

Urban Renewal in West Philadelphia: An Examination of the University of
Pennsylvania's Planning, Expansion, and Community Role from the Mid-1940s to
the Mid-1970s

A senior thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Honors in
American History

by

Scott Cohen

April 6, 1998

Advisors: Mark Lloyd, Thomas Sugrue, and Barbara Savage

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
The University's 1948 Martin Report: The City of Philadelphia Is There From the Start	5
Harnwell's Early Years: The Babies Had Boomed so the University Expands	22
1956-60: The General State Authority Gets Involved	31
A New Frontier: Expansion Continues as the University Adopts a Fresh Approach Towards Planning	41
Penn's Role in West Philadelphia: The "University City" Concept and the Local Community	55
The Mid-1960s: The University and the City Redefine Their Goals for University City With Respect to All Parties Involved	68
"Lend Me Your Ears": Heightened University-Community Involvement Doesn't Deter Burgeoning Development Criticisms	80
Protest Turns to Action: The University City Science Center, the 1969 Sit-in, and the Quadripartite Commission	87
Harnwell's Last Years and Meyerson's Succession: Urban Renewal Slows Down and University Financial Troubles Force Development in New Directions	102
Conclusion	112

Introduction

As triumphant American soldiers returned home from their service in World War II, numerous factors were causing the nation's cities to change at an astronomical rate. Large numbers of African-Americans were continuing to migrate North and settle in the country's urban centers in search of new lives -- especially because of increased job opportunities during the war. A good amount of industry began to desert its outdated city factories and relocate in America's suburbs. Many whites followed suit, in search of a quieter life and better schooling for their children--urban life no longer appealed to them. Young men were not looking towards the military as their major option after high school, and the number who sought higher education increased. As a result, universities and colleges were on the rise, further sparked by the federal government's desire for more research, especially technological, that would help fully establish America as a major power in the world.

The country was still riding high on its recent victory overseas, and no social ill was too difficult to correct for governmental and institutional powers. In particular, beginning in the 1940s, these two groups began to focus their attention on the growing deterioration and poverty of America's cities. Overcrowding in dwellings, lower employment rates, absentee landlords, and often the lack of repair for older buildings all contributed to this decline. Coupled with higher education's elevating importance, these problems associated with urban society began to occupy the minds of scholars, planners, politicians, and institutional leaders. Studies were conducted, brains started buzzing, and innovative thinkers began developing potential solutions to the cities' ills.

Soon after, the predominant theory abounding in mid-twentieth century scholarship and policy was urban renewal. Consistent with the American triumphant attitude of the time, these thinkers wanted to revitalize cities by replacing the older buildings and facilities of the past with modernist urban visions and structures. Universities and city, state, and federal governments began to accept the urban renewal model as feasible, and in less than

one decade, all of them began to throw their power, influence, and money into the renewal of America's cities.

While their intentions may have been truly noble, reality has proven that the outcomes have harmed a good number of people. Nevertheless, these urban reformers continued the process in many cities for over twenty-five years, and today, fifty years since the inception of urban renewal, "slum" conditions as defined in the 1940s and 1950s still plague this nation's urban areas. Furthermore, these development actions exemplified the mindset of American society's power structure--their failure to consider African-Americans, a racial group that has often been at the bottom of America's social, economic, and political status since its forced passage to this country.

With the onset of the 1960s, this mindset changed. As the civil rights movement progressed throughout the decade, students, faculty, and community members around the country began to condemn the institutional redevelopment that was dislocating poor African-Americans from their neighborhoods. Cities and institutions reevaluated their functions with increased community awareness, but construction continued. By the time urban renewal had stopped in 1972, positive physical effects were evident in designated areas and the role of higher institutