into a spiritually run-down condition. We publicly assure ourselves of the truth, namely, that this malaise is mostly imaginary, and then irrationally we wonder privately whether it may not be, perhaps, the symptom of some deep-seated disease. We are aware that certain dangerous political plagues have assumed epidemic proportions in other parts of the world, and are so afraid that we are already contaminated or are about to be contaminated that we often act like hypochondriacs. Lifelong neighbors grow mutually suspicious because each thinks that the other is talking as if he had an incipient red, brown, or black pox. Intelligent men spend most of their energy seeking for a nostrum guaranteed to be a panacea against all political epidemics, and waste the rest of it arguing over the respective merits of their favorite remedies.

It seems fairly obvious to me that our troubles are more emotional than physical. We know that we can produce enough food and comforts for all our people, and we really believe that our system of government is fundamentally sound. In such circumstances, even superstition-ridden savages would recognize that the gods were favorable and that jubilation was in order. We have, of course, a few minor aches and pains of a physical nature. But I have a suspicion that if we were to collect ourselves and build a more serene mental and emotional attitude, we would find that some of them are caused by nervous indigestion on
the bicarbonate of soda and aspirin level, and others by the bind-
ing and pinching of outgrown and outworn economic and political
clothes. Yet so used are we to the discomforts these garments
now inflict upon us that, in our present mental state, they actually
seem to be tissue of our body politic. We can't so much as discuss
the insertion of a gusset in the back of our economic trousers
without having the radical element scream for surgeons and a
major operation, and the conservative element rail ominously of
undertakers and coffins. Surely this isn't the kind of democracy
that our forebears had in mind when they promulgated the Decla-
ration of Independence and wrote the Constitution of the United
States.

All of this may seem far afield from the future of education
and public universities, but I hope I can demonstrate that it is
most pertinent. When the Bill of Rights was added to the Con-
stitution of the United States, freedom of religious worship was
considered sufficiently important to be included in the first article.
Since then we have continued to regard the religious convictions
of the individual as so peculiarly his own that public schools are
usually forbidden by law to mention the subject. The wisdom
of this is clear to all who observe the evangelistic rivalry of the
many sects into which Christianity has disintegrated, who recog-
nize that many non-Christian faiths are represented in the United
States, and who reflect that freedom of worship implies freedom
not to worship if the individual so desires. But, unfortunately,
in excluding religion from the public schools we have tended to
exclude or neglect the preceptual teaching of morals, ethics, and
social philosophy. Two reasons were probably operative. Differ-
ent moral codes tend to link themselves to different religious and
social groups. Like religion they are sectarian, and one man's
morals are often another man's immorality. Perhaps we were
right in refusing to impart any particular code of morals, or con-
flicting codes of morals, in the public schools. But did we not
fall into a more serious error when we failed to recognize that
religious worship is only one aspect of the process of character
building: that character building is a phase, an extremely im-
portant phase, of the education of youth, and that, as such, it is
much broader, it goes much deeper than sectarian creeds or morals? It is questionable, I think, whether we are right in avoiding the entire subject and deliberately leaving this field of education to the church and the family. Through the changing years both church and family have suffered from handicaps: the church from declining interest and conflicting ideals; the family from many causes. Families have been more numerous, but they have grown smaller, and they have lost much of their group spirit and unity, especially in large cities. Times change and knowledge increases so rapidly that the elders of a family no longer appear to be oracles of wisdom to their children. They are out of date on so many practical things that children tend to disregard all of their teachings as equally obsolete. The family fireside, around which once developed the strength and wisdom of a family philosophy, and where character and personality flowered in the loving nurture of family loyalty, has in many instances given way to the radiator or the hot-air register; where the fireside still exists, it tends to be merely a spot where one pauses to flick the stub of one’s cigarette on the way to the movies.

Out of all these developments has come a very serious thing: a neglect of youth’s capacity for faith. Human beings are not machines. They won’t operate efficiently on fuel and physical attentions alone. Few, if any, human beings can live effectively or happily unless, consciously or unconsciously, they are building a shrine in which, item by item, they collect and cherish the ideas and the ideals in which they have faith. If American social institutions—the school, the church, and the family—do not supply this need deliberately, it will be met by the individual haphazardly. And it has. I cannot help but conclude that much of our present doubt and fear arises out of our neglect to meet youth’s need, and youth’s capacity, for faith.

In considering this situation we find that every converging road leads through or at least past the front door of the school. Youth cannot participate in twelve or sixteen years of book study and classroom lecturing without putting its faith in some reason for the activity. The psychologists tell us that self-interest determines all our attitudes and dictates the faith that we may have in
them. Probably it does. But there is a difference between an animal-type of self-interest, and the enlightened self-interest of boys and girls going through schools and colleges. In the absence of convincing guidance, the majority of them, so far, have selected the first and simplest explanation of their school careers that came to their attention. They went to school so as to be able to compete more successfully with their fellows, and to outstrip some of them in the race for money, power, and social status. We can't condemn them for this choice, few convincing alternatives were impressed upon their minds. America does have other ideals, of course, but none has been more dominant in American society, none more consistently adhered to, than that of personal advancement through financial power, too often attained through the exploitation of one's fellowmen. Now even that objective appears to be shattered. Not even the assurance of economic security, let alone the hope of wealth, remains to justify learning. The result is akin to chaos. A university president sees it in the minds of the young men and women around him every day. They are trying to reason themselves out of their dilemma. They are thinking more than they ever have in the past. But they are also showing a dangerous tendency to run like frightened sheep after any bell-wether that promises to find them a new Shangri-La on the other side of the mountain.

This nation has reached a point where the process of letting nature take its course will no longer suffice. The civilization carved out by the pioneers and the democracy cemented at Gettysburg, need spokesmen to restate the fundamental beliefs broadly outlined in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. But more than restatement is needed; there must be translation of these fundamentals in terms pertinent to the new agencies of the twentieth century and to the accelerated tempo of daily living. The average citizen—and especially the young men and women—needs a clear reformulation of our democratic philosophy of life, as expressed that, upon it, he may build, in confident stability, his personal and family attitudes. For none of us, as Daniel A. Prescott has pointed out in his comprehensive work on "Emotion and the Educative Process," has the time or
the inclination to think through every question of behavior that arises in his life. He must build attitudes in conformance with which he can make automatic judgments. And if those attitudes and decisions are to be socially desirable they must be basally agreed upon by a majority of men. A man lacking attitudes, with no personal philosophy, or without ideals of some kind, would worry himself sick in an effort to direct the course of his life for a year. It we want to live in harmony and maintain a democracy against forces that both openly and invidiously threaten its very existence, we must give more attention to the capacity for faith which our people possess, and agree upon a community of attitudes to be transmitted to our children.

No one knows better than I that this is dangerous ground. One who suggests instruction in any moral, ethical, political, or personal philosophy for our boys and girls and young men and women is instantly assailed with the cry of "indoctrination" something altogether opposed to all democratic principles, something tending toward totalitarianism. That people can so conceive of it simply shows how much more astute than we the totalitarian dictators have been. They have been wise enough to see youth's need for something to believe in, some object of faith. If people can't find a legitimate object with which to fill their capacity for faith, they will listen to the promises of political messiahs, or to quack medicine salesmen, or to the leader of some exotic cult. The trend of the times is indicated in many ways. The Oxford Movement was of little consequence until it adopted "Moral Rearmament" as its slogan. Then it swept around the world because it announced a concrete solution of a pressing problem, in which the people might put their faith. Gerald Heard's latest book, *The Third Morality*, is another groping attempt to supply a felt human need for a star to which mankind may hitch its wagon. Some day the human race may reach a super-human peak of pure reason from which all problems may be analyzed and solved on strictly rational grounds. But we haven't reached that peak yet, and if we ever do I have a feeling that it may prove to be a place most bleak and cold.

Let me try to clarify my meaning of this word, indoctrination.
All education is indoctrination after a fashion. Certainly, all education starts with a process of indoctrination. Some children even have to be "indoctrinated" with the idea that schools are worth going to before they will start their formal educations. No individual is born with a knowledge of the responsibilities of social living. If he is going to live successfully as a member of any society he must be taught the rules of the game. And we can't wait for him to learn these rules by trial and error, or allow him to make his own selection from them. At home and at school we attempt to "indoctrinate" a boy or girl with certain attitudes towards his playmates, his brothers and sisters, his parents, other adults in the community, and finally toward himself. Some of our rules of personal and social behavior might be improved upon, but we don't, for that reason, ignore them and let children run wild. We do the best we can to give them a foundation of fairly satisfactory attitudes by "indoctrination" and let our doubts about them wait until the child has developed sufficiently mature judgment to handle doubtful situations with diplomacy.

I believe that we need to do more of this kind of "indoctrination" on the relation of the individual to the particular kind of society in which we live—a democratic society in which a sense of social responsibility is far more important than it is in a dictatorship. We do not hesitate to "indoctrinate" children with the idea that good health is a great asset in happy living. Nor do we, because of our realization that much is yet to be learned about the proper care of the body, hesitate to "indoctrinate" our children with the rules of personal hygiene which seem to us most effective at the moment. We need to take a similar attitude toward social and political hygiene and toward all the individual's relations to the ideals and objectives of democratic government. We may be violently sectarian concerning how the objectives of democracy can best be achieved, but certainly the majority of us are in agreement on the ideals themselves and on the kind of behavior that is desirable for democratic citizens. If we are not agreed, and can't agree, then democracy is a failure; and I refuse to be persuaded of any such conclusion.

Freedom of thinking must be preserved, of course, but that
guaranty of democracy does not imply the excesses of intellectual or cultural anarchy. If, in recurrent crises, we act like jitterbugs, is it not a sign that too little attention has been paid to character building on the democratic pattern? If there is fear for democracy's future, is it not because educational agencies have neglected an opportunity and a duty to "indoctrinate" the American people with the democratic ideal? A nation so imbued would possess a glowing faith in democracy that would far transcend everyday acquaintance with its weaknesses. If we are to build and maintain our American society, must we not supply through education some clear-cut and mutually shared objectives to which, as a people, we can pin our faith? To reiterate vague generalities isn't enough. Either the concepts of democracy must permeate our lives and determine our attitudes in the everyday business of the community or it will die of atrophy and its bones will be picked by the political harpies that every society supports, and which have a certain usefulness if their activities are confined to their legitimate sphere of scavenging. As a people we need certain common social habits, imbedded in rock, not sand, habits that can't be shaken by every windstorm of doubt, or difficulty, or depression. Social habits are the forces that make possible orderly human societies. They are developed through discipline of the human spirit in its struggle to meet human needs and human desires. These things are utterly beyond the satisfactions of science or the gratifications of materialism. Nor are they to be interpreted purely in economic terms or constructed upon economic foundations. Efficiency has a hollow ring when set up as a substitute for the joy of human service. A nation dies when its ideals wear out, and neither scientific progress nor technological advancement are prophylactics against the decay of man.

All the more strongly, therefore, should democracy cherish those social habits peculiar to it, those skills in which it has acquired some certainty. And we who represent the major educational agencies of our country should bend more diligently to our task of nurturing in our citizens—Indoctrinating, if it please you—the democratic concept of the dignity of the human spirit, the value of the individual. To paraphrase Aristotle: "The good of man
must be the end of the University. To secure the good of a single individual is better than nothing. But to secure the good of a nation or state is a nobler and more divine achievement.” Whether America shall be exalted or debased rests with her citizens. Today they are called upon to make serious decisions in practical action that are vital to the future of a government “of the people, for the people, by the people.” They need reassurance, a renascence of their faith in the American tradition and guidance in its application to new and unfamiliar situations. There is a challenge here to the American school system, and especially to the universities; almost a Macedonian cry on the part of those in the press of the conflicts, that the universities send forth men qualified in every sense, for the leadership of a great and responsible nation—leaders who will make available to the people accurate knowledge and clear interpretations of tangled issues, leaders who will keep faith with America.

Thanksgiving

RT. REV. JOSEPH CORRIGAN: It is fitting and just, Eternal Father, that we give thanks to Thee always for all Thy benefits. Therefore as we close this Convocation
For the inspiration of this hour
For the proven fruits of a hundred years just now passing into history and memories
For the promise of greater fruitfulness in this University’s work in a new centennial program
For these, as for all other gifts, we lift grateful hearts to Thee, Father of us all, Who livest and reignest
God world without end. Amen.
FOLLOWING THE ORIGINAL PLAN laid down by the Centennial Celebration Committee the alumni and former students of the University gathered in Jesse Auditorium on Saturday morning, November 4, at a special Alumni Convocation to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of their alma mater.

Although many alumni had participated in various other phases of the Celebration throughout the preceding months, the Alumni Convocation on November 4 climaxed the Centennial Celebration activities. Mr. Byron Spencer, of Kansas City, President of the University of Missouri Alumni Association, presided at the Convocation which opened with selections by the University Men’s Glee Club under the direction of Mr. Mark Bills. Judge Kimberugh Stone of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals delivered the principal address, following which an honorary membership in the Alumni Association was conferred upon President Frederick A. Middlebush by Mr. R. B. Caldwell of Kansas City. In the presentation speech Mr. Caldwell pointed out that he had always regretted that Dr. Middlebush had graduated from the University of Michigan and not the University of Missouri. However, he continued in praise of the work Dr. Middlebush had done as professor, then later dean, and now president.

Replying to Mr. Caldwell, Dr. Middlebush expressed his appreciation and said that he had always felt like a Missouri alumnus and now that it was official, he was extremely happy. Continuing, Dr. Middlebush announced the formation of a bequest program for the University. He stated that a bequest program committee had been appointed to outline a plan whereby the attention of alumni and friends of the University shall be called to the idea of including in wills, insurance policies, and other forms of disposi-
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The bequest committee announced by President Middlebush was composed of the following: Chairman, Earl Nelson, St. Louis, representing the School of Law; School of Journalism, C. C. Clayton, St. Louis; Arts and Science, Milton R. Stahl, St. Louis; Education, Henry J. Gerling, St. Louis; Medicine, Dr. Thomas G. Orr, Kansas City; Agriculture, Clay Stark, Louisiana; Business and Public Administration, T. S. Vickroy, St. Louis; Engineering, Carl W. Brown, Jefferson City; and Graduate School, David W. Hopkins, St. Joseph.

Officers of the University are ex officio members and David A. Blanton, St. Louis; Frank Mann, Springfield; H. I. Himmelberger, Cape Girardeau; Lawrence P. Bonfoey, Quincy, Ill.; and Raymond W. Hall, Kansas City, are members at large.

President Middlebush called attention to the student activity building being prepared by remodeling Read Hall, former dormitory for women. He said it will serve a great need temporarily, but would not supplant the projected Union Building which was started in the early twenties by alumni and students. With more than 5500 students enrolled in the University, the necessity of having a union and student activity building of major proportions is tremendous, he said.

The exercises closed with the singing of “Old Missouri.”

Following is the text of Judge Stone’s centennial alumni address:

JUDGE STONE: This centennial celebration is drawing toward an end. I am asked to contribute a word on behalf of the alumni. I claim but two qualifications so to do: a sustained family loyalty to the University and a rather long personal affection for it—for three generations, members of my family have attended this school; and I have known it rather well during one-half its life, as I matriculated just fifty years ago.

In any birthday celebration, time necessarily is somewhat in our thoughts. As to men, we think in terms of years while, as to great human institutions, we think in terms of centuries. There is significance in this difference. There is a justified sense of comparison between the transitory and the enduring. In considering the enduring, time figures chiefly as a measure of the pace of
progress. It is only in that sense, I wish to think of time today.

There are innumerable phases of the progress of this University. Many have been better treated by others heretofore during this celebration. I desire simply to emphasize briefly some aspects closely related to and of special interest to the alumni.

But first, let us have in mind the real significance of what we mean by the alumni. I like to think of them as so much man power, efficiently trained here in body and mind and spirit, going out, through the years, to carry on and lead in making ever greater, finer and better our State and our Nation.

One aspect of this alumni influence is numerical. The first graduating class, in 1843, had but two members—both of the same family and residing in the same county. The various graduating classes this year (in June and in August) reached the total of one thousand three hundred and forty-four members—who came from every county in the State, from many other States and from not a few foreign countries. To date, approximately fifty thousand graduates have passed out from this school and many more others have received instruction short of graduation. These young men and women have gone back into every community of this State, into every State of this Union and into many foreign countries.

Impressive as are these statistics of growth, the effects of these alumni upon the life and development of this State and Nation—yes, sometimes upon world values too—is of vastly more importance. Let no one think that their influence has not been greatly aided and much increased because of this University education. Education has been well defined as “the process by which each individual creates his own universe and determines its dimensions.” The University has expanded the personal universe of every student it has had and, because thereof, has sent him or her out with this wider view and influence. But education is not insulated into the growth of the individual student. It radiates from him; and through him affects the family, the community, the State and the Nation—and even, mayhap—the civilization of the world itself.

This effect upon others is most discernible in the great men which the school has produced in many lines of human thought
and action. These men are too numerous even to example by name. Great scientists, great scholars and educators, great men in the professions and in business, great statesmen, great soldiers and great divines. But apart from these outstanding individuals, the continued, cumulative influence of those who have not attained pronounced individual distinction is beyond all calculation. These humbler ones may not have glowed or flashed upon the mountain peaks but they have vastly increased the light and the warmth of the valley lands where most of us must abide. If you have an imagination which has the wings of the morning and which takes no heed of time nor space you can better estimate the influence of those who have attended this University than can I. I can generalize only that I know the sway of the University for good, through the years, has increasingly gone deeper and has reached wide horizons. Also I can say this: an indubitable effect of the University has been a substantial contribution to the development of our American culture.

I borrow from another when I say that the prime purpose of education in this country is to develop an American culture. I am aware that we have gained and we can gain much from the cultures of other peoples. But if such contributions are to be really gain, they must come through discriminating selection and adaptation and not through wholesale imitation.

The culture of a people is the tree which grows upward from a soil composed of all the innumerable and varied elements—from barest necessities to highest aspirations—which make up the composite life of that people. From that soil it has its being and derives its vigor and direction. Elements in other cultures may enrich that soil. They can never replace it. This truth is more emphatically so of our people than of any other important nation on earth. Some of the reasons for this are because our beginnings were small and were in a virgin land, thus opening opportunities for freer growth; and because our subsequent accretions from the outside have been from the cultures of no one but all of the older countries; thus escaping the binding effects of any particular culture. This situation accentuates the desirability—yes, the necessity—of developing our own culture if it is to be healthy and worthwhile to us.
I like to think that this middle western country is particularly well fitted to develop this American culture, because of our newness and the relatively small direct foreign influence in our midst. I like to think that this University, because it is a State institution, because it is in the heart of this country and because it stems from pioneer days, can be peculiarly effective as an agency to promote such development.

Certainly it is doing this vital work. In its academic department, it is sending out men and women with minds trained to think and stored with useful knowledge. It is sending out those from the various professional schools well equipped to begin their individual life works but, even more, with an appreciation of the relation of such work to the public good—doctors who will contribute to the bettering of the health of the State and Nation; lawyers who will help preserve our ideals of justice and liberty; farmers who will intellectualize and develop that greatest of our callings; engineers, who will make life easier and more enjoyable; trained business men who will promote the efficiency and the ethical standards of business; teachers who will train our youth to think clearly, courageously and sanely; newspapermen who will respond to their great opportunities and responsibilities of influencing public thought and action; research men in all lines, who will make this country a better place wherein to live. This is what the University is doing.

Now a word as to the duty of the alumni in forwarding this work. Our obligations to the University are great. We should try to measure up to them. We should see to it that the University continues to grow in its power to develop this American culture. To do this we should see that it does not lack in material welfare, so that it may maintain an outstanding, well paid faculty; and that it may have the proper physical equipment. We should extend its influence by directing the attention of young men and women to its outstanding advantages, so that they may carry its benefits to the people in ever increasing measure.

Also, we should be on guard to protect it from subversive influences from without or within. If such influences come from without, we can take such individual or united action as the
particular situation may demand. If such are within the University itself, we had best rely upon the faculty administration and the Curators. We may advise and counsel. We may not dictate nor direct.

It is in this sense of intended helpful counsel that I venture a suggestion. In all controversial fields of study—whether of a social, political, economic or religious character—the function of the teacher, in a school maintained by all of the people, is to reveal and not to advocate. Intense public antagonism to the University will be created if it be utilized as a place for proselyting particular doctrines on controversial subjects and, far worse, such antagonism will be justified. This school was well nigh wrecked by the one attempt in its history to embark upon such a course. The result was that the legislature, in 1855, declared vacant the offices of the president and all professors and tutors because of the partisan and sectarian attitude of President Shannon. After all, it is the truth which makes and keeps us free. It is the right of the Missouri boys and girls to choose for themselves. They need only be told the facts fairly and dispassionately.

I advert especially to this not because of any present condition in the University, but because our country is overflowing with propaganda of all kinds—a substantial amount of which is directed at young people in particular. Coming from many sources, it is unavoidable. Coming in the classroom with the high authority of a teacher to a student, it has no place in a State supported school. The alumni and the people of this State are not supporting and will not support a school for the purpose of producing either Catholics or Protestants, democrats or republicans, liberals or conservatives, communists or nazis. They want their school to produce intelligent, high minded, courageous, free thinking and free acting Americans. That is what this University has done in the past and what it is doing now.

Having in mind the fine way in which the Curators, the presidents and the faculties of the past up to this day have held the University to its true purpose of developing our American culture by producing fine, upstanding American men and women, small gift of prophecy is needed to envision an ever expanding useful-
ness and benefit to the State and to the Nation from this school. Gentlemen of the Board of Curators, President Middlebush and gentlemen of the faculties, because of our belief in this fine future for the University, and our belief in your deep intention and your entire ability to guide the University farther onward in its great destiny, it is with enthusiastic confidence that we, the alumni, wish you and our beloved school God speed.

* * *

Special guests of honor at the Alumni Centennial Celebration were the twenty-nine members of Company I of the 5th Missouri volunteers of the Spanish-American War, who held their 41st anniversary reunion on the University campus during the weekend of November 3 and 4.

Those attending the reunion were as follows: Gilbert Barlow, Bethany; Charles M. Barnes, Marston; Jesse Bateman and Ezra Berry, Columbia; Robert W. Brown, Jefferson City; Stephen S. Carroll, Kansas City; George W. Corrigan, Pasadena, California; Samuel O. Craig, Bowling Green; Harvey D. Dow, Sedalia; Raymond S. Edmunds, Miami, Mo.; Hollis Edwards, Columbia; Col. George H. English, Washington, D. C.

Hugh E. Hall, Columbia; Walter Ham, Verona, Mo.; Adam Hill, Independence; Thomas P. (X-Ray) Howard, Los Angeles; Walter C. Kerr, Perry; Robert L. Kirk, Portland, Ore.; John H. Lanning, Festus, Mo.; Walter W. Lewelling, St. Louis; Bart M. Lockwood, St. Joseph; John H. Norton, Sacramento, California; Jesse M. Owen, Union, Mo.; James E. Peeler, Marshall; Dr. Charles L. Parkhurst, Houstonia; Walter Rick, Webster Groves; Elmer E. Pearcy, St. Louis; Edwin D. Smith, Dayton, O.; and Royall Switzler, St. Louis.
ADVANCEMENT of the higher education ideal in the State of Missouri and of the University as an expression and instrumentality of that ideal were primary considerations of the Board of Curators when the Centennial program was originally outlined. As an institution dedicated to the service of the state and its citizenry, the University played a significant role in the history and development of Missouri. The Centennial Celebration was deemed an appropriate opportunity to acquaint the people with the University’s achievements in the past and with the advantages which it might offer in the future.

To bring the general public within the scope of the program, the General Alumni Association through its scores of local organizations provided effective channels through which those persons who otherwise would have no connection with the University were acquainted with its story.

For administrative purposes the state alumni association had already been organized into thirty-one zones representing the 114 Missouri counties. Each zone or district has its own organization as well as each county comprising the district. The opportunities here were obvious.

In all, twenty-one separate celebrations of the Centennial were held throughout the state with the University’s administration, the alumni office, the friends of the University, and the alumni themselves in the various localities cooperating. In each instance the alumni on the scene planned the meeting, which in most cases was a banquet, and attended to details. To create an audience representative of that district, local service clubs, Chambers of Commerce, Rotary, Kiwanis, Commercial Clubs and other civic groups, were invited to participate and their response was immediate and enthusiastic. The meetings became community undertakings.
The principal speaker on each of these occasions was a representative from the University, Dr. Middlebush, president of the University; R. L. Hill, director of alumni activities; deans, department heads, and other University officials.

Civic leaders, school administrative and faculty persons, and members of the clergy, whether or not they were alumni, were brought into close contact with the work of the University. Probably at no other time in the school's history has the public which it served been so well acquainted with its achievements and aspirations.

Major celebrations were staged in Kansas City, St. Joseph, Joplin, Hannibal, Jefferson City, and Columbia and the attendance, drawn not only from these cities but also from the surrounding counties, numbered in the hundreds at each gathering. Smaller but no less important meetings were held in Charleston, Caruthersville, Poplar Bluff, Butler, Fayette, Neosho, Farmington, Mountain Grove, Springfield, Bethany, Bolivar, Rolla, Warrenton, Montgomery City, Hamilton, Lebanon, and Union. Every section of the state was afforded an opportunity to join in the year-long observance. The resultant enthusiasm and good will were gratifying to the sponsors.

Not to be overlooked were the celebrations sponsored by the General Alumni Association outside the state in cities such as Washington, New York, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Dallas. These were essentially alumni gatherings at which a University official conveyed greetings from the campus.

Following the basic plan which had been carried out throughout the entire state the Columbia Chamber of Commerce with the cooperation of the other civic organizations and the local alumni group sponsored a Columbia and Boone County Centennial Banquet which was held at the Tiger Hotel on the evening of November 2.

Mr. John M. Allton, President of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce, presided at the banquet. Following selections by the University string quartet and the Men's Glee Club the officers of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce were introduced.

The principal addresses of the evening were given by Mr. E.
Sydney Stephens, who spoke on "Town and Gown," and Judge North Todd Gentry, who introduced the descendants of the original donors to the University alumni.

Their addresses were as follows:

**TOWN AND GOWN: A CENTURY OF RELATIONSHIPS**

*By E. Sydney Stephens*

"A people, which has no pride in the noble achievements of remote ancestors will never achieve anything worthy to be remembered with pride by remote descendants."—Macauley.

The University of Missouri was established on February 11, 1839, when Governor Lilburn W. Boggs signed the Geyer Act; but the story of its foundation begins twenty-five years earlier. It begins when the pioneers made their migration to Boone County from Virginia by way of Kentucky from 1815 to 1825, and who brought with them an appreciation of the value of college training; it begins when Missouri was admitted to the Union and thus became eligible for the seminary grant from the federal government; it begins when Boone County was organized in November, 1820, and when Columbia was moved the same year from the heights of Smithton to the beneficent waters of Flat Branch.

The pioneers, who settled in Boone County, cleared the forests, fought the Indians and established what are now Columbia and Boone County, were fired with a zeal for education that is unsurpassed in the history of this country. Speaking in 1890 at the semi-centennial celebration of the founding of the University, General Odon Guitar, distinguished soldier and jurist, made this statement:

“When I assert that the voluntary gift of one hundred and eighteen thousand dollars in 1839, to the State of Missouri, with which to found this institution, was an act of munificence without a parallel in all the history of mankind from the dawn of creation to this hour, I intend it as no mere laudatory, or boastful declaration. History will vindicate its truth.”

The General may have been extravagant in his statement, but
the fact remains that the enterprise, the energy, the determination and the self-sacrifice, of those early pioneers will remain as an outstanding achievement in the annals of American public education, and they should be a stirring inspiration to those of us who now enjoy the fruits of their labors.

Ten years before the establishment of the University, the citizens of this town and county began to demonstrate their determination to provide their children with the blessings of literary and scientific training. On the third Monday of May, 1829, Bonne Femme Academy was established on the banks of the creek which bears the same name. Warren Woodson was installed as teacher, a man, according to the announcement of the trustees, "competent to teach reading, writing, arithmetick, grammar, geography, the mathematicks, and some of the more ordinary branches of belle lettres." The schoolhouse, stated the announcement, was "a very commodious brick building, with two rooms, twenty-two feet square, situated in a healthy, highly moral and very respected neighborhood, possessing, perhaps, as many advantages for such an institution, and offering as many inducements to boarders from a distance, as any in the country. Terms of tuition per year, to consist of two sessions of five and a-half months each: $8 for reading, writing and arithmetic; $12 for grammar, geography, mathematics, &c., and $18 for the Latin language."

The trustees announced that boarding could be had with respectable families near the academy for $25 per session of five and a-half months, "washing, fuel, and candles included."

In 1832, the Columbia English and Classical Academy was established by Lyman Guernsey, with W. M. Kern as assistant. In 1834, J. Coleman Boggs, brother of Lilburn W. Boggs, Governor of Missouri, established Bear Creek Academy, in which were taught the "usual English branches and bookkeeping and surveying."

Columbia College, the real forerunner of the University, was established in Columbia in 1834. A contemporary commentator stated that the "day was not distant when the subject of the establishment of a state college would be agitating the Legislature
and that he had every reason to believe that it would be established in that village, centrally located, where the solicitude and anxiety has been manifested in the cause of literature.”

Columbia College was chartered by the Legislature in 1833 with the following trustees: Robert S. Barr, A. W. Rollins, Richard Gentry, Warren Woodson, Thomas W. Conyers, William P. Cochran, James W. Moss, William Cornelius, Oliver Parker, David S. Lamme, John B. Gordon, David Todd, and Sinclair Kirtley. Thomas Miller, a graduate of Indiana College and a classmate of Major James S. Rollins, was elected President. He served for four years, but resigned in 1838 on account of failing health.

There is every evidence that the mainspring of the movement for the creation of a state university was in Columbia, for in addition to the establishment of a number of local colleges and academies, the fostering of legislation, which ultimately created the University, was carried on principally by the representatives of Boone County in the General Assembly, and in the Constitutional Conventions of 1865 and 1875. During the period when the laws for that purpose were being considered, the county was represented in the House and in the Senate by: David M. Hickman, James S. Rollins, Alexander Persinger, Tyre Harris, John B. Gordon, Thomas C. Maupin and A. W. Turner, all of whom, by their energy, their eloquence and their persistent determination, impressed upon the Legislature the importance and value of a state system of education. The leader in the Legislative halls of the state and the nation, as well as in the county and throughout Missouri, was James S. Rollins, who for fifty-eight years made the University the subject of his constant and unwavering devotion and solicitude and who, through his liberality, influence and eloquence, justly earned the title of “Father of the University.”

By the Act of Congress of January 24, 1827, two townships of land, approximately 48,000 acres, were donated by the United States government to the State of Missouri for the purpose of a seminary of learning; and by an act of December 31, 1831, the state was authorized to sell these lands and to invest the proceeds “solely for the use of such seminary and for no other purpose.” The lands were subsequently sold, for the sum of $78,000, which,
under act of the Legislature, was invested in the stock of the bank of the State of Missouri. It is interesting to note that the greater part of these lands were located in Jackson County, 7,612 acres within the present limits of Kansas City. Undoubtedly, they were worth, even at that time, much more than was realized from them. If retained today, they would constitute an endowment adequate to support the present activities of the University.

That legislation for the establishment, expansion and support of the University has been secured, from the beginning and throughout its history, only after severe struggle is evident from the proceedings of the General Assembly. In 1838, David R. Atchison, of Clay County, afterwards United States Senator, offered a resolution in the House that “it is expedient to locate a State Seminary at this session.” Immediately John Miller, of Cooper County, moved to amend the resolution by placing the prefix “in” before the word “expedient.” Then the fight started. Numerous amendments were offered, all designed to obstruct and defeat proposed legislation. At the same session, Henry S. Geyer, of St. Louis, introduced a bill establishing the State University of Missouri, which, after long discussion and many amendments and heated debate, was enacted and on the 11th day of February, 1839, it was signed by Governor Boggs; and thus a University of Missouri was created, the first state university west of the Mississippi River.

Major James S. Rollins, at the same session, introduced and secured the passage of a companion bill providing that the site of the University should contain at least forty acres in compact form within two miles of the county seat of Cole, Cooper, Howard, Boone, Callaway or Saline Counties. It was to be awarded to the county which offered the largest amount of money and which afforded other facilities appropriate for that purpose. Pursuant to the bill, five commissioners to select the site were appointed. They were John G. Bryan, of Washington County; Chauncey Durkee, of Lewis; Archibald Gamble, of St. Louis; John S. Phelps, of Greene, afterwards Governor of Missouri; and Peter H. Burnett, of Clay, who became first Governor of the State of California.
Then came the tug of war. Saline County retired from the contest before the battle began, but the other five counties proceeded with vigor and determination to secure the coveted prize.

Let us have a look at the resources of Boone County when it entered that contest, keeping in mind that the competition was limited to a period of ninety days and that it extended from March first to June first, when most of the citizens of the county were in dire need of devoting their attention to the making of a living. The country had not recovered from the depression of 1837. Values were low, markets were almost completely absent and the state and county were only nineteen years old. There was no wealth and little earning power. The story, therefore, that I shall tell is not one of pretentious or impressive history, but rather the “simple annals of the poor.”

The population of Boone County was 13,361, composed of 5,504 white males; 5,025 white females; 3,008 slaves; and 32 free colored persons. Of the white male population, 571 could neither read nor write and yet Boone County subscribed to the establishment of the University the sum of $17,921.75, or an average of $53.50 for each white person over the age of twenty years. The revenue of the county, from all sources was $4,943, and thus to pay the subscription would have required the county’s entire income for more than twenty-four years. On the basis of present population, revenue and wealth, the contribution was the equivalent of $1,600,000.

The town of Columbia consisted of 700 inhabitants, white and black, free and slave. A contemporary account gives the following description of the community at that time: “It has nine stores, two taverns, four grog-shops, and but one meeting-house. Thus you see Bacchus has four temples—and I know not how many domestic altars—and God but one, in Columbia.”

Here is a financial statement of the period of the town of Columbia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total amount received from all sources within the year</td>
<td>$305.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount paid out within the same period</td>
<td>305.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in the Treasury</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no roads, bridges, telephones, or newspapers in the county. Living conditions were of the most meager nature; most of the houses were built of logs with puncheon floors; only the more prosperous citizens could afford houses with board floors and even those were of the roughest type.

My grandfather related to me the following experience of his family: Fearing an attack from Indians his father took the entire family and spent the night in the woods. On their return to their home the next morning, they found that the Indians had visited the house but had done no damage beyond the taking of the carcass of a bear which his father had killed the day before.

These were the conditions which faced the stalwart pioneers and educational zealots when they entered the lists to compete with their sister counties for the establishment of the institution for which they had so long labored. Under the leadership of James S. Rollins, Archibald W. Turner, John B. Gordon, Sinclair Kirtley, James M. Gordon, Warren Woodson, William Cornelius, Dr. A. W. Rollins, Dr. William Jewell, and Dr. William H. Duncan, the task was begun. Meetings were held throughout the county in churches, schoolhouses, beneath the “shade of arching oaks and on ‘muster-grounds’”. The canvass for funds extended from the mouth of Cedar Creek to the upper reaches of Callahan. At first it was thought that $50,000 would secure the prize and subscriptions were predicated on that basis, but it was later found that other counties had reached and surpassed that figure. The battle lines in Boone County were reformed, the forces were rallied and the task was resumed with fresh courage and determination and soon the $100,000 mark was reached and it was thought that victory was within grasp; but reports came that Callaway and Howard Counties had increased their subscriptions and so the attack was again renewed with the securing of the final figure of $117,921.75.

The commissioners appointed to consider proposals met in Jefferson City to open the bids, where it was found that Cole County had offered $30,000; Cooper, $40,000; Howard $94,000; Callaway, $96,000. The commission, by unanimous vote, awarded the location to Boone County.
There were 913 subscribers and with six exceptions, subscriptions ranged from $5.00 to $3,000. There were only three of the latter amount, those being by Eli E. Bass, Jefferson Garth, and Edward Camplin, the last of whom could not even write his name. Many of the lesser subscriptions were remarkable in the light of the resources of those who made them. Many gave more than they possessed at the time the subscriptions were taken. Others gave from one-fifth to one-third of their property. Mrs. Ann Gentry, widow of General Richard Gentry, who had lost his life in the Seminole War, subscribed $100, this despite the fact that she was compelled to support herself and nine children by operating a boarding house and serving as postmistress at a salary of $350 per year. Warren Woodson, county clerk, gave his entire annual salary of $1200. Charlie Burns, a Scotch well-digger gave $5.00, which was more than he was ever known to have possessed at one time, but the $5.00 was paid, as was every other dollar subscribed in the movement. Burns’ gift was as highly prized as that of his compatriot who gave to the establishment of Harvard University a peck of parched corn. A number of subscribers mortgaged their farms and homes to meet their pledges and in more than one instance the mortgages were foreclosed.

This demonstration of enterprise, foresight and self-sacrifice justifies the claim that the pioneers of Boone County established a record that has never been surpassed. The names of those who promoted the movement and who gave so unstintedly of their substance are recorded in the office of the Secretary of the University on a Roll of Honor. They should be engraved in bronze and prominently displayed so that this and succeeding generations may know to whom they are indebted for the institution which is the University of today.

The corner-stone laying ceremony for the erection of the original University building was held on July 4, 1840, and the structure was completed at a cost of $74,494. Thus the people of Boone County, without one cent of aid from the State of Missouri, and without touching a penny of the federal endowment resulting from the sale of seminary lands, had provided the nucleus of a great University.

The first President of the University was John Hiram Lathrop, of Hamilton College, New York. He assumed his duties in March, 1841, with three professors. The salary of the President, when he was elected was $2,500, but due to lack of adequate resources, he voluntarily reduced his compensation to $1,250 with additional compensation to be derived from a percentage of tuition, if and when it was available. The three professors received $500 each per year, with a similar participation in tuition fees. Their total compensation never exceeded $800.

Warren Woodson was the first Treasurer of the University and he was succeeded by Dr. William H. Duncan, who served from 1841 to 1855. He carried the funds of the University, as well as its financial records, in his pocket. His report showed that in November, 1841, there was a balance in the treasury of $20.00.

From the date of its establishment until 1857, the University did not receive one dollar from the state. It was supported during the first twenty-eight years of its existence by tuition, by the income from the federal endowment and by the liberality of the citizens of Boone County. Despite this fact, however, the Legislature, while denying the University any financial support, and failing to officially recognize it, had the temerity on December 4, 1855, to declare vacant all the offices held by the President, professors and tutors.

During the Civil War the University buildings were occupied by federal troops and used for barracks, prisons and stables for horses. Many of the fine forest trees which adorned the campus were destroyed by the soldiers and other acts of vandalism were committed.
The destruction of the President's residence by fire in November, 1865, was the circumstance that probably induced the Legislature to make its first financial contribution to the University. In 1867 it appropriated the sum of $10,000 for the construction of a "family-house" for the President. The appropriation bill was written and sponsored by James S. Rollins. It also provided that there should be "set aside and appropriated, annually, for the support of the State University of Missouri, out of the revenue of the State, after first deducting therefrom the one-fourth of the revenue for the Public School Fund, one and three-quarters percent of such balance of the State revenue; and this is declared to belong to the University, and shall be paid to the Treasurer of the Board of Curators, as provided for by law, for the payment of other funds of the University."

This provision was afterwards repealed. Had it been retained, it would have provided a fixed and substantial source of revenue for the institution.

From that date the University began to claim well deserved support from the State, but for a period of twenty-five years those claims were met with extreme parsimony on the part of the Legislature.

The federal government, having made possible the establishment of the institution by the creation of the seminary fund, again came to its aid in 1870, by a grant of 330,000 acres under the Act of Congress of 1862, sponsored by Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, supported by James S. Rollins, of Missouri, for the benefit of agricultural and mechanical colleges. It was not until 1870 that the Legislature was induced to give consideration to securing the benefits of that grant and even then the struggle was attended by great bitterness and opposition.

Once more, James S. Rollins, who was then a member of the State Senate, ably assisted by Francis T. Russell, Boone County Representative in the House, led the movement for the establishment at the University of the Agricultural College. The fight to prevent the establishment of the college continued with great force and bitterness, but finally an act was passed, and again the people of Boone County were called upon to make a contribution
in order to secure the location of the college in Columbia. At that time, instead of soliciting private subscriptions, it was decided to raise the funds by taxation. The sum of $90,000 was provided.

Active in the movement, besides Major Rollins, were Colonel William F. Switzler, Odon Guitar, Judge Boyle Gordon, James L. Stephens and others. $80,000 of bonds at 10% were issued by the County Court to provide its contribution to the enterprise. To this was added $10,000 by the trustees of the town of Columbia.

The news of the decision of the state officials who were to locate the College of Agriculture was awaited with great anxiety by the citizens of the county. As soon as the award was made, a messenger was dispatched from Jefferson City, who crossed the river in a rowboat, mounted a horse and proceeded to Columbia post-haste. Whereupon the occasion was celebrated by a public gathering where there was feasting, music, oratory and an appropriate supply of hard liquor.

Great as were the contributions of the citizens of Boone County to the establishment of the University and of the College of Agriculture, and helpful as were the recognitions of the institution by the Legislature subsequent to 1867, they were no more essential than the provision of the Constitution of 1875 which recognized the University as then organized and which provided that it should be maintained with its existing departments and which further provided that "the government of the University shall be vested in a Board of Curators to consist of nine members." That was the charter of liberty, the Magna Carta of the institution. It clothed the Board of Curators with the authority to organize the institution, to determine the qualifications of its staff and to fix their compensation. It afforded the means of emancipating the University from political control and of freeing it from the strait-jacket of administration by legislation.

Credit for that accomplishment belongs to Colonel William F. Switzler, who, as Chairman of the Committee on Education of the Constitutional Convention of 1875, proposed and secured the adoption of the measure.

Thus with the expansion and development of the University
and with its recognition by both the federal and state governments, it appeared that the institution was reasonably secure and its location permanent. Indeed so convinced was he of that fact that General Guitar, in his address on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary, made the following declaration:

"When, by the Act of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, of February 24, 1870, the 'College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts' was located at Columbia, as a department of the University, in consideration of $90,000 paid by Boone County and Columbia, the marriage bond between the institutions was made complete and irrevocable. The object and intent of the Federal Grant of July, 1862, had been carried out, and the title to the land therein granted absolutely and unconditionally vested in the 'Curators of the University of Missouri,' to be disposed of, and the proceeds applied, in manner as in said Act is provided. The court of last resort in this land, by adjudications, sanctified with age and of universal acceptance and authority, has set its seal upon the legal effect and binding force of the statutes referred to. Warring factions may disturb the public tranquility, and revolution shake the pillars of state, but as long as the state and national governments shall remain intact, these foundations will stand unshaken and unimpaired."

Thus General Guitar seemed convinced that the permanency of the location of the University and the College of Agriculture had been established beyond dispute. He was doomed to disappointment, however. Two years after that statement was made the main edifice was destroyed by fire and the following year, when the Legislature convened, the fight upon the institution was resumed and an effort which all but became successful to move the University away from Columbia was instituted. Indeed, the bill providing for the removal actually passed the Legislature and was only defeated after a motion to reconsider had been adopted.

Once more the people of this community were called upon to secure the retention of the institution in their midst. For that purpose they contributed $50,000, this time by popular subscription.

From the ashes of the main building, the State, for the first
time, proceeded to build a real University. For that purpose the Legislature made an appropriation of $236,577, from which together with the fire insurance on the main building and the $50,000 contributed by the citizens of Columbia, a number of the buildings occupying Francis Quadrangle were constructed.

It is well to remember, however, the enterprise of the citizens of this town at the time of the crisis created by the fire. It occurred on the evening of January 9, 1892, but classes were resumed, without interruption, on the following Monday morning. Every public building in Columbia was placed at the disposal of the University and classes were conducted just as if the conflagration had never occurred. Only two students went home. The enrollment of the institution at that time was approximately five hundred. It did not reach the one thousand mark until ten years or more later.

Beginning in 1867, the appropriations to the University by the Legislature at ten year intervals were: 1867, $21,388; 1877, $33,500; 1887, $98,461; 1891, $93,983; 1892, $236,577; 1893, $269,000; 1897, $105,000; 1907, $817,500; 1917, $1,349,397.34; 1927, $2,826,908.58; 1937, $4,063,155; and 1939, $4,075,496.

The enrollments at the same intervals were: 1867, 87; 1877, 399; 1887, 530; 1897, 701; 1909, 1,767; 1917, 3,085; 1927, 4,300; 1937, 4,638; and 1939, 5,568.

Co-incident with the construction of new buildings, in 1893, the preparatory department of the University was abolished and a system of accredited high schools throughout the State was inaugurated. As we have seen, enrollments increased, and appropriations by the State went forward in commensurate proportions with the growth of the institution.

Then came the World War and the desire on the part of the University to pay fitting tribute to its sons who made the supreme sacrifice in that struggle. The Memorial Tower and the Memorial Stadium were built, again with the aid of contributions of citizens of this community. Those contributions amounted to $90,000.

And thus we come to the end of one hundred years of relationship between town and gown. The people of this town and county are proud of the progress of the University. They are
grateful for the benefits which it provides. They have tried to be worthy of the trusteeship involved in its location here. They will continue to support it and not to obstruct or interfere with it.

What of the future? What obligations rest upon those of this and succeeding generations? For what purposes did the pioneers and those who followed them work and sacrifice to build this institution? Obviously they wanted, above all, the benefits of liberal education. They also wanted freedom of worship, but not unreasoning skepticism. They wanted freedom of speech and of the press, but not unbridled license. They wanted freedom of thought and academic freedom, but not of the type in the name of which crimes are sometimes committed. They wanted freedom of enterprise, but not regimentation or governmental paternalism. They wanted a republican social and political order, with representation of the minority as well as the majority, but not domination by the majority to the exclusion of the rights of the minority.

If we are grateful for the sacrifices of our forefathers and if we are worthy of the heritage which they have passed on to us, that is the kind of order we shall have in this State and in this nation.

ROLL CALL OF THE DESCENDANTS OF ORIGINAL DONORS

By Judge North Todd Gentry,
President of Boone County Historical Society

Many of the things that I shall mention this evening are well known to many of you; but we rejoice at the re-telling of them, for we are proud of our people who have done so much for this university, an institution which has accomplished so much and of which we are justly proud.

The people of Columbia and of Boone County have long been friends of education, especially higher education and they cherished the hope of having the University of Missouri located in their midst from the time of the laying out of Columbia. In 1821 the official plat of Columbia, now of record in Deed Book “A” at
page 104 in the Recorder's office of this county, shows that a piece of ground containing ten acres was reserved, as stated on the official plat, for a "Seminary of Learning." That ground is situated on the south side of West Broadway; and, while it was not used for a seminary, it is interesting to note that in 1909 it was acquired by the Columbia Board of Education, and one of Columbia's grade schools, the Grant school, was erected on it. The people of our town and our county, even at that early day, 1821, were looking forward to the location in their midst of an institution for the higher education of our youth.

Bonne Femme Academy, established in 1829, Columbia College, established in 1831, Columbia Female Academy, established in 1833, Bear Creek Academy, established in 1834, and Boonsborough Academy, established in 1836, give additional evidence of the interest of the early Boone countians in the cause of higher education. And Rocheport Academy, Ashland Academy and Lathrop Academy, and still later Welch's Military Academy and Missouri Bible College further emphasize that interest.

Captain Sinclair Kirtley, representative from Boone county in 1834, introduced a bill in the house of representatives, which provided for the establishment of a state university; but the bill failed of passage.

In 1839, as has already been mentioned, Major James S. Rollins, who was active in season and out of season in behalf of higher education, assisted by his associates John B. Gordon, Captain David M. Hickman, Alexander Persinger and Tyre Harris in the house of representatives, and by Hon. Archibald W. Turner and Thomas C. Maupin in the senate, sponsored the passage of the bill establishing the state university. It provided that the university should be located within two miles of the county-seat of one of six counties, Callaway, Boone, Howard, Saline, Cooper or Cole. Those counties were near the center of the state and on the Missouri river, and the principal means of transportation was then by river. The bill became a law upon its approval by Governor Lilburn W. Boggs on February 8, 1839; and it provided that the selection of the county in which the university was to be located was to be made on June 24, 1839 (See Laws of Mo.
1839, pp. 184, 5, 6 and 7); so the contest lasted from February till June, and a lively contest it was. Major James S. Rollins, assisted by John B. Gordon, A. W. Turner, Sinclair Kirtley, David M. Hickman, Alexander Persinger, Judge Warren Woodson, Tyre Harris, Elder Thomas M. Allen and others constituted the soliciting committee. And that committee made a campaign never before equaled, and it has never been equaled since then. Meetings were held in every part of Boone county, and it must be remembered that that was before there were any railroads or even gravel roads in our county; so the committee traveled on horse back. The census of the next year shows that Boone county had a population of thirteen thousand, but three thousand were slaves.

Mr. Stephens, in his admirable address this evening, mentioned the Scotchman who was a well digger and who subscribed five dollars; and it should also be mentioned that he paid his subscription fifty cents at a time, as did some of our other poor people. And by the way, while we give credit to the rich, who subscribed thousands of dollars, credit is due to the poor, who subscribed a few dollars, which meant as much to them as the thousands did to the rich. Mr. Stephens kindly mentioned my grand-mother Mrs. Ann Gentry, a widow and the mother of thirteen children, eight of whom were then living, who was a subscriber; and there were four other widows on that subscription list. And the list contained six ministers, who had small congregations, and each received a meager salary, and that was paid irregularly. Amos Marney, Young E. Hicks, George L. Hickam, Overton Harris and three others mortgaged their homes to pay their subscriptions, as often stated and as shown by our deed records. And William Lampton, who lived where the Columbia Tribune building now stands, had his home sold at auction to pay his three hundred and fifty dollar subscription. One man sold his saddle horse to pay his subscription, and another sold his cow and borrowed a cow to furnish his family milk for the coming winter. John B. Gordon, a Columbia lawyer, gave his home, which was Eleven-acre Lot No. 27 in Columbia, now a part of the West campus; and upon that Gordon ground Jesse Hall, Lee H. Tate Hall,
Swallow Hall, the President's house and parts of the Engineering and Education buildings now stand. Two men died before payment in full of their subscriptions; so (as shown by the county court records) the balances due by them were allowed as debts against their estates, and paid by their administrators.

Mr. Stephens just mentioned that every dollar of the subscription was paid; and that is correct. Some one has recently expressed a doubt as to the payment of one hundred and seventeen thousand nine hundred and twenty-one dollars at that early time. Of course, we all know that some like to belittle what others have done, and it is easy to find a person who doubts something that has been a recognized fact for so long a time. Dr. Samuel S. Laws once said, "I knew a man who doubted the existence of God, doubted the existence of the world, doubted his own existence, then doubted the doubt." I have heard Major Rollins, General Odon Guitar, Col. William F. Switzler and others state publicly that "every dollar of that subscription was paid;" and I have heard Dr. William H. Duncan, Dr. Walter T. Lenoir, R. B. Price and my father Thomas B. Gentry, all treasurers of the university, make similar statements; and I have heard Robert L. Todd, who was curator and secretary of the board of curators for twenty-five years, make the same statement; also Judge Boyle Gordon, Jefferson Garth, Sanford Connelly and General John Ellis. Certainly Missourians, who were in Boone county at that time, or shortly thereafter, know more about what occurred here than a man born and raised in a distant state who never visited Missouri till a few years ago. Col. Switzler, Missouri's greatest historian, in his history of the university, says, "Not a penny of the subscription was repudiated." And such careful students of history as Hon. E. W. Stephens, Dr. William Benjamin Smith, Dean Walter Williams and Secretary Floyd C. Shoemaker, have stated in print that "Every farthing of the subscription was paid." Besides the University catalogue says that the Boone county subscriptions were paid, and the money was used to pay for the erection and equipment of the first university building, for many years known as the "Main building." Had those subscriptions not been paid, the university building would not have been
erected, for the State of Missouri never made any appropriation for the university till 1867. I heard a gentleman, a visitor from another state, in speaking in the university auditorium about the Boone county subscription, say, "That was the first time in the history of the world that a county erected and equipped a state university."

Samuel Nichols, a tenant on a farm near Ashland, who in 1837 volunteered for service in the Florida Seminole Indian War, but who, so he told me, had not been able up to that time to cash his pay check for service in that war, subscribed twenty-five dollars.

Levi Park, an early constable of Columbia township, who could neither read nor write, subscribed two hundred dollars, and his wife counted out the money for him.

Dr. William Jewell, a Columbia physician and a man of means, subscribed eighteen hundred dollars; and ten years later donated ten thousand dollars to found William Jewell College, of Liberty, Missouri.

Mr. Stephens mentioned Edward Camplin, a farmer who resided one mile west of Columbia, who could neither read nor write, who was one of the three men to subscribe three thousand dollars each; Mr. Camplin saying that he had often felt the need of an education. Some one recently has questioned that statement, although Robert L. Todd, General Guitar and others have time and again said that he could neither read nor write. So if you will go with me to the Probate court of this county, I will show you the original will of Edward Camplin, witnessed by Robert L. Todd and others, and it was signed by Mr. Camplin, by making his cross mark. One year later Mr. Camplin executed a codicil to that will, and again he made his cross mark. Then go with me to the Recorder's office of this county, and I will show you three deeds, executed at different times by Mr. Camplin, and he made his cross mark in signing each one of them.

Col. Eli E. Bass, a farmer residing two miles north of Ashland, was the second three thousand dollar subscriber. Two of Col. Bass' grandchildren graduated at our university; Mrs. Margaret Bass Chamberlain became hostess at Read Hall, the first dormitory for young women, and his grandson Everett E. Bass became
superintendent of the public schools of Greenville, Mississippi, holding that position for thirty-eight years. After the death of this illustrious grandson, the people of that school district erected a four hundred thousand dollar high school building, which they named the “Everett E Bass High School.”

The third three thousand dollar subscriber was Jefferson Garth, a farmer who lived at what is now the northeast corner of Broadway and Garth avenue; to his friends, he was affectionately known as “Uncle Jeff.” Mr. Garth was one of the few men of 1839 to live till the burning of the university main building on the night of January 9, 1892. Then an effort was made to remove the university, some four of the smaller cities of our state being what might be termed aspirants for its location, and the Missouri general assembly was called on to decide. It became necessary for the people of Boone county to raise fifty thousand dollars to secure the re-location of the university in Columbia; and that money was donated to the state, with the understanding that it would be used in the erection of a building, a memorial to the men and women who subscribed so generously to the university fund in 1839. But such a building has never been erected. Well, Mr. Garth in 1892 was eighty-nine years old, blind and sick in bed; but he subscribed one thousand dollars to secure the re-location of the university. Realizing that he could not long live, he asked that he be permitted to sign the subscription paper, in order that when the money was due, that sum could be allowed against his estate. So I was sent to see that grand old man, who, although blind, could write his name; but he did not sign on the dotted line, he signed at an angle, perhaps across three lines. That was the last paper he signed, for he soon passed to his reward. But by his signature, he had bound his estate to pay that subscription, and one thousand dollars was allowed against his estate by the Probate court of Boone county, and that sum was paid by his executor in May, 1892. We have with us this evening some of the Missouri descendants of Mr. Garth, and I am going to ask them to rise, as I call their names; James M. Garth, William W. Garth, Jefferson G. Worley, A. T. Clinkscales, Russell Clinkscales and Robert Clinkscales, of Columbia, Garth Clinkscales,
of Boonville, Mrs. Lizzie Garth Crews, of Fayette, and Walter Garth and Miss Pauline Garth, of Kansas City.

Elder Thomas M. Allen, a distinguished minister of the Christian denomination, subscribed six hundred dollars; and all of the members of that denomination, especially those who were named for him, would feel honored to claim relationship with him. He was one of the greatest advocates of higher education in Missouri.

Dr. M. R. Arnold, a physician and farmer who resided east of Columbia, subscribed two hundred and fifty dollars; and he is represented by Mrs. Susan Arnold Hickman and Mrs. Eliza Arnold Moreland, of Boone county.

Athanatius Barnett, a Bear creek farmer, was another subscriber; and three of his grandchildren live in Boone county, S. R. Barnett and Miss Mary J. Barnett, of Columbia, and Mrs. Beulah Barnett Brown, of Hallsville. And by the way, their maternal grandfather Samuel Batterton was also a subscriber.

Lawrence Bass, a farmer, subscribed three hundred dollars; and his kinsman L. Derby Bass, of near Ashland, represents him at our dinner.

Mrs. Mary Beattie, a widow who also lived on Bear creek, subscribed one hundred dollars; and she is represented by Mrs. Sue Beattie Bennett, of Fulton.

David C. Berry, a farmer, from near Rock Bridge, was a subscriber; and his grandson is Judge W. P. Cunningham, of the Boone county court.

Samuel Boldin, a Missouri river farmer, subscribed fifty dollars; and his grandchildren Dr. Frank B. Williamson, of Columbia, and Mrs. Geo. H. Cox, of Huntsdale, are here.

James Bowling, a farmer, subscribed twenty-five dollars; and his grandson Charles B. Bowling, president of Exchange National Bank of Columbia, is with us.

Austin Bradford, a farmer to the Southeast of Columbia, subscribed four hundred dollars; and he is represented by Dr. George A. Bradford, Alex Bradford, Mrs. Narcissa Bradford Butler, Mrs. Lavinia Lenoir Nifong and Mrs. Virginia Dyas McAlester, all of Columbia.

C. C. Branham was a clerk in a dry goods store, working for
twenty-five dollars a month, yet he subscribed one hundred dollars. He is represented by his grandchildren Warren S. Branham, of Columbia, Robert T. Branham, of Kansas City, and Mrs. Madaline Branham Collins, of St. Louis.

Travis Burroughs, of the Perche creek neighborhood, a bridge builder who lost money in nearly every bridge that he built, subscribed thirty-five dollars. He was the father of the late George W. Burroughs and the father of the late Miss Anna Burroughs.

James Chandler was a farmer, a poor man with a large family, but he subscribed one hundred dollars. Two of his great grandchildren, Miss Jessie Chandler and Clyde C. Chandler, of Columbia, are with us.

Benjamin Connelly, a Black Foot farmer, whose descendants have changed the spelling of the name to Conley, subscribed two hundred dollars. His descendants, S. F. Conley, Wm. T. Conley, Dr. Dudley S. Conley, Mrs. Helen Conley Miller, Mrs. Virginia Hunt Robertson and Miss Frances Hunt, all of Columbia, are here.

Henry Crumbaugh, a saddler, came to Columbia one year before (1838), and I have heard him say that he had only one dollar when he reached Columbia. Yet he subscribed two hundred dollars. He is represented at this meeting by his daughter Miss Cornelia Crumbaugh; and his granddaughters Mrs. Josephine Gregory and Miss May Karnes live in Kansas City, and his grandson Andrew J. Crumbaugh lives in Neosho.

Abraham Davenport, another Black Foot farmer, subscribed one hundred and twenty-five dollars; and his great grandson John Davenport, of Columbia, is with us.

Nathaniel Dodd, a Rock Bridge farmer, subscribed fifty dollars; and John L. Dodd, of Boone county, and Miss Dorothy Dodd, of St. Louis, are his descendants.

Dr. William H. Duncan, second treasurer of the university, subscribed three hundred and fifty dollars; and his pocketbook in which he kept the university money has already been shown to you this evening. Mrs. Susan T. Smoke and Mrs. Margaret T. Ferguson, of Columbia, and Mrs. Mamie Allen Matthews, of Liberty, are his grandchildren.

Berkley Estes, a Cedar creek farmer, subscribed three hundred
dollars; and his great grandsons John Estes, R. J. Estes and Sam R. Estes reside in this county.

Joseph Estes subscribed two hundred dollars, although he was then only nineteen years old. His Missouri descendants are Joseph M. Estes, J. P. Estes and Ambrose Johnston, of Columbia, and Mrs. Wm. R. Gentry, Jr., of University City.

John H. Field, a Columbia merchant, subscribed six hundred dollars; and his daughter, Mrs. Elizabeth Field Davis, a graduate of Class of 1878, calls Columbia her home. Mrs. Davis’ grandfather, Dr. William Provines, subscribed four hundred dollars.

Mrs. Ann Gentry’s subscription has already been mentioned by me; and I now call on her Missouri descendants present to rise, Mrs. Lucy Gentry Ankeney, Mrs. Mary Paxton Keeley, Boyle G. Clark, Frederick Gordon and your speaker, all of Columbia, Thomas G. Clark and Richard Clark, of McBaine, Wm. R. Gentry, of St. Louis, and Harrison Gentry and Jack Terrill, of Jefferson City.

Her other Missouri descendants are Mrs. Eliza Gentry Young and Mrs. Sallie Gentry Elston, of Kansas City, Mrs. Dorothy Clark Poland, of Cameron, Andrew J. Crumbaugh, of Neosho, and Matthew and Frank Paxton, of Independence.

Oliver Perry Gentry, a clerk in a grocery store, subscribed two hundred and fifty dollars. Mrs. Katie Belle Powers, of Paris and a graduate of 1902, represents him.

Captain David Gordon, a farmer on Hinkson creek, subscribed five hundred dollars. His Missouri descendants are Mrs. Bettie G. Anderson, James W. Gordon, Hugh Baker, Miss Bettie May Baker, Mrs. Martha G. Hale and Larry Gordon Sapp, of Columbia, and Dr. James E. Gordon, of Maplewood.

John B. Gordon, in addition to giving his home place to the university, gave three hundred dollars in money. It is with pleasure that I call on his descendants to rise, Edwin P. Gordon, Mrs. Sadie Gordon Weaver, Frederick Gordon, A. T. Clinkscales, Russell Clinkscales and Robert Clinkscales, of Columbia, Garth Clinkscales, of Boonville, and Hughes Clinkscales, of Carrollton. The late Boyle Gordon, a son of John B. Gordon, taught law in the university for ten years.

David Gentry, my great uncle and a Terrepiin creek farmer,
subscribed fifty dollars; and his descendants now live in and near Monroe City.

Robert Gillaspie, a Cedar creek farmer boy under age, subscribed twenty-five dollars. His grandson, J. E. Gillaspie, is a Columbia druggist.

George W. Gordon, a Columbia carriage maker, subscribed two hundred dollars; and Mrs. Minnie Gordon Tinchenor, Mrs. Belle Gordon Parman and William Barnes, of Columbia, William Gordon, of Nevada, and Mrs. Mary Gray McQuitty, of St. Louis, represent him. His brother Judge James M. Gordon subscribed one hundred and fifty dollars; but he was never married.

Richard Harrison Gentry, a Columbia township farmer, subscribed two hundred and fifty dollars; and he is represented by Mrs. Lucy Gentry Ankeney and Mrs. Mary Paxton Keeley, of Columbia, and Harrison Gentry, of Jefferson City, and Mrs. Eliza Gentry Young and Mrs. Sallie Gentry Elston, of Kansas City, and Matthew and Frank Paxton, of Independence.

Sylvester F. Goslin, also a farmer, subscribed one hundred dollars; and John R. Goslin and Joseph Goslin, of Columbia, and Mrs. Nadine Goslin Gardner, of Rocheport, are his grandchildren.

Captain Thomas D. Grant, a farmer from the two-mile prairie, subscribed three hundred dollars; and he has a grandson, Lee W. Grant, of St. Louis, an attorney.

John Guitar, Columbia’s first confectioner, subscribed one thousand dollars. His descendants are Odon Guitar, Jr., Wm. H. Guitar, Ed H. Guitar, Mrs. Martha Guitar Hale, Miss Sarah Guitar and Mrs. Emily Guitar Allen, of Columbia, and Mrs. Mary Guitar Brown and A. Leonard Guitar, of St. Joseph.

James Harris, later county judge, was a farmer boy, under age and he had no money; but he subscribed one hundred dollars, and used the first money he made to pay his subscription. Mrs. Susan Harris Dorsey, Mrs. Pierce Estes, H. Pierce Niedermeyer and Mrs. Sabra Niedermeyer Tull, of Columbia, and William B. Harris and James H. Harris, of Fulton, represent him. May I also say that the late Judge David H. Harris, of our circuit court, was a son.

John M. Harris, a Cedar township farmer, and the grandfather
of Lieutenant Governor Frank G. Harris, subscribed fifty dollars.

John W. Harris, a twenty-three year old farmer, subscribed one hundred dollars. His granddaughter, Mrs. Mary Harris Guinotte, of Kansas City, represents him.

