THE SIZE OF BROWN UNIVERSITY
THE SIZE OF
BROWN UNIVERSITY

HENRY M. WRISTON

Providence
BROWN UNIVERSITY
1946
FOREWORD

Following the first World War the Trustees and Fellows gave consideration to the size of Brown University, and after a series of tentative moves took definitive action in 1929 restricting further growth.

At the close of the recent war the Corporation again reviewed the situation. A special committee was appointed, composed of W. Randolph Burgess, '12, Chairman, Charles E. Hughes, Jr., '09, Homer N. Sweet, '07, Fred B. Perkins, '19, W. Russell Burwell, '15, Arthur M. Allen, '97 and Walter H. Snell, '13. After careful study, they presented a report which was the principal item of business at a special meeting of the Corporation. Having thoroughly discussed the recommendations, Brown's governing body voted that the formal restrictions should be removed and that the size of the University should be determined by two criteria: first, by the number of candidates fully qualified by education, character, and ability, and, second, by our capacity to care for them properly.

This booklet comprises the substance of the report prepared for the special committee. On the basis of several suggestions made by the members of that group, it was revised before submission to the Trustees and Fellows, and in the light of the discussion at the meeting of the Corporation, it has been still further revised. It is now published as an exposition of the reasons for the change in policy.

HENRY M. WRISTON
THE SIZE OF BROWN UNIVERSITY

The close of a great world war offers a favorable moment for Brown University to review the formal restrictions upon the size of the institution. The votes on the subject were passed by the Corporation during the years following the first World War. The last official act occurred on October 17, 1929. Since these decisions many new factors have appeared.

The first reason why Brown should reconsider formal restrictions upon its size is that the University represents something so vital to American life that its services should be made more fully available.

Colleges such as Brown, whose character gives them profound educational significance, were not located by compass or slide rule. Every great institution embodies some concept so profound and so compelling that its validity is limited neither by time nor space. In the nation's history this community and this University have epitomized freedom of thought, speech, and action, tolerance in religion, the peaceful association of races, creeds, and nationalities. Those ideals are still the touchstone of our educational policy. What Brown meant in 1764 and what it means in 1946 are identical; as it was of
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vast importance for the world of the eighteenth century, it is also of critical importance for the twentieth.

Today Brown is located in the center of the second largest metropolitan area in New England and the eleventh largest in the country. Those are important and relevant data in the current circumstances, for a small country college in the midst of a great urban center is almost unthinkable. This would be particularly true in regard to Brown which has had such an intimate relationship with the development of the state. However, the controlling factor is that the problems of tolerance are even more pressing now than in 1764. More acute than ever is the need for the spiritual, moral, and intellectual values which led to the establishment of Brown, which have informed its history and remain the inspiration of its future. In so far as man's capacity to create power and release energy has out-run his mastery of the moral forces by which alone energy can be wisely channeled, the University now has a place even more essential than it had earlier in American history.

There is too little realization that only a few institutions of higher education are dedicated without reservation to our historical ideal. Our age is marked by paradoxes; none is more striking than that public education is less and less fundamentally concerned with the public interest, whereas private
of 1787 setting up the Northwest Territory referred first to religion, second to morality, and third to knowledge. How long is it since a federal or even a state statute has reiterated such an emphasis?

What, concretely, is now proposed by way of public action in a moment of moral crisis? New York is typical. It proposes to develop a number of two-year technical institutes. The pressure toward vocational, technical, and specialized training is given a vast impetus at the very moment when international tensions, strikes, and a thousand other manifestations show that the deeper and more fundamental need is for more liberal education.

No disparagement of the practical arts, science, or technology is involved in this review of the current situation of higher education. The Charter of Brown University forbids any such underemphasis; it specifically directs us to "respect the sciences." All these skills are of great importance. But all can be brought to frustration unless the overriding importance of the liberal arts is recognized. Undampened faith in the liberal arts is exhibited by only a relatively small group of independent, endowed colleges and universities. They still cultivate the capacity to deal with large questions of public policy not as a technical expert but as a competent citizen.

Nevertheless, while the proportion of attention to liberal arts in public institutions has been shrinking, the independent institutions devoted to the lib-
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eral ideal have not been compensating that loss by a commensurate increase in enrollments. Between 1900 and 1940 the number of men in colleges increased ninefold, and the number of women tenfold. Yet in a typical liberal arts institution, such as Brown, the increase in those forty years was only 126 per cent at the College, and only 226 per cent at Pembroke. (See Figure I on the preceding page.) Furthermore, even this relatively small gain was not spread equally over the forty-year period. Brown and Pembroke stood still during the decade of the Thirties when the number of men enrolled in liberal arts colleges advanced 62 per cent and the women in liberal arts curricula 51 per cent. Meanwhile enrollments in full-time four-year undergraduate professional and technical colleges showed a gain of 147 per cent among men and 170 per cent among women. (See Figure II opposite.)

Shall this trend, by which the liberal arts are being swallowed up, be allowed to continue? It may be suggested that existing colleges of liberal arts have only a limited liability, that they have absorbed their fair share, and new institutions should meet the need. That cannot be expected. New experimental colleges appear, as do junior colleges and technical institutes, but there is no significant move to found new liberal arts colleges, save for a few Catholic institutions. Nor can endowed colleges shrug off responsibility by asserting that public in-
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stitutions should readopt programs of liberal studies. Political pressures make it quite unlikely that any such course will be followed.

If the liberal arts college, the only institution except the Church which has a decisive role to play in the moral crisis of the world, restricts its responsibilities, those obligations will remain undischarged. The world has greatly changed since 1764 in scale, in scope, in pattern, in pressure. But wherever one turns in the examination of the modern scene, the validity and significance of the fundamental ideal which Brown so powerfully expresses are more apparent than at any time in its 182 years of history. There are not enough institutions to meet the need; Brown should carry a heavier share of the load. That is the first reason why Brown ought now to make an effort to accommodate more students.

II

There is a second compelling reason why Brown should reconsider rigid numerical restrictions. It arises from a second paradox, parallel with the first. As already pointed out, liberal education receives less emphasis just when greater emphasis is essential. It is equally true that education is more local just when it should embody the "one-world" concept.

The United States is inextricably involved in world politics. The dominant position we took in two wars makes that abundantly clear. If we are to discipline
ourselves to take the responsibilities and accept the
disappointments and difficulties that come from an
active role in world politics, we must suit our edu-
cational pattern and program to that reality.

Physically it was never so easy to achieve the re-
sult we seek. The "new" world of communication
and transport made the two "world wars" of the
twentieth century different from those of the eight-
eenth and earlier centuries. We think little of shut-
tling men to distant army camps and sending armed
forces clear around the world. Each day some new
miracle of flight speeds up communication with the
uttermost parts of the earth. One would expect de-
velopments of that character to stimulate great mi-
gratings of students from place to place, such as
characterized higher education in the days of its
origins.

Indeed, the lessons of the dangers of sectionalism
dramatized by our own Civil War might be expected
to lead to the freest interchange of students within
the United States. Nevertheless our institutional
fabric and orientation are not more national but
more sectional and even more local. There is a marked
contrast between enthusiastic efforts to exchange
professors and students with Europe and with La-
tin America, and the lack of effort to encourage a
boy from California to come to New England, or a
New Englisher to seek educational experience in
the South, or a Southerner to find his way into
the universities and colleges of the Middle West.

A vast multiplication of opportunities for higher education is not inherently contradictory to a correspondingly great interchange of student populations. Yet there is a strong tendency no longer to look upon universities as great adventures of the human spirit but as community service stations. Just when transportation has made location less significant than ever, a college's opportunities and potentialities are calculated on the basis of the local demographic situation.

Junior colleges epitomize the increasing accent upon parochialism. Most are strictly local, as local as high schools. They have local students, and often employ local teachers. They are local in a different sense also; in many communities considerable pressure is put upon high school students to prevent them from going away to "outside" institutions. That is isolationism of a very disastrous kind. The desire to "keep spending power in town" overrides the educational need for experience away from home. Historically the college has supplied a transitional environment between home disciplines and the independence of maturity.

The tendency to parochialism which junior colleges manifest at the local level, state universities exhibit at a higher level. By differential charges adversely affecting students from outside the state they penalize the free migration of students. The
greater the pressure of enrollment, the more they tend to narrow the geographical range of their service. Several have now gone much further than financial discrimination and have virtually barred registrants from out of the state. The tendency to localism has gone so far that some of the larger state universities draw the majority of their students from three or four contiguous counties. Indeed to meet local pressures some states have as many as fifteen or twenty state supported four-year colleges; most students live at home. From the standpoint of acquiring gainful skills this may be satisfactory; but viewed in a larger educational perspective there is a serious loss, for those students have none of the educative benefits of residential experience.

In a country as rich and varied as the United States tariffs and quotas on "foreigners" from the next commonwealth, or even the next community, are anti-educational. Certainly they run counter to the thesis and reality of "one-world" in the most dramatic manner. To accept global responsibility in politics and drift into localism in education is a contradiction so obvious as not to require elaboration.

The drift has gone so far that the number of colleges with more than a local student body is small. The only institutions of collegiate grade which steadily combat such parochialism are independent institutions, like Brown, which seek to develop a na-
tional constituency. Only the oldest and strongest, whose alumni are scattered far and wide, can do this effectively or on a scale which makes a real impact upon the problem.

Brown should not fail to exploit this significant educational opportunity or neglect to make itself more nearly national in its appeal. It must actively encourage qualified students from all parts of the country to come to its campus for four years. Such a program is essential to its own domestic effectiveness. It is necessary, also, to make a contribution toward breaking down sectional barriers. This cannot be done merely on a token basis. Enough students must be enrolled from many places to make a substantial impact upon the life of the College, and for the College to leave its impress upon their thought.

III

There is a third reason why Brown should review its stated policy with regard to size. The war has brought a new drive for universal higher education. Such a surge followed the last war. It did not prove transitory but continued to be felt even during the long depression. (See Figure I on page 11.) The effect of the recent war in stimulating demand for higher education gives every evidence of being even more intense.

The reasons for the demand that higher education approximate secondary education in availabil-
ity are fairly clear. Faced with the problem of training a vast Army and Navy, and developing leadership within the ranks, the colleges were mobilized by the government. Under adverse circumstances of haste, distortion of program, and confusion they did astonishingly well. Confronted with a necessity for research and technological development to meet imminent dangers, the nation called upon the universities to supply laboratories, scientists, and critical personnel of many kinds.

Out of these experiences came a new appreciation of the vast resources of mind and skill which had been modestly concealed in academic organizations. In consequence, the G. I. Bill of Rights; the Army, Navy, and Air Corps programs for training officer personnel; the government’s program for continuing scientific research and technological development have all combined to bring the universities into a position quite unique in their history. Public recognition of the essentiality of higher education has given it great popular prestige. As a result, the social pressure toward universal higher education eclipses any predictions that might have been made even five years ago. In a recent survey 85 per cent of the parents interviewed wanted their children to go to college.

Colleges cannot remain insensitive to this pressure, for they are instruments of society. They are obligated to respond to its deep urges, though not
to its transient whims. To protect them from the latter, universities are not subjected to the daily test of the market place. In order to achieve their high purpose they need some detachment from the market's hurly-burly. But this insulation is designed to shield them from momentary pressures; it does not condone insensitiveness toward genuine social needs.

Beneath all these obvious and recently strengthened sources of social pressure, there is a deep, underlying, vital force. The democratic thesis is undergirded by confidence in popular enlightenment. At every great crisis realization of that fact is refreshed and reinvigorated. At such times the egalitarian temper is strengthened, and all forms of privilege condemned.

America has come as close to a classless society as any country in history. The colleges have been in the forefront of this development; it is the proud boast of the colleges, and more particularly of Brown, that they have been hospitable to the poor boy or girl who had to work and who needed scholarship aid. Nonetheless the college population has been disproportionately drawn from the higher income levels.* Now the demand is widespread and insistent that opportunity for higher education be further
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*This is discussed in *Science, the Endless Frontier, a Report to the President*, by Vannevar Bush, Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development (Washington, 1945), pp. 165 ff.
equalized, and that no capable youth shall be denied higher education.

There is a historical reason why Brown University should respond cordially to this insistence upon a wider basis of democratic education. In the days of its greatest glory, when it attracted national attention by its program, Francis Wayland pleaded that education should "look with as kindly an eye on the mechanic as the lawyer, on the manufacturer and merchant as the minister." This was not a manifestation of a passion for vocational training. He did not propose courses in management or sales technique. His passion was to raise "to high intellectual culture the whole mass of our people." He wanted merchants and manufacturers and workers in every field to become "practical philosophers." He wanted every man, of whatever vocation, to be competent in forming judgments, able in intellectual discipline, and alert in moral perception. The program of education for all and the Brown program of liberal education for those entering upon any field of endeavor are modern approaches to the great ambition of Francis Wayland.

Right now public attention is centered upon recruiting potential new scientists.* Surely that is of vital importance, and Brown will play its appropriate part. Of even greater urgency, however, is

*See Science, the Endless Frontier, passim.