Joel H. Haden said that he got his start working on a farm, splitting rails at one dollar per hundred; and although he had been a resident of Boone county less than one year, he subscribed one hundred dollars. Some years later Mr. Haden told this story on Dr. Daniel Read, who went to Mr. Haden’s farm to buy a cow. Dr. Read asked for a bucket, for he wanted to be sure the cow was a good milker. “Then,” according to Mr. Haden, “Dr. Read got down on his knees, took both hands and almost knocked the bottom out of the bucket.” Mr. Haden told him that the price of the cow was seventy-five dollars, but it was worth five dollars to see the president of the university go through such a performance; so he sold the cow for seventy dollars. Mr. Haden’s descendants are Mrs. Sallie Carter Bright, Joel H. Carter, William J. Carter, Garland Carter and Mrs. Virginia Carter Heisler, of Columbia, Richard Carter, of Mexico, and Mrs. Rella Carter Smith, of Stephens.

Judge John Henderson, a farmer who lived at what is now Midway, subscribed one hundred dollars; and two of his great grandsons, Paul H. Henderson and L. D. Henderson, now live at Midway.

Edward D. Henry subscribed twenty-five dollars; and at the semi-centennial celebration, he showed a trowel with which he laid brick in a wall of the university building. His great grandchildren are Mr. O. R. Johnson and Edward Sutton, of Columbia, and Mrs. Evelyn Sutton Vesser, of St. Louis.

John Todd Henry, who operated a small coal mine, subscribed two hundred dollars; and his daughter Miss Emma Henry represents him.

George L. Hickam and John Hickam subscribed one hundred dollars each, and some of their descendants still live in Boone county.

Joseph W. Hickam, later county judge, subscribed one hundred dollars; and two of his great grandchildren live here, Leslie M. Strawn and Miss Emma Strawn.
Captain David M. Hickman, a Cedar township farmer, subscribed two hundred dollars. His grandchildren are Thad B. Hickman and Mrs. Sallie Young Guitar, of Columbia, who are here; and Walker Hickman and Miss Mary Hickman, of Kansas City.

William Y. Hitt, a Columbia merchant, subscribed eight hundred dollars; and his granddaughter, Mrs. John L. Henry, of Columbia, represents him.

George Hume and Lewis Hume, Cedar township farmers, subscribed one hundred dollars each, and some of their descendants still live in Boone county.

Dr. George R. Jacobs, a Columbia township farmer, subscribed two hundred dollars. His granddaughters, Misses Katherine Jacobs, Louise Jacobs and Mariah Jacobs, are with us.

James E. Johnson, a saddler, subscribed one hundred dollars; and his grandson, John Quarles, is here.

Jacob S. Johnston, of the Rock Bridge neighborhood, subscribed one hundred dollars; and we have his daughter, Mrs. Mollie Johnston Buckmaster, and his grandson, Ambrose Johnston, with us tonight.

John T. M. Johnston subscribed one hundred dollars; and his granddaughters, Miss Eva Johnston and Mrs. Elvira Johnston Ellis, of Columbia, and his great grandson, Lawrence Johnston, of St. Louis, represent him.

Matthew O. Keene, who made a meager living selling apples, subscribed fifty dollars; and at the semi-centennial celebration he was given a seat on the rostrum.

Richard L. Keene, a farmer, subscribed one hundred dollars; and Harry Keene, R. L. Keene, Mrs. Joel W. Carter and Charles Sutton are his descendants.

Captain Sinclair Kirtley not only worked for the university act, but he subscribed eight hundred dollars. He is represented by his kinsman, H. H. Banks, of Columbia.

Robert Lemon, another farmer, subscribed one hundred dollars; and Mrs. Amanda Lemon Corlew, who holds the record for long service as a Columbia public school teacher, is his daughter.

William R. Lenoir subscribed one hundred dollars; and his de-

David S. Lamme, the step-father of Mrs. James S. Rollins and a Columbia merchant and miller, subscribed twelve hundred dollars.

Montgomery P. Lientz, a farmer residing northeast of Rocheport, subscribed one hundred and twenty-five dollars. He was present at the great semi-centennial celebration, when General Odon Guitar asked the original subscribers to state their ages, all except any who were widowers. So when Mr. Lientz's name was called, he replied, "Present. Widower for the second time." His daughter, Mrs. Blanche Lientz Palmer, of Columbia, is with us.

James S. Lowry, a Terrapin creek farmer, subscribed one hundred dollars; and his great grandson J. Milton Lowry lives in Columbia.

John H. Lynch, of Columbia, subscribed five hundred dollars; and he had to sell his slaves to raise money to pay that subscription. His grandson is Wm. B. Cauthorn, Columbia's city engineer, and his granddaughter is Mrs. Leslie Bates, of North Kansas City.

John Martin, sheriff, and Thomas C. Maupin, state senator, subscribed two hundred dollars each, although the emoluments of each one's office was not great.

Milton S. Matthews, who had just moved to Columbia and was just twenty-one, subscribed fifty dollars. He was the grandfather of Frank W. Dearing, of Columbia.

James Lawrence Matthews, a Columbia mechanic, subscribed one hundred dollars; and his two granddaughters Mrs. Mary Matthews Rieger lives in Kansas City, and Mrs. Iza May Berry Heer lives in Springfield.

Newman T. Mitchell, a Missouri township farmer, subscribed twenty-five dollars; and Mrs. Exie Mitchell Gray, of Columbia, Dr. Porter J. Mitchell, of Rocheport, and John Mitchell, of Kansas City, are his descendants.

Foster and Tyre Martin, of New Salem church neighborhood, were young farmers, and they subscribed fifty dollars each; but their descendants are too numerous to mention.
Rev. Robert L. McAfee, of Rocheport Presbyterian church, subscribed two hundred dollars; and he acted as chaplain at the cornerstone laying on July 4, 1840. Mrs. Jennie Banks Marshall, of Unionville, is his granddaughter.

Turner McBaine, a Missouri river boatman, subscribed one hundred dollars. His only living Missouri descendant is Mrs. Henry Ess, of Kansas City.

Levi McGuire, a farmer near Boonsborough, subscribed fifty dollars; and his grandson, Dr. Morris S. McGuire, lives in Boonville.

Seven Northcutts, Ben F., Eli, John, Joseph, T. M., George and William, were subscribers in sum from thirty to three hundred dollars; and some of their descendants live in Boone and Callaway counties.

Oliver Parker, of Columbia and a merchant, subscribed twenty-two hundred dollars; and his grandson, James P. Hickok, lives in St. Louis.

Rev. Moses U. Payne, a Methodist minister, subscribed twelve hundred and fifty dollars; and later made a liberal donation to Howard-Payne College, of Fayette. His daughter, Mrs. Martha Payne Cresap, lives in St. Joseph.

Judge Hiram Phillips, also a farmer, subscribed five hundred dollars; and his grandson, Frederick Kennedy, is here tonight.

William F. Pierson, who made his living making and peddling fly brushes, subscribed five dollars; and his friends wondered how and where he would ever get that much money.

Thomas Prather, a farmer north of Columbia, subscribed two hundred dollars. I call on his grandchildren and great grandchildren, Arch S. Prather, Frank G. Prather, Mrs. Mary Prather Keene, Mrs. Lula Prather Brown, C. B. Prather, Mrs. Olive Cooper and Mrs. Frankie H. Grant, all of Boone county, to stand.

Moss Prewitt, later university curator, subscribed fifteen hundred dollars. His descendants are Mrs. Wm. H. Willis, R. B. Price, Lakenan M. Price, Mrs. Thomas J. Turner and Mrs. George A. Evans, of Columbia.

Silas Riggs, of the county court and a farmer from near Stur-geon, subscribed one hundred dollars, as did his brother, Zadock
Riggs, a farmer from the same neighborhood; and some of their descendants live in Boone county.

Noah Robnett, a farmer, subscribed fifty dollars. Will his grandchildren, Curtis Robnett, Mrs. Ann Robnett Johnston, Mrs. Susan Arnold Hickman, and Mrs. Eliza Arnold Moreland, now please rise.

Pleasant H. Robnett, a fifteen-year old farmer boy, subscribed three hundred dollars. I call on his daughters, Mrs. Madge Robnett Dysart, Mrs. Estelle Robnett Vivion, and Mrs. Robnett Bradford, to stand.

James Rogers, a farmer from northeast of Columbia, subscribed one hundred dollars; and two of his children, Clifton Rogers and Miss Elizabeth Rogers, live here.

Major James S. Rollins, who was well-called "Father of the University of Missouri," subscribed two thousand dollars, and in 1882 donated the university bell. His descendants are a son, Curtis B. Rollins, grandchildren, J. S. Rollins, Mrs. Mary Gray Stephens, Mrs. Florence Gray Kline, and I. O. Hockaday, Jr., and his great granddaughter, Miss Juliett Rollins, of Columbia, John H. Overall, Sidney R. Overall, and Mrs. Eulalee Hockaday Sneed, of St. Louis, Mrs. Adell Overall Black, and the sons of the late Rollins M. Hockaday, of Kansas City.

Dr. Anthony W. Rollins, of Perche township, subscribed fifteen hundred dollars; and a few years later by will established the Rollins Aid Fund. Descendants same as above.

Robert R. Rollins, a bachelor and a brother of Major James S. Rollins, subscribed one hundred and fifty dollars. Relatives same as above.

Henry H. Ready, a Columbia tailor, subscribed five hundred dollars.

Lemuel B. Searcy, a farmer, subscribed one hundred dollars. Will his descendants, Miss Laura Searcy and Mrs. Wm. J. Carter, please stand.

Thomas Selby, a tavern-keeper, who had enough children to fill his tavern, subscribed four hundred dollars; and his widow finished paying his subscription before she married again.

William Shields, a surveyor, donated land, the value of which
I do not know. His great grandson, J. Keyser Pratt, lives in St. Louis.

Captain William Smith, father of the late Fielding W. and Warren A. Smith, subscribed two hundred dollars. He is represented by his grandson, Dr. Stanley N. Smith, Mrs. Martha Smith Catron, and Miss Ada Smith, of Columbia.

Andrew Spence, still another farmer, subscribed two hundred dollars; so I call on his grandson, Estill Spence, of Boone county, to make his bow.

Caleb S. Stone subscribed four hundred dollars. His grandchildren are J. Dozier Stone, of Columbia, and Mrs. Nelle Winklemeyer, of St. Louis.

Wm. W. Tucker, a Rocky Fork township farmer, who was the father of sixteen children, was a subscriber. R. S. Pollard, Ruby M. Hulen and others in Boone county are descendants of Mr. Tucker.

Roger North Todd, of Columbia, subscribed eight hundred dollars. He is represented by your speaker and Warren S. Branham, of Columbia, William R. Gentry and Mrs. Madaline Branham Collins, of St. Louis, and Robert Todd Branham and Mrs. Alice Todd Downey, of Kansas City.

Archibald W. Turner, a Columbia lawyer, subscribed fifteen hundred dollars. His descendants are Mrs. Roy Turner Bright, A. T. Clinkscales, Russell Clinkscales and Robert Clinkscales, of Columbia, Garth Clinkscales, of Booneville, and Miss Mildred Turner, of St. Louis.

Thomas Turner, a Cedar creek farmer, subscribed one hundred dollars. His descendants are so numerous that I will only mention some; Turner Hamilton, Edward R. Hamilton, Mrs. Nannie Hamilton McKimpson, Mrs. Lucy Hamilton Clark, O. H. Turner, Clyde Ballew, Mrs. John L. Henry, Mrs. P. S. Quinn, Mrs. James P. Hendrick, Jeff D. Turner and Mrs. Ola Turner Estes, of Columbia, Leslie and Turner Robinson, of Centralia, Samuel and George Turner and Mrs. James A. Carlisle, of Auxvasse, Dr. A. T. Quinn, of St. Louis, and E. H. Turner, of Warrensburg.

John VanHorn, a blacksmith, subscribed two hundred and fifty dollars. He is represented by his kinsman J. D. VanHorn of Columbia.
John G. Vivion, another Cedar creek farmer, subscribed one hundred dollars. His granddaughters, Mrs. Edward R. Hamilton and Mrs. Elmore H. Smith, of Columbia, are with us.

Benjamin N. Watson, a farmer from the Midway neighborhood, gave one hundred dollars; and his granddaughter Mrs. Ruby Westlake Fredenberger lives in Boone county.

Mrs. Caroline R. Wilson, one of the widow subscribers, gave two hundred and fifty dollars; and her son, Josiah W. Wilson, gave three hundred dollars. J. Dozier Stone, of Columbia, and Mrs. Nelle Winklemeyer, of St. Louis, are descendants of Mrs. Wilson.

Charles, James, John, Thomas, and William Winn, Rocky Fork township farmers, subscribed sums varying from five dollars to one hundred dollars. Lucy Wilcox and Hannah Hardin, widows, subscribed three hundred dollars and five hundred dollars respectively. While Samuel Wall, a Columbia tavern-keeper, subscribed five hundred dollars.

Judge Warren Woodson subscribed twelve hundred and fifty dollars; which considering the fact that he had two sons and five daughters and had been married twice, was liberal. The orator of the evening Mr. E. Sydney Stephens, his brother, Hon. Hugh Stephens, of Jefferson City, and his sister, Mrs. Mary Stephens Gray, of St. Louis, are great grandchildren of Judge Woodson.

John Woolfolk, another farmer, subscribed one hundred dollars; and his granddaughter, Miss Louise Woolfolk, lives at Deer Park, this county.

Edward Young, a farmer from the Englewood neighborhood, subscribed fifty dollars; and his son Edward Young, Jr., subscribed twenty-five dollars. Mrs. William H. Guitar, of this city, represents Mr. Young.

It will be seen by the foregoing that men from all parts of Boone county and men of various avocations were intensely interested in the location of the University of Missouri in Boone county; and they showed their interest by subscribing and paying one hundred and seventeen thousand, nine hundred and twenty-one dollars.

After the location of the university in Boone county, several
sites were suggested for the campus. At a celebration on July 4, 1839, on what is now the West campus, Roger North Todd responded to the toast, “The University of Missouri; May it be erected on this piece of ground, and may it prove a blessing to the youth of our state for all time to come.”

Much of the first university campus, now known as Francis Quadrangle, was located on ground that in 1832 had been used for a race track, the Gordon track. Some years later my father built his residence on the south side of Conley avenue; and thereafter his older brother, Oliver Perry Gentry, and his brother-in-law, Boyle Gordon, pointed out to him in my presence the ruins of that old track, which then and for some time later could be recognized. They said that it started at what is now the northeast corner of Rothwell Gymnasium, from there it went north through where Read Hall and the Memorial Tower have been erected, then it curved to the west and passed just south of where the old columns stand, thence to the south through ground now occupied by the Engineering and Education buildings and along what is now Maryland avenue to Rollins Field. Then it curved to the east and extended to the point of beginning, where the judges stand was erected. No doubt those “thirty-niners,” as they recalled the contests of speed that they had witnessed, looked forward to the time when young men, aye young women, would there contest for university honors; and that representatives from our university would there compete in oratory and debate with representatives from other universities. And mayhap they expected the young men there to be trained to engage in baseball, basketball and football contests, successful contests with the young men of Iowa, Nebraska, Oklahoma, New York and Kansas.

The cornerstone of the university main building was laid on July 4, 1840, and Governor Lilburn W. Boggs, Secretary of State James L. Minor, State Auditor Hiram B. Baker, Attorney General S. M. Bay and State Treasurer Abraham McClellan were guests of honor. A procession of men on horseback formed in front of the court house in Columbia, rode south on Eighth street to Broadway, thence east to Ninth street and south to the university
campus, then called the "university lot." My father told me that he was then a boy of ten years, and that he rode on a horse behind his older brother Richard Harrison Gentry, and witnessed the cornerstone laying.

Judge David Todd, of the Boone circuit court, who had subscribed eight hundred dollars, presided on that historic occasion; and it is worthy of mention that his son, Robert B. Todd, and his nephew, Robert L. Todd, both of Columbia, composed the first graduating class of the university. Robert B. Todd was popularly called "Big Bob Todd," and Robert L. Todd was popularly called "Little Bob Todd."