--- 21 ---
the recruitment of potential outstanding citizens, who can exercise moral, social, and political leadership.

If the colleges which are really devoted to the liberal arts make no room for the increasing numbers of able students, it will be regarded as a manifestation of social insensitiveness. If they find it inconvenient in the light of their traditions to alter policies, it will mean that alert, competent, potentially valuable citizens will be given a training less well adapted to the social and political realities of the modern world.

The acceptance of this responsibility will strain our educational ingenuity, and tax teaching capacity perhaps as never before. But Brown University was started with heroic effort, infinite courage, and boundless faith in order to achieve a glowing ideal. It still has that responsibility. To be dominated by tradition, sentimentality, or convenience in the face of the new challenge would scuttle the courage, faith, and idealism that brought this institution into being and made it a great liberal force in education.

The new flood of students is coming very largely from the lower income groups. If we close our doors against those new students, it will be interpreted, perhaps not accurately but nonetheless credibly, as a manifestation of an "aristocratic concept of education." The private institutions, hitherto unjustly
accused of a tendency to be aristocratic, snobbish, and exclusive, will seem at last to offer justification for those epithets.

In facing this problem we must overcome a stubborn prejudice that mere numbers inevitably mean lower standards. There is overwhelming evidence that a widened program of higher education need not affect standards adversely. It should not require argument to prove that there is no correlation between economic or social position on the one hand, and intellectual power, moral insight, and capacity for growth on the other. Many thousands of potential college students of high quality have never matriculated; several investigations have revealed the accuracy of that observation.*

Simple logic makes it clear that if there are more able students desiring higher education, more able students can be enrolled in an institution with a program which attracts them and which is skillful in making wise selections. Our own experience parallels the logic. Because war conditions left the College with idle facilities, Pembroke was permitted to expand in order to take up some of the slack. Between September, 1942, and October, 1945, the entering classes increased nearly 50 per cent in size; at the same time the standing of those successive classes improved markedly as reflected by well-

*Some are cited in Science, the Endless Frontier, Appendix A, pp. 158 ff.
authenticated testing standards. Furthermore, our experience with students after they enter the University reveals that there is no significant relationship between the size of the entering class and its academic average in college work.

Brown is in a peculiarly good position to make these assertions. In the first place, it has long experience in the objective and statistical study of student data. No college in the country has systematically supported a testing program and pursued pertinent follow-up research for a longer period than Brown. With such experience as a basis, it can be said that Brown now has in operation as well-devised and as effective a method of measuring and evaluating its entering students as any institution in the country. The testing office is managed with great skill. None of its data lends support to the notion that growth in size means lowered standards of admission or performance.

The quality of a student body — large or small—depends upon the power of the institution to attract students and the skill of its officers in making wise selections. Attraction is not automatic; age, prestige, location, and many other factors are involved. But to be effective they need skillful exploitation. Attraction cannot be measured by the gross number of applications, or even the ratio between applications and admissions. One of the most mysterious, yet one of the most significant, facts
in higher education is that students tend to apply to an institution fitted to their grade of ability.*

In recent years under the leadership of Dr. Bigelow and Miss Mooar, Brown's power of attraction has been increased in effectiveness. Not only has the quality of entering classes improved, but the percentage of students resident in the college has advanced. At Pembroke only 44 per cent of the students lived in dormitories in 1936; this year 62 per cent are in dormitories. Both colleges are less local and appeal to wider areas. In the year 1939-40, 44 per cent of the Pembroke entering class came from outside Rhode Island; in the current year 69 per cent come from outside the state.

In summary, the third reason we should relax rigid restrictions upon size is that the college population in the United States is going to increase; among the new students are many with high aptitude for liberal arts studies; the College and Pembroke can accommodate more of them not only with no loss of standards but concurrently with an improvement in the quality of their student bodies.

IV

The compelling reasons for relaxing the restrictions upon the size of the University are educational and social.

*This was shown most strikingly in the famous Pennsylvania Study of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, under the direction of Dr. W. S. Learned, Brown, 1897.
We then face the question: Is it practicable? No one can answer this fully, for today no one can predict with assurance the long-term trend of prices and salaries or the yield from securities. What we must do is analyze the current situation in the light of experience, and form the best judgment possible. On that basis the indications are that some growth in size is not only practicable but would be financially advantageous. The reason is that we are not now employing our facilities to the maximum, or even to the optimum. Until we make the best use of personnel and plant, unit costs will be higher than necessary.