My father saw the first university building erected, which was the largest building erected in central Missouri up to that time; it was at first popularly called the "big school house." He told me that the brick for that building was burned on the back campus (which was just south of where Jesse Hall now stands); and I saw the brick burned in the back campus, which was used in the east and west wings of the main building, known as the "additions of 1885." My father saw the old columns erected; and he told me that each column consisted of blocks of stone about three feet high, and that a tripod of sycamore poles was erected, a long rope was wrapped around each block, and it was raised and lowered by means of one rope and one pulley. Ten yoke of oxen furnished the power; and, as the oxen walked slowly to the north, the university was slowly yet surely being erected. So well were columns constructed that they have stood for lo these many years,—six monuments to the memory of those who furnished the money and those who performed the labor. And around the old columns cluster memories, both sacred and lasting. Around them the university cadets and university band have marched; the engineering students have there learned to use the compass and theodolite; the students of art have there painted pictures and made sketches; the dramatic clubs have there given Shakespearian entertainments; the university women have there given May day exercises; graduating classes have there had their pictures taken; and old grads have returned after thirty, forty and fifty years, recalled the absent ones, and had their pictures taken with the old columns
for a background. Long may the old columns stand; and may they, with the glorious memories that surround them, prove an inspiration to the boys and girls "for all time to come."

The university suffered from poverty. Mention has already been made of the cut in the salaries of President John H. Lathrop and the members of the first faculty, and of the voluntary relinquishment of a further part of his salary by Dr. Lathrop. When I was a boy and for many years before, there was a fence around the West campus, which was the only campus for many years. For years all of the back campus was rented, part of the time to Judge Warren Woodson, who had it plowed up and planted in corn. My father said that his mother lived close to the campus when he was a boy, and that she gave him a calf; and he got permission to keep his calf in the front campus, paying twenty-five cents a month for the privilege. And the professor of astronomy stated in my hearing that when he was appointed, he found one of the hinges to a shutter on the observatory was broken, and of course there was no money in the treasury to pay for repairs. So the professor employed John VanHorn, a Columbia blacksmith, to make and fit a hinge, and paid him by allowing him to look through the small telescope at the moon. And each student was requested to bring a slate and pencil with him to each class, because chalk and paper were so expensive.

On July 4, 1890, there occurred the semi-centennial of the laying of the cornerstone, and an interesting occasion it proved to be. A procession of men on horseback assembled in front of the court house in Columbia, and, imitating those of fifty years before, they marched south on Eighth street to Broadway, thence east on Broadway to Ninth and south to the university campus. It was my good fortune to ride a horse in that procession, as my father stood on the sidewalk and recalled his horseback ride of fifty years before. Lieutenant Enoch H. Crowder, later General Crowder, had a few university cadets to assemble in front of the university building and fire a salute as the procession neared the campus. When the first canon boomed, my mare stood on her hind feet; and when the second shot was fired, she turned and ran full speed in the opposite direction. So someone asked Lieutenant
Crowder to order the cadets to "cease firing;" when our procession was again formed and we proceeded to the campus.

Robert L. Todd, a member of the first graduating class, presided, and gracefully introduced the speakers. I wrote Mr. Todd's address for him; that is I copied it on the first typewriter that was brought to Columbia, which I borrowed from the owner, Walter F. Hodge. Governor David R. Francis, State Auditor James M. Seibert, General Odon Guitar, Col. Leonidas M. Lawson, Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, Dr. M. M. Fisher, Col. William F. Switzler, Judge B. M. Dilley, General E. Y. Mitchell and Judge John Hinton were the speakers. All of the survivors of those who had contributed to the fund of 1839 were invited to be present, and many of them attended, including General John Ellis, who was marshal of the day on July 4, 1840, and assistant marshal, Jacob S. Johnston. The other assistant marshal, Major Nathaniel W. Wilson, who subscribed five hundred dollars, had died one week before; so a draped chair in his memory was placed on the rostrum in the university chapel, where the exercises were held on July 4, 1890. General Guitar delivered the eulogy on the men and women of 1839, and his language was strong and eloquent, and at times pathetic and humorous; he called the roll of the living subscribers, and had them respond. We have enjoyed a good dinner in the Tiger Hotel this evening; but dinner on that occasion was served under the shade trees of the West campus, served by the ladies of Columbia, and fried chicken, old ham and other good things, too numerous to mention, were enjoyed by everyone. It was my great pleasure to talk with many of those grand old men on that day, and to learn first-handed of the efforts they made and of the hardships they endured in order to pay their subscriptions. That was a great celebration, for alumni and friends gathered here from all parts of the state and of the nation; one of the speakers, Col. L. M. Lawson, was then a resident of New York City, and other speakers were from Kansas City, Jefferson City, Lebanon, Rolla, St. Louis and Cape Girardeau. Patriotic songs were sung, Prof. F. Pannell being the leader, and flags were everywhere in evidence. The League of American Wheelmen had a meet and tournament that afternoon in Colum-
bia, and young people from various parts of the United States entertained the distinguished guests by bicycle riding; and there was a display of fireworks on the campus that night. Of the sixty-eight men and women, who took part in the speaking, singing and parading, and who served on committees on July 4, 1890, only three survive, viz., Senator Ben M. Anderson, Mr. Curtis B. Rollins, and your speaker.

In his address this evening, Mr. Stephens mentioned that the main university building and the additions of 1885 were destroyed by fire on Saturday, January 9, 1892, the old columns alone remaining. It should be mentioned that that fire occurred just four years to a day after the death of Major Rollins; and one week before that fire, Mr. George Bingham Rollins, a son of Major Rollins, had a dream and he dreamed that the university building burned at night. I well remember that fire, for an exhibition of the Athenaean (not Atheneaum) society was to be given that evening in the university chapel, and the audience was assembling. Now the first and second floors of the east wing constituted the chapel, and the general library was on the third floor of that wing; and the fire started in the northeast corner of the building, in the space between the ceiling of the chapel and the floor of the library; it was caused by some electric wires that crossed, and the wind from the northeast carried the flames through the non-fireproof structure. Prof. F. Pannell and the members of the university orchestra had just taken their seats in front of the rostrum in the chapel, when the electric lights flared up and went out; then the large chandelier fell from the ceiling close to the musicians, and all present knew that the building was on fire. There were no telephones in Columbia then; but there was preaching that night in the second story auditorium of the Methodist church on Broadway. Some one in that church looked out of a window and announced that the university was on fire, when the meeting adjourned without the customary benediction. Persons attending that meeting ran along the streets, giving the alarm, and in a short time most of the people of Columbia were on the university campus. I heard the tolling of the university bell that night; I saw the smoke and flames when they first burst through
the library and chapel windows; I heard the crashing of glass, brick, stone and timbers; I saw the floor of the library fall, and with it thirty thousand volumes, numerous files of Missouri newspapers, seventeen oil portraits, many of them painted by General George C. Bingham, also numerous pictures of university friends and letters and documents of various kinds; I saw students, citizens of Columbia and university teachers work like Trojans in their efforts to save the building and contents; and I saw Columbia women and university girls serve hot coffee and sandwiches to the men and boys, many of whom worked all night, the cold being intense. Later during the night and the next day I saw the university cadets, as they stood guard and kept persons away from the tottering walls. At first it was suggested that we get some uniforms, swords, bayonets, rifles and 14,000 rounds of ammunition that were stored in the armory, away up in the dome over the center portion of the building. But Prof. J. P. Blanton said that it was not necessary to risk life to save that property, as the same belonged to the U. S. government, and he felt certain that Senator F. M. Cockrell would get a bill passed by Congress, relieving the university for such loss, which the Senator promptly did, and which President Benjamin Harrison signed. Later the fire reached the dome, and the firing of those rifles and the explosion of the rounds of ammunition sounded like a sham battle was in progress. J. G. Babb, of Columbia, secretary of board of curators, was always cool and thoughtful; so he procured a lantern and some boys to help him, and they removed the university records from the so-called fireproof vault, which proved not to be fireproof.

Several amusing things occurred during that awful night, but I shall be able to mention only a few. When he heard the alarm, President R. H. Jesse ran from the president’s house into the east wing of the burning building and into the chapel, and almost lost his life trying to extinguish the fire, for Columbia, like most towns of its size, had no fire department; but Mrs. Jesse said that she went to the front door of the president’s house, where she handed her pocketbook to a man she never saw before. Most of the water in the tank on top of the building had frozen; and the
fire hose had never been tested. The hose leaked badly, so a little water was spilled here and there, which did no harm and no good. When I was a student a few years before that fire, I was a member of the Athenaeian society, during which time the society purchased a piano, paying for it by the month; and the last payment had been made two or three months before the fire. When everyone realized that the building could not be saved, efforts were made to save its contents. Some of us went into the west wing and into the museum and dragged out Dr. Laws' stuffed elephant, tearing out a part of the west wall of the building in order to do so. We stood the elephant on the campus near the Scientific building, later called the Agricultural building, now known as Switzler hall, when the old brute fell over on a Columbia man named Ed Butcher, mashing his finger. Mr. Butcher had the distinction of being the only person who was injured during that fire. Then E. C. Clinkscales, John N. Fellows, J. K. Fyfer, and your speaker, and some younger Athenaeans, ran into the Athenaean society hall, in the middle part of the old building, picked up that piano and carefully carried it out on the campus to a place of safety, supposedly. The ground was covered with snow, and it was snowing; so we procured a tarpaulin and covered up the piano, when it disappeared, and no one knows to this day what became of it; it was insured against fire, but not against theft. Then we went into the law library, on the second floor on the south side of the west wing, and gathered arms full of books, when we heard the firing of the rifles in the dome. All of us dropped the books and hastened out, when we learned that it was safe to again enter the building. We again went to the law library and took books from the shelves, but never thought of picking up the books that we had dropped on the library floor. The books on the floor were burned; hence there were missing volumes in nearly every set of books in the law library. Other workers carried apparatus from the Physics' laboratory, all of which they dropped when they heard the pop, pop, popping of the rifles; and that apparatus was nothing more than junk. But much of the university furniture and equipment was saved through the vigorous efforts of teachers, students, citizens and especially
the faithful janitors. Prof. L. M. Defoe, later affectionately known as “Daddy Defoe,” and Ed B. Cauthorn went to the fourth floor and carried the surveying and engineering instruments from the building.

Finally Dr. Edward D. Porter, dean of the College of Agriculture, concluded that it was not safe for anyone to enter the building; so with his cane in hand, he stood at the front door and called out, “Stop! Not another person shall go in. All of the property of the State of Missouri is not worth the life of one Missouri boy!” And in only a few minutes, the roof and floors fell. Then I turned to a friend near me and said, “That is the last of the University of Missouri. The teachers and students will scatter to all parts of the country and never come together again.” But I am proud to say that I was badly mistaken.

The next morning (Sunday) a committee was appointed to go to the Wabash station and urge the students not to leave for home or for any other school, but the committee did not function; not a student thought of leaving. At a meeting Sunday morning in the Haden opera house, students and members of the faculty pledged themselves to stay in Columbia; and Columbia people pledged renewed efforts in behalf of the university. At that meeting a speaker mentioned that it was once said that brick and mortar do not make a university, but that a university could consist of Mark Hopkins sitting on one end of a log and a student on the other. H. C. Williams and J. Harry LaMotte made speeches in behalf of the students, and predicted that the fire would result in greater things for our university. Prof. Paul Schweitzer appeared on the stage, donned in a pair of rubber boots and a rain coat, which he had worn all night, while fighting the fire and saving university property. He declined to make a speech, saying it was “time for action, not for talking.”

Long before the smoke had cleared away, friends of the university, old and young, from all parts of the state and the nation, rallied to its assistance; and the new university “rose Phoenix-like” from the ruins. President Jesse and his wonderful teachers Allen, Broadhead, Burnam, Clendenin, Connaway, Defoe, Gerling, Hoffman, Hicks, Jones, Lawson, Lipscomb, Manly, Miller, Moss,
McAlester, Paxton, Penn, Schweitzer, Smith, Tindall, Updegraph, Waters and Yantis proved to be the right men in the right place, put up with all kinds of inconveniences, accepted of the best that Columbia friends could offer, and school continued the same as if nothing had happened. The Columbia churches, lodges and private residences opened their doors, and the same were used as class rooms and lecture rooms, the law students appropriately made their headquarters in the Boone county courthouse, and the city of Columbia rented the Haden opera house, which was used for university literary and musical entertainments and also commencement exercises. Vacant rooms, carpenter shops, stables and coal houses were temporarily used for the storage of the university property that had been saved; and every one showed a willingness to loan space for storage and give a cheerful helping hand.

Dr. George A. Wauchope was then connected with the department of English, and he wrote a song that has been sung thousands of times since then by students, alumni and friends, and which let us hope will be sung as long as Missouri has a state university:

Old Missouri, Fair Missouri,
Dear Old Varsity;
Ours are hearts that fondly love thee,
Here’s a health to thee.

Every student, man and maiden,
Swell the glad refrain,
Till the breezes, music laden,
Waft it back again.

Proud art thou in classic beauty,
Of thy noble past;
With thy watchwords Honor, Duty,
Thy high fame shall last.

After the fifty-two thousand dollars was subscribed by our people to secure the re-location of the university in Columbia
(every dollar of which was paid), and after an additional legislative appropriation, due to the influence of university friends, we realized that the burning of the university building was a blessing in disguise.

And I should further say that in 1871 the town of Columbia issued bonds to the amount of ten thousand dollars, and the county of Boone issued bonds to the amount of eighty thousand dollars to secure the location of the College of Agriculture in Columbia. And although the Missouri Supreme court decided that bonds so issued were illegal and uncollectable (57 Mo. 178), Columbia and Boone county paid the bonds issued by them, both principal and interest in full.

The James L. Stephens Medal in oratory, the John W. Harris prize, the John C. Conley prize, the Rollins Aid fund (which now amounts to sixty-five thousand dollars), the James S. Rollins six one-thousand-dollar scholarships, the Henry and Cornelia Crumbaugh one thousand dollar scholarship, and the William L. Parker donation of fifteen thousand dollars to establish the first university hospital further attest the interest of the men and women of Boone county in the University of Missouri. Besides, Boone county people have liberally donated to the University Y. M. C. A. building, the Missouri Union building, the Student center buildings and the Memorial Tower and Memorial Stadium.

Because of these and many other things, I am proud of Columbia, and proud of Boone county. And I hope, President Middlebush, that in the official record of the centennial celebration of our university, full credit will be given to the people of Boone county; and I also hope that some day in the near future the university curators will name one of the university buildings for the Boone county friends of the cause of higher education.
OTHER MEETINGS

DURING THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION numerous learned societies and professional organizations held their meetings on the University campus.

The one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the University of Missouri and the ninety-seventh anniversary of the instituting of forensics on the University of Missouri campus were commemorated on December 1 and 2, 1939, with a conference in which the Missouri Chapter of the National Society of Delta Sigma Rho, the Department of Public Speaking of the Speech Association of Missouri, the Missouri High School Debating League, the University of Missouri Library, Forensic Activities of the University of Missouri, and the College of Arts and Science of the University of Missouri all participated.

The program began formally on Friday morning, December 1, with an address of welcome by Dean W. C. Curtis of the College of Arts and Science to the fifth annual High School Debaters Assembly, and was concluded on Saturday evening, December 2, with a debate between the University of Missouri and the University of Wisconsin.

Missouri high school debaters spent the two full days on the campus, holding their annual assembly, engaging in practice debates, and in taking part in the anniversary celebration. The Department of Public Speaking of the Speech Association of Missouri held a meeting on Saturday morning, December 2, to hear addresses by Professor R. L. Davidson, Director of the Extension Division, University of Missouri; Professor Bower Aly, Director of Forensics, University of Missouri; Professor John E. Dykstra, Department of Economics, University of Missouri; and
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Mr. L. W. Horning, Regional Director of Research, Association of American Railroads. The University of Missouri Library participated in the occasion by arranging a valuable exhibit of books of interest to students of forensics.

At the anniversary luncheon held in the Colonial Room of the Tiger Hotel at noon on Saturday, December 2, Professor Wilbur E. Gilman, Chairman, Committee on Forensic Activities, University of Missouri, acted as toastmaster. Professor Henry Lee Ewbank, of the Department of Speech, University of Wisconsin, former president of the National Association of Teachers of Speech and former president of the National Society of Delta Sigma Rho, delivered an anniversary address entitled "Debate Discussion, and Democracy." The faculty and student body of the University of Missouri were well represented and high school debaters and teachers from all sections of Missouri were the honored guests at the anniversary luncheon.