In the first place, we are not making the best use of our faculty resources. Unless steps are taken, that situation will deteriorate instead of improve. It is essential to increase faculty salaries. The bargaining position of the union and other labor factors have raised the pay of mechanics, janitors, and groundsmen, while the faculty have had little or no salary relief to offset rising costs of living and higher taxes. In fact many are receiving less than manual workers. This situation is irrational and unjust and calls for prompt redress.

If improvement in faculty salaries were to depend upon endowment resources, it would become necessary either to raise large new sums or to reduce the size of the faculty by dropping non-permanent members. Having too great a preponderance of perma-
ponent members would create a faculty static in its membership; it would not be adequately refreshed by the infusion of new blood. That would not be a healthy situation. Reduction in faculty numbers would also involve reducing the size of the University. In short, if the basic solution of this problem lay in maintaining endowment income in some fixed relationship to student enrollment, in the absence of greatly enlarged endowment, it could not be done by holding the institution at its present size. It would be necessary to shrink both the College and Pembroke; otherwise, in the light of falling returns on safe investments, the situation would grow progressively worse. Such a course would result in a serious waste of plant facilities and a marked increase in unit costs. In all likelihood it would lower the morale of our constituency enough to constitute a serious deterrent to gifts for the University. The Alumni Fund, our "living endowment," would be impaired at a time when need for an increase in that type of support is becoming more and more apparent. The effect upon the student body would also be bad from many points of view. Moreover, we should have to turn away hundreds of qualified young men and women who have the right to look to us for an education.

Overemphasis upon a fixed relationship between endowment resources and the size of the College does not lead, therefore, to a desirable result. The
University cannot prevent rising operating costs and lower endowment returns; it cannot alter the fact that lower returns discourage gifts to endowment. Consequently the maintenance of a fixed enrollment offers no solution to the problem.

In order to give financial relief to permanent members of the faculty it is essential to find other ways of enlarging income besides increase of endowment. The readiest means to that end is a revision of the ratio between permanent senior members of the faculty and the temporary junior members. That is the most direct way to reduce unit costs of instruction. Redress of that ratio can be achieved, however, only by increasing the size of the student body.

At the present moment the ratio of senior permanent members to juniors on term appointments is very high. Since the limitation on the size of the colleges was established, the number of full professors has increased by 50 per cent and the number of associate professors on permanent tenure has remained stable. The number of assistant professors and instructors on term appointments has shown a corresponding decline. We have, therefore, a much larger permanent faculty in relation to the size of the student body than in 1929. Those facts create a problem, but they are also a tribute to Brown University. Teaching conditions have been so admirable and morale so good that a large percentage of those who joined the faculty after the last war de-
sired to stay. By their teaching capacity and their scholarship they made themselves valuable, and became permanent members of our University.

Meanwhile the relationship of endowment to the cost of instruction has become progressively less significant. That fact was highlighted in the 1920's by the studies of Mr. Trevor Arnett and his proposals for increased tuition fees as a means of improving college finance. Even before his point was made publicly, Brown had already initiated the policy he advocated. For example, when he made his report on Brown University in 1919 the tuition at the College was $153 a year, while the cost per student was $565. By 1926, when he spoke at the Association of Urban Universities in Providence, Brown tuition had advanced to $350 in the College and $300 at Pembroke, while the cost per student was $604. In 1919 tuition met only 27 per cent of the cost of the student's instruction in the College; in 1927 it paid 58 per cent.

By progressive stages tuition was advanced to $450 (plus fees) in both colleges, or about 30 per cent more in the College and 50 per cent more in Pembroke, a net increase from both colleges of about 35 per cent from 1927 to 1939. Costs per student advanced 25 per cent in the same period. Meanwhile, to help those who could not meet the new scale of fees, scholarship aid from University funds increased 30 per cent, and endowments for this purpose were enlarged by numerous gifts. Loans to students in-
creased 150 per cent in the College during the same period.