The American Philosophical Association, Western Division, held its Fortieth Annual Meeting at the University of Missouri on April 20, 21, and 22, 1939, at the invitation of the University and the Department of Philosophy, as part of the celebration of the Centennial Anniversary of the University. About 125 members attended, of whom about 35 appeared on the various programs presented in the University Library Building. The presidential address, Recent Shifts in Ethical Theory and Practice, was delivered by Jay William Hudson, Lathrop Professor of Philosophy in the University.

In honor of the Centennial of the University of Missouri, the American Mathematical Society held a meeting of this national society at the University on Friday and Saturday, December 1-2, 1940.

In addition to the usual papers there were two invited addresses under the joint auspices of the University and the Society, given by graduates of the University, Professor L. R. Ford of Armour Institute speaking on "Projective Transformations in Two Complex Variables"; and Professor E. W. Chittenden of the University of Iowa on "Topological Functions."
A dinner was held on Friday evening at the Tiger Hotel at which Dean Bent welcomed the visitors on behalf of the University.

While actually not a part of the Centennial Celebration, during the year sixty-four state organizations held their meetings on the University campus. These various meetings were attended by approximately 16,000 persons and in each instance some special mention was made of the fact that 1939 was the Centennial year, generally in the form of a brief talk by the President or some member of the University staff.
VIII

THE UNIVERSITY HISTORY

IN THE FIRST REPORT of the original Centennial Committee appointed by Dr. Walter Williams in 1934 to survey the possibilities of an adequate commemoration of the University Centennial event, one of the three main suggestions was "that a committee be appointed to consider a memorial volume of the Centennial." Early in 1935 it was unanimously agreed by the Curators that Dr. Jones Viles, Chairman of the Department of History at the University of Missouri as official University Historian should be commissioned to prepare the volume of the History of the University of Missouri from the day of its founding in 1839 to the day of the Centennial Celebration. This task was carried out with unusual historical faithfulness in a volume published by the University of Missouri in 1939 entitled "A History of the University of Missouri 1839-1939."

Previously there had been two histories of the University, the earliest written by President Read and published after his death in 1883 by the Federal Bureau of Education under the title "Contributions to the History of Education; Historical Sketches of the Universities and Colleges of the United States."

Through the early months of 1890 Thomas Jefferson Lowry, first dean of the School of Engineering, contributed a series of articles to the Columbia Herald which were published by the University the same year as "A Sketch of the University." Lowry carried the stories on from 1876 to 1890. This history was reprinted in 1898 by the United States Bureau of Education as No. 21 "Contributions to American Educational History, Higher Education in Missouri."

Another history of the University compiled by William F. Switzler was in possession of the University in typewritten manu-
script form, but had never been published, since it was a careful and accurate collection of facts rather than a history, the bulk of the manuscript being made up of summaries of the meetings of the Board of Curators, the Executive Committee, programs of Commencement exercises, all sorts of exhibitions and historical contests and the like.

In the preface of the History volume Dr. Viles states that “The writing of a history of a university presents very real problems to the teacher and student of history, imbued with the conventional concepts as to values, proportions and objectives. The basic difficulty seems to be that the possible readers are of so many different groups, with every group entitled to consideration. In the history of a state university, the tax-payers, the alumni, my colleagues and the students of social history may all claim something of interest. The antiquarian and the human interest journalist must often crowd out the conventional historian. I have accepted the situation as frankly as I could, and make no pretense of uniformity in scale of treatment or of consistency in inclusion or exclusion. As in all eclectic productions the result may well be irritation to all and complete satisfaction to none.

“No institution develops in vacuo. The history of any university is a chapter in the history of higher education, and also, in the social history of its time and place. As ours is a state university—and as the history of higher education in the United States is as yet unwritten—the setting I have emphasized is the economic, political, and social development of Missouri.

“Any reader of the second part, on the modern university, will see how difficult it would be for a writer long identified with one school and one field of knowledge to have grasped and presented the problems and progress of all the schools. The modernization of the University took form in the development of the various departments, not of the University as an entity. Without the assistance of my colleagues this second part, if completed at all, would have been hopelessly inadequate. . . .

“Documentation by footnote references seemed out of keeping
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with the character of the book, but some indication of the main sources of information is clearly desirable. The official records of the University survived the fire of 1892 apparently intact. They include the minutes of the board of curators from its first meeting, and a separate series, beginning in 1869, of the executive committee. The papers of the board also go back to the beginning, but vary greatly in interest, depending primarily on the varying practice of the secretaries in copying into the official minutes the full text of reports and the like. Their arrangement leaves much to be desired but they are indispensable. The University faculty minutes begin in 1863, and of the new professional schools at various dates. Until toward the end of the eighties they contain disappointingly little beyond the formal record of student petitions and student discipline.

"There are two sets of printed catalogs available, in the libraries of the University and of the State Historical Society; the latter has, either as separates or in the appendices to the legislative journals, a complete set of the curators' reports to the governor or Assembly. The appendices contain also reports of the legislative visiting or investigating committees.

"The State Historical Society has a complete file of the Statesman (originally the Patriot), Switzler's paper, beginning in 1841, and a more broken file of the Herald, edited by E. W. Stephens and beginning in 1876. Both editors were members of the board and deeply interested in the University. The Jefferson City papers in the same depository are invaluable for debates in the Assembly."

The volume is prepared in two parts. The first 243 pages by Dr. Viles deal with the founding of the University and carries the story of its development up through the time of the fire which destroyed the University building on January 9, 1892. The remainder of the volume from page 247 to 508 is broken down into eleven chapters dealing with the history and growth of the various schools and colleges of the University from the time of their founding to the time of the Centennial Celebration."
The chapter titles of the first section "The Old University" are as follows:

I  The Background
II  The Foundations
III  Sectionalism and Sectarianism
IV  Recovery and Progress
V  The Time of Troubles
VI  From College to University
VII  Samuel Spahr Laws
VIII  The Fire

The chapter titles of the second section "The Modern University" and the authors of each chapter are:

IX  Introduction
X  The College of Arts and Science
   HENRY MARVIN BELDEN, Professor Emeritus of English
XI  The College of Agriculture
   WILLIAM CARLYLE ETHERIDGE, Professor of Field Crops
XII The School of Business and Public Administration
   WILLIAM LEONARD BRADSHAW, Associate Professor of Political Science and Public Law
XIII The School of Education
   DEAN THEOPHIL WILLIAM HENRY IRION
XIV The School of Engineering
   MENDELL P. WEINBACH, Professor of Electrical Engineering
XV  The Graduate School
   CHARLES FREDERIC MULLETT, Associate Professor of History
XVI The School of Journalism
   ROSCOE BRABAZON ELLARD, Professor of Journalism
The History itself is bound in red cloth, the format, binding, and paper being identical in every way to the Centennial Celebration Proceedings volume. The end sheets in the volume carry an airplane view of the University as it appeared at the time of the Centennial Celebration in 1939. Illustrations appearing in the history include the Columns; Old Academic Hall, the original University Building; President John Hiram Lathrop; President Daniel Read; and President Richard Henry Jesse.

Five thousand copies of the history were published by the University during the Centennial year and the volume was officially presented to President Middlebush by Dr. Viles at the Centennial Convocation on November 1, 1939. Some two thousand copies of the history have been distributed to the high schools of the State, public libraries, and other universities and colleges throughout the country. Copies of the History may be purchased from the Director of Publications at the University of Missouri.
APPENDIX

The detailed programs, a copy of the official program, and miscellaneous information relative to the various celebrations are included in this appendix.
FOUNDERS' DAY BANQUET
February 14, 1940

Program

Toastmaster

John H. Lathrop............ Vice-President of the Board of Curators

Mr. Lathrop is a grandson of John H. Lathrop, first President of the University of Missouri and also first President of the Universities of Wisconsin and Indiana; son of the late Gardiner Lathrop, former member of the Board of Curators; and father of Gardiner Lathrop, a member of the Senior Centennial Class at the University of Missouri.

Invocation.... Reverend Carl Agee, Dean of the Missouri Bible College

Address and Greetings

Lloyd C. Stark....................Governor of Missouri
Frank Briggs....................Member of the Missouri Senate
John G. Christy..................Speaker of the Missouri House of Representatives
John D. Taylor...................Member of the Missouri House of Representatives
Lloyd W. King.............State Superintendent of Public Schools
Allen McReynolds.....President of the State Historical Society of Missouri
Uel W. Lamkin......President of the Northwest Missouri State Teachers College representing the State Teachers Colleges
Franc L. McCluer......President of Westminster College representing the Missouri College Union
Frederick A. Middlebush...President of the University of Missouri
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Missouri Elective Officials and Members of the Tenth General Assembly who were responsible for the Founding of the University of Missouri in 1839.

Governor ..................................... Lilburn W. Boggs
Lieutenant-Governor ......................... Franklin Cannon
Secretary of State .......................... James L. Minor
State Auditor ............................... Hiram H. Baber
State Treasurer ............................. Abraham McClellan
Attorney-General ............................ Samuel Mansfield Bay
Supt of Public Schools ........................ Peter G. Glover

**Senate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>William M. Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Henry Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>James Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Caison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>William McDaniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Glasscock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Joshua Gentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>John Conger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Thomas C. Maupin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Charles R. Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Rawlins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>Thomas J. Gorham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>Daniel Ashley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Josia Morin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>Cornelius Gilliam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James T. V. Thompson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**House of Representatives**

| Audrain | James Jackson               |
| Barry   | Littlebury Mason            |
| Boone   | David M. Hickman            |
|         | James S. Rollins            |
|         | Alexander Persinger         |
|         | Tyre Harris                 |
|         | John G. Gordon              |
Caldwell—John Corrill
Callaway—
  John A. Burt
  Isaac Curd
  Benjamin Young
Cape Girardeau—
  J. Russel
  George F. Bollinger
  Isaac Williams
Carroll—Thomas Minnis
Chariton—Thomas Watson
Clark—Samuel D. South
Clay—
  David R. Atchison
  J. M. Hughes
  Jesse Morin
Clinton—Jesse B. Thompson
Cole—
  A. M. Elston
  James Enloe
Cooper—
  John Miller
  B. F. Hickox
  S. Hall
Crawford—Simeon Frost
Daviess—John D. Williams
Franklin—
  F. R. Childs
  William Brown
Gasconade—John B. Harrison
Green—Chesley Cannefax
Howard—
  Thomas Jackson
  Charles Canole
  John P. Morris
Jackson—
  J. Chiles
  Thomas Jeffries
Jefferson—
  Benjamin Hunt
  Jonathan Smith
Johnson—James W. Fulkerson
Lafayette—
  William M. Bowring
  J. Young
Lewis—Addison Reese
Lincoln—George Huston
Linn—James A. Clark
Livingston—Charles H. Ashby
Macon—Johnson Wright
Madison—John Polk
Marion—
  William Carson
  John H. Curd
  William Ritchie
Miller—Edward Wilkes
Monroe—
  Jonathan Gore
  William N. Penn
Montgomery—M. M. Maughas
Morgan—John B. Fisher
New Madrid—
  George R. Netherton
Perry—Joab W. Burgee
Pike—
  William Biggs
  James W. Booth
  M. Kelly
Polk—R. E. Acock
Pulaski—Robert Montgomery
Ralls—
  Chappel Carstarphen
  J. D. Caldwell
Randolph—George Burckhartt
Ray—
  C. B. Morehead
  Hardy Holman
Ripley—Alfred Detherage
Rives—George B. Woodson
St. Charles—
  John D. Coalter
  B. Emmons
St. Francois—Joseph Boggy
Ste. Genevieve—
  Allan W. Holloman
St. Louis—
  John Sappington
  Thomas Jarrell
  Wilson Primm
  Henry S. Geyer
Thomas Caulk
Bernard Pratt
Saline—Thomas B. Harvey
Scott—Wilson Brown
Shelby—Elias Kincheloe
Stoddard—F. Bradshaw
Taney—John W. Hancock
Van Buren—James Williams
Warren—Rufus Fullerton
Washington—
   Myres F. Jones
   T. Manning
   A. Hudspeth
Wayne—Richard D. Gowan

St. Louis City—
   J. Jules Brinkman
   David A. Hess
   Oliver E. J. Shick
   William Warren Burke
   Harold V. Healy
   John A. Sullivan
   Robert M. Uxa
   Edward M. Brady
   Edwin G. Foerst
   Edward J. Hogan, Jr.
   Michael R. Kennedy
   Edward F. Byrnes
   Joseph Council
   Don S. Gregson
   Maurice Schechter
Missouri Elective Officials and Members of the Sixtieth General Assembly participating in the Centennial Celebration

**Governor** ............................................. Lloyd C. Stark

**Lieutenant-Governor** .................................. Frank G. Harris

**Secretary of State** ..................................... Dwight H. Brown

**State Auditor** .......................................... Forrest Smith

**State Treasurer** ......................................... Robert W. Winn

**Attorney-General** ............................................ Roy McKittrick

**Supt. of Public Schools** .................................... Lloyd W. King

**Senate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Charles O. Roberson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Francis J. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Jess D. Sexton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Ray Mabee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>M. E. Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Delmar Dail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Lee Diment Seelig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Dick B. Dale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>Frank P. Briggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>W. B. Whitlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Raymond E. Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>William M. Quinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>George D. Clayton, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>C. S. Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>Charles Ewen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>Bert Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>Charles Sims Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>T. E. Roberts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>William E. Freeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>Edward A. Barbour, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>Paul C. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>L. N. Searcy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>James Clarence McDowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th</td>
<td>Emery W. Allison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>Raleigh McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th</td>
<td>George A. Rozier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th</td>
<td>Phil M. Donnelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th</td>
<td>Allen McReynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th</td>
<td>W. J. Doran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th</td>
<td>Percy Pepoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st</td>
<td>Michael D. Kinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>John M. McKeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd</td>
<td>Joseph H. Brogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34th</td>
<td>Myles P. Dyer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**House of Representatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adair</td>
<td>C. E. Still</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>H. T. Floyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atchison</td>
<td>J. A. Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrain</td>
<td>Suggett Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Clarence Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>C. W. Remm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>Carl J. Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>C. P. Junge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollinger</td>
<td>R. A. DeWitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>Thomas J. Walker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buchanan—
  L. C. Thedinger
  Emmett Cook
  Paul Turner
Butler—R. H. Weber
Caldwell—John Stephens
Callaway—Robert G. Hall
Camden—Leonidas King
Cape Girardeau—
  Frank A. Lowry
Carroll—Joe H. Miller
Carter—C. P. Turley
Cass—
  Roscoe Conklin Summers
Cedar—H. A. Simrell
Chariton—John D. Taylor
Christian—G. Purd Hays
Clark—Orvey Buck
Clay—Arthur Roy Kincaid
Clinton—M. J. Woodward
Cole—H. P. Lauf
Cooper—M. T. Devine
Crawford—W. E. Martin
Dade—Will W. Dodson
Dallas—Charles R. Farrar
Daviess—Urlin Salmon
DeKalb—Herbert Miller
Dent—John Jack
Douglas—Gladys B. Stewart
Dunklin—A. S. McDaniel
Franklin—A. H. Steinbeck
Gasconade—John Schermann
Gentry—Allen T. Bare
Greene—
  Roy J. Chaffin
  A. T. Parrish
  H. C. Crist
Grundy—Fred McGuire
Harrison—Tom Brown
Henry—Charles T. Campbell
Hickory—O. B. Whitaker
Holt—W. H. Weightman
Howard—H. Clay Bentley
Howell—Buford Skaggs
Iron—J. Arthur Francis

Jasper—
  William F. Maring, Jr.
  W. O. Hanks
  Don C. Grafton
Jefferson—John G. Christy
Johnson—J. R. Garrison
Knox—Paul K. Gibbons
Laclede—T. Victor Jeffries
Lafayette—Harry E. Gladish
Lawrence—Walter Whinrey
Lewis—F. B. Conrath
Lincoln—A. L. Welborn
Linn—D. A. Peery
Livingston—R. R. Kitt
McDonald—
  Grover C. Studivan
Macon—Clyde I. Murry
Madison—Charles Barrett
Maries—E. A. Wallace
Marion—Roy Hamlin
Mercer—L. N. Dixon
Miller—Fred Spearman
Mississippi—Daniel O'Bryan
Monteau—J. L. Freeman
Monroe—B. E. Cowherd
Montgomery—William Barton
Morgan—Robert J. Murray
New Madrid—Jackson Davis
Newton—Wayne Slankard
Nodaway—
  A. H. (Bert) Cooper
Oregon—Obie Ford
Osage—Paul B. Dessieux
Ozark—J. B. Heriford
Pemiscot—A. B. Brinkman
Perry—Tolbert Henson
Pettis—E. W. Couey
Phelps—J. J. Daily
Pike—William B. Weakley
Platte—J. W. Farley
Polk—Harrison S. Rainwater
Pulaski—Guy Winningham
Putnam—M. E. Fish
Ralls—Edmond R. Caldwell
Randolph—Lawrence Holman
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Ray—R. F. Wollard
Reynolds—M. M. Jamison
Ripley—Howard R. Maness
St. Charles—Frank J. Iffrig
St. Clair—Albert Gaston
St. Francois—B. E. Caruthers
Ste. Genevieve—
  Charles T. Wolf
Saline—Guy Abney
Schuyler—E. E. Hale
Scotland—
  James Clarence Woodsmall
Scott—James S. Wallace
Shannon—R. E. Searcy
Shelby—Morris E. Osburn
Stoddard—Claude Arnold
Stone—Willis Lane
Sullivan—Z. A. Cleton
Taney—Henry Awbrey
Texas—J. N. Williams
Vernon—Robert Ewing
Warren—Harry B. McGee
Washington—
  Perry A. Hoffman

Wayne—O. R. Sutton
Webster—D. Raymond Carter
Worth—J. W. Haley
Wright—J. F. Newton
Jackson—
  John B. Haskell
  William H. Lafferty
  Max Asotsky
  Thomas J. Gill
  Frank M. Robison
  Edgar J. Keating
  Eugene E. Montgomery
  V. E. Phillips
  Samuel C. Hayden
  William Randolph Smart
St. Louis—
  Forrest Mittendorf
  Howard Elliott
  Hartwell G. Crain
St. Louis City—
  John T. Hughes
  Joseph L. Ivanhoe
  Jerry Novak
  Michael J. Smith
CENTENNIAL CONVOCATION

November 1, 1940

Program

FREDERICK A. MIDDLEBUSH, President
University of Missouri
Presiding

Academic Procession.............................Svendsen
University Band

Invocation

RIGHT REVEREND JOSEPH CORRIGAN
Rector, Catholic University of America

Address: “The Contribution that an Endowed University Can Make to the Life and Growth of a Nation”

JAMES B. CONANT
President of Harvard University

Presentation of “A History of the University of Missouri”

JONAS VILES
Professor of History

Address: “Can Democracy Survive Without Indoctrination?”

ROBERT G. SPROUL
President of the University of California

Introductions

“Old Missouri”

Benediction

RIGHT REVEREND JOSEPH CORRIGAN
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date of Founding</th>
<th>Delegates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>James B. Conant, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Charles Seymour, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edgar S. Furniss, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Edwin B. Williams, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Harold W. Dodds, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>George B. Pegram, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. L. Thorndike, Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank H. Bowles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Henry M. Wriston, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. G. D. Richardson, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Frank P. Graham, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. W. Pierson, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>J. D. Hoskins, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Alexander G. Ruthven, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. S. Yoakum, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>H. B. Chimmins, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>James S. Wilson, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>H. B. Wells, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fernandus Payne, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>G. S. Brett, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>W. P. Few, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. B. Hoover, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Frederick A. Middlebush, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry E. Bent, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Clarence A. Dykstra, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edwin B. Fred, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Guy S. Ford, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal N. Chapman, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donald C. Balfour, Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Date of Founding</td>
<td>Delegates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Franklin B. Snyder, President James W. Bell, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>George R. Throop, Chancellor F. W. Shipley, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of Iowa</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Eugene A. Gilmore, President George D. Stoddard, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Tech.</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Karl T. Compton, President H. M. Goodwin, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Denver</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>David S. Duncan, Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Frank L. McVey, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Edmund E. Day, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>F. K. Richtmyer, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Deane W. Malott, Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Robert G. Sproul, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Charles P. Lipman, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>J. W. Fulbright, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Joseph A. Leighton, Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>John Pomfret, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Raymond Walters, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Robert L. Stearns, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Homer P. Rainey, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>A. P. Brogan, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of America</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Ray L. Wilbur, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Ralph H. Lutz, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Joseph Corrigan, Rector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of Tech.</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Roy J. Deferrari, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Wallace W. Atwood, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George A. Works, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard C. Tolman, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. R. Munro, Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. B. Bizzell, President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COLUMBIA AND BOONE COUNTY CENTENNIAL
BANQUET

November 2, 1939

MR. J. M. ALLTON
President Columbia Chamber of Commerce
Presiding

Music .................................................... University String Quartet
Professor Rogers Whitmore, Director

Introduction .............................. President Frederick A. Middlebush

Address: Town and Gown .............. E. Sydney Stephens

Address and Roll Call of the Descendants of
Original Donors ............................ North Todd Gentry

"Old Missouri"

(134)
ALUMNI CENTENNIAL CONVOCATION

November 4, 1940

Program

MR. BYRON SPENCER
President University of Missouri Alumni Association
Presiding

Music. ...................... Selection by the Men’s Glee Club
MR. MARK BILLS, Director

Address. ...................... Judge Kimbrough Stone

Conferring of Honorary Alumni Membership on Dr. Frederick A. Middlebush by Mr. R. B. Caldwell

Remarks. ...................... President Middlebush

“Old Missouri”
CENTENNIAL
CONVOCATION

COMMEMORATING THE
ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE FOUNDING OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Brewer Field House— Nov. 1, 1939
The one hundred year history of the University of Missouri has not always been one of easy and uninterrupted progress. Today we are harvesting where pioneers overcame difficulties that at times, no doubt, seemed insurmountable. Men of devoted and consecrated lives kept the struggling institution alive when war threatened its very existence, and built out of the ashes of a single building, one of the greatest of American State Universities. The University of Missouri is our heritage from loyal and unselfish educators, statesmen, and citizens of Missouri who through the last century have given their labor and their means for a great State University.
The history of the University begins with the passage of the Geyer Act by the Tenth General Assembly on February 11, 1839. On June 24, of the same year, Columbia was selected as the location for the University. Later that same summer the first Board of Curators held its initial meeting under a sugar maple tree located on the northern edge of the present campus to select the site for the first University building. The corner stone of that building was laid on July 4, 1840, class work in the preparatory division having been started on April 14, of that year, and the first college classes opened the following December. The first commencement exercise was held November 28, 1843. John H. Lath-
rop became the first President on March 1, 1841, and served in that capacity until 1849, when he resigned to become the first Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin.

During Lathrop's administration the sole income to the University was derived from the meager student fees and the revenue from $78,000 worth of stock invested in the old Bank of the State of Missouri. Following Lathrop's resignation, James Shannon served as President for six years, but because of his active part in religious and political affairs, Shannon involved himself and the University in the bitter sectional fights of the 50's and was
forced to retire in 1856. He was followed by President Hudson who had been a member of the faculty since 1841. Hudson and his successor, President Minor, had brought the University back to an even keel when in March, 1862, the institution was closed.

The University's sole endowment income from the bank stock had ceased, the institution was badly in debt, teachers had not been paid, most of the students had gone off to war or gone home, and the University building was occupied by Federal militia.

The University was re-opened in November, 1862, primarily through the efforts of local citizens, and in 1865, the University was formally re-organized with Lathrop as President for the second time. The Curators had re-opened the University in 1862 because they hoped to secure the federal land grant which had been authorized under the Morrill Act for the founding of a College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. After a bitter fight at Jefferson City, Major J. S. Rollins, who had taken a leading part in the establishment of the University, was instrumental in securing these funds for the founding of the college at Columbia with one division, the School of Mines, to be located at Rolla.
Meanwhile the Assembly in 1867, twenty-eight years after the school was founded, made its first appropriation to the University. This appropriation was for the establishment of a Normal College, the forerunner of the present School of Education, and also for the rebuilding of the president's home which had been destroyed by fire. It was during this same period that women were first admitted to the University.

Work in Agriculture was offered for the first time in 1870, and the School of Mines was opened at Rolla in 1871, the School of Law established in 1872, and the School of Medicine in 1873.

Under the administration of President Lawes, enrollment grew and the student body became more representative of the state at
large. About this time the legislature began making regular appropriations for the maintenance of the University.

The outlook for the University had never seemed brighter when on the night of January 9, 1892, the main building was destroyed by fire and along with it most of the library and scientific equipment. Over night vacant stores and churches were converted into class rooms and school work went on. What at first seemed a great catastrophe proved a blessing in disguise, for the Missouri legislature provided for the building of Jesse Hall, which was completed in 1895, and for most of the other buildings now facing Francis Quadrangle. The University as we know it today, both in physical plant and general organization, actually dates from the reconstruction period following the fire.

This picture of Major James S. Rollins known as the Father of the University of Missouri was painted by George Caleb Bingham and presented to the University by friends of Major Rollins in 1873. The original was destroyed when the University burned in 1892, but a reproduction made from sketches of the original now hangs in the Governor's reception room in the State Capitol.
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# ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

and

DELEGATES TO THE FORTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date of Founding</th>
<th>Delegates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>James B. Conant, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Charles Seymour, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edgar S. Furniss, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Edwin B. Williams, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Harold W. Dodds, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. P. Eisenhart, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>George B. Pegram, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. L. Thorndike, Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank H. Bowles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Henry M. Wriston, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. G. D. Richardson, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Frank P. Graham, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. W. Pierson, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>J. D. Hoskins, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Alexander G. Ruthven, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>C. S. Yoakum, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>H. B. Chimmins, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>James S. Wilson, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>H. B. Wells, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fernandus Payne, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>G. S. Brett, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>W. P. Few, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. B. Hoover, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Frederick A. Middlebush, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry E. Bent, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Clarence A. Dykstra, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edwin B. Fred, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Guy S. Ford, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal N. Chapman, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donald C. Balfour, Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Franklyn B. Snyder, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James W. Bell, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>George R. Throop, Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F. W. Shipley, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of Iowa</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Eugene A. Gilmore, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George D. Stoddard, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Tech.</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Karl T. Compton, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. M. Goodwin, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Denver</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>David S. Duncan, Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Frank L. McVey, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Edmund E. Day, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F. K. Richtmyer, Dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University of Kansas 1865 Deane W. Malott, Chancellor
E. B. Stouffer, Dean
University of Illinois 1867 A. C. Willard, President
R. D. Carmichael, Dean
University of California 1868 Robert G. Sproul, President
Charles P. Lipman, Dean
University of Nebraska 1869 C. S. Boucher, Chancellor
Harold W. Stoke, Dean
University of Arkansas 1872 J. W. Fulbright, President
Ohio State University 1873 Joseph A. Leighton, Professor
Vanderbilt University 1873 John Pomfret, Dean
University of Cincinnati 1874 Raymond Walters, President
Johns Hopkins University 1876
University of Colorado 1877 Robert L. Stearns, President
University of Texas 1881 Homer P. Rainey, President
A. P. Brogan, Dean
Stanford University 1885 Ray L. Wilbur, President
Ralph H. Lutz, Dean
Catholic University of America 1887 Joseph Corrigan, Rector
Roy J. Defferrari, Dean
Clark University 1887 Wallace W. Atwood, President
University of Chicago 1890 Henry G. Gale, Dean
George A. Works, Dean
California Institute of Tech. 1891 Richard C. Tolman, Dean
W. R. Munro, Professor
University of Oklahoma 1892 W. B. Bizzell, President
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PROGRAM

FREDERICK A. MIDDLEBUSH, President
University of Missouri
Presiding

1. Academic Procession . . . . . . Svendsen
   UNIVERSITY BAND

2. Invocation
   RIGHT REVEREND JOSEPH CORRIGAN
   Rector, Catholic University of America

3. Address: “The Contribution that an Endowed University Can Make to the Life and Growth of a Nation”
   JAMES B. CONANT
   President of Harvard University

4. Presentation of “A History of the University of Missouri”
   JONAS VILES
   Professor of History

5. Address: “Can Democracy Survive Without Indoctrination?”
   ROBERT G. SPR OUL
   President of the University of California

6. Introductions

7. “Old Missouri”
   (The audience is requested to join in the singing)

8. Benediction
   RIGHT REVEREND JOSEPH CORRIGAN
Visitors to the University campus frequently ask about the origin of Missouri’s historical columns which now stand in the center of Francis Quadrangle. The series of pictures on this page present the evolution of the columns starting with the upper picture: An architect’s drawing as the building was originally planned, the next picture shows the building after completion in 1842, the third picture shows the building after the wings had been added in 1872. The fourth picture was made during the fire in 1892. The picture at the bottom of the page shows the columns as they are today.
On its one hundredth birthday the University offers work in eleven major divisions. They include the College of Arts and Science, College of Agriculture, School of Business and Public Administration, School of Engineering, School of Education, Graduate School, School of Journalism, School of Law, School of Medicine, and the Extension Division located at Columbia, and the Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy located at Rolla.

The University grounds at Columbia cover more than 800 acres. The main divisions are Francis Quadrangle, the East Campus, the athletic fields, and the University farm. Within a ten mile radius of the campus, the University owns approximately 1,200 acres of land which are used for instructional and experimental purposes by the College of
Agriculture and operates another 2,200 acres as a wildlife experimental area. Ninety buildings, 49 of them major structures, house the various activities of the University, and twelve major buildings on the thirty-two acre campus of the School of Mines at Rolla house the activities of that division.

There are approximately 40,000 former students and alumni of the University now living in every county in the State of Missouri, every state in the union, and in fifty-two foreign countries.

Student enrollment in the University has shown a steady increase since 1934. During the school year, 1937-38, the University of Missouri had one of the largest percentage increases in its student body among all the major universities in the en-
The campus at the Missouri School of Mines as it appears from the Observatory on top of Jackling Gymnasium.

tire United States. Enrollment the first semester of the current school year established an all time high with 5,566 students registered at the University and 779 students enrolled in the School of Mines. While there are students from other states and a few from foreign countries enrolled in the University who give the institution a cosmopolitan atmosphere, the preponderance of the students, 4,621, are from the State of Missouri. In addition to the resident enrollment, 1,739 individuals are carrying correspondence and extension courses.

During 1938, there were 1,070 degrees conferred by the University at the June and August commencements, and during the Centennial Year of 1939, the number of persons graduating in a single year will probably establish a new record.
The University Library which opened with eight periodicals in 1841, now contains 380,649 volumes. The Library building was erected in 1914, and the West wing was added in 1937. This building also houses the offices and files of the Missouri State Historical Society. There are five branch libraries located in the buildings of the various professional divisions of the University.

This monument originally placed at the grave of Thomas Jefferson at Monticello, Virginia, in 1826, was constructed from his own design and was presented July 4, 1883, to the University of Missouri, first state university to be founded in the Louisiana Territory, purchased from France during Jefferson's administration as President of the United States.

Memorial Stadium, the scene of the University of Missouri gridiron activities, seats approximately 26,000 persons. While football holds the focus point of general interest, the University also maintains an extensive program of physical education and intramural activities so that all students may participate in some form of sport.

The Memorial Tower of the University of Missouri has been called one of the most perfect examples of Gothic Architecture in the United States. It was built through popular subscription of friends and alumni in memory of the 142 sons of the University killed in the World War.
BOARD OF CURATORS

Front Row left to right: J. H. Wolpers, Poplar Bluff, Chairman of the Executive Board; Dr. Frederick A. Middlebush, President of the University of Missouri; Frank M. McDavid, Springfield, President of the Board; George Willson, St. Louis; and John H. Lathrop, Kansas City, Vice-President of the Board.

Back Row left to right: H. Charles Cox, Rockport; Harold J. Moore, Brookfield; Earl Nelson, St. Louis; H. J. Blanton, Paris, Chairman of the Executive Committee; James A. Potter, Jefferson City; and Leslie Cowan, Columbia, Secretary of the Board. (This group constituted the Board of Curators at the opening of the Centennial Celebration. However, during the current year, the terms of H. Charles Cox and George Willson have expired. Mr. Tom K. Smith of St. Louis has been appointed to the Board by Governor Stark, and there is still one vacancy.)

THE GOVERNOR'S BOARD OF VISITORS

Tom K. Smith, Chairman..............St. Louis
Cowgill Blair............................Joplin
E. A. Ikenberry.........................Independence
Clif Langsdale.........................Kansas City
Clay H. Stark.........................Louisiana

The historical pictures appearing in this program are through the courtesy of the Missouri State Historical Society, Westhoff Studio, and the University Photo Service.