The high ratio of permanent members of the faculty to the size of the student body means that senior members are performing assignments which younger and less expensive appointees could manage capably. Indeed the infusion of young men with war experience would have a salutary effect. Moreover, it would be possible to instruct more students by adding non-permanent, and less costly, members to the staff. Brown, therefore, finds itself again in the situation which existed in 1919 when Mr. Arnett reported in his financial study of Brown University that the institution could “care for 500 more students with comparatively little increase in expense.” That year the cost per student was $565. The next year enrollment increased from 933 to 1,259 and the cost per student fell to $449. Even though costs of all kinds rose rapidly in the early Twenties, it was not until 1927 that the unit cost again touched the 1919 figure. The increase in enrollment proved financially favorable. Although there had been a series of deficits in preceding years, in those years there was only one deficit; surpluses were the rule.

The fiscal officers of the University estimate that an increase in the student body at this time would again have the same general effect. If, for example, a rise in enrollment to 2,000 undergraduates in the College and 750 at Pembroke were assumed, along
with an appropriate increase in younger faculty members, a decline in unit costs would occur as there did after 1919. The net increase in income after taking into account additional expenditures would be over $100,000.

To summarize: until war and inflation reversed the process, the ratio of student fees to cost of instruction was rising. Meanwhile, the role of endowment in meeting costs was progressively declining. So far as we can foresee the future, there is little likelihood of a vast gain in endowment resources such as followed the last war. Therefore the process of bringing student fees more closely into relationship to the cost of instruction must continue. Our fees are substantial and are bound to increase. Many new economic groups are capable of paying them, and yet more can pay part if scholarship aid, loans, and employment supply the balance.

Enlarged enrollment would help balance faculty ranks by the infusion of younger blood. Increased income from enrollment should make it possible to improve the salary status of the permanent members of the faculty and to carry our work of instruction without diminution of quality — to the mutual advantage of all. Under these circumstances additional students would improve rather than impair our financial stability.

The Library supplies the second reason why we could accommodate more students more economi-
Analysis of our plant facilities shows that with more efficient management we can so increase use of instructional space that more students can be accommodated. Failure to use to the full any portion of our educational facilities is difficult to justify at this time. The registrar has reported that the College could have as many as 2,000 students without the addition of expensive laboratories. As in all institutions the plant facilities are not in perfect balance, and even with the present size of the College some new classrooms are essential.

The most pressing need either for the present enrollment or for a larger enrollment is new student housing. We have been working to achieve a wider geographical distribution of students as an essential part of our educational program, but we cannot expect students to come from a distance to live in substandard quarters. The proposed quadrangles at the College and the new Pembroke dormitory are planned primarily to meet this urgent need. We are undertaking a pioneering program of integrating the fraternities into the educational structure while rehousing them under college supervision. It is absolutely essential that we retire from dormitory use buildings which are fire hazards and no longer fit for student occupancy. The new housing can, if necessary, provide for some further growth. However, increased housing facilities do not involve a like addition to the size of the student body. But they can
supply a flexibility which will help us improve geographical distribution with the resultant increase in the percentage of residential students. This is dramatically illustrated by our recent experience with Pembroke.

All the major considerations which have been set forth apply with unusual force to Pembroke. The collegiate education of women is little more than a century old and it did not gain great impetus until fifty years ago. The relative increase in social pressure for universal higher education is therefore much more pronounced in the case of women than of men. As a consequence Pembroke has experienced a recent growth in demand for admission even greater than that of the College. In the current year nearly a thousand applications for admission to the freshman class have been received.

There is also an important moral compulsion which bids us allow Pembroke a larger registration. The war made the situation of men’s colleges very precarious. With empty dormitories and a surplus faculty in the fields in which women tend to concentrate, it was clearly prudent to loan Pembroke some of the idle College facilities. It was possible simultaneously, therefore, to meet a pronounced social pressure, improve the academic and personal qualifications of the Pembroke student body, and hedge to some extent the losses in the operation of the College. All those things were done, to the
obvious benefit and advantage of the University.

We must now do one of two things. We can arbitrarily cut the Pembroke enrollment back to 500, or we can maintain it at its recent level. To follow the first alternative would arouse the natural resentment of both undergraduates and alumnae. In any realistic or humane view of the situation there is only one course to pursue, namely to withdraw the formal restriction upon the size of Pembroke.

Four primary considerations suggest the removal of formal restrictions on the size of Brown University.

1. The vital contribution of our liberal arts program should be available to more candidates.
2. The cosmopolitan character of the University should be re-enforced in the face of prevalent localism.
3. Existing endowed institutions must care for their fair share of the vast numbers of new students capable of profiting by a liberal arts education; the social and economic base of Brown's student body can be broadened, without impairment of standards.
4. The optimum use of our facilities calls for a larger student body; the increase in income will outweigh the added cost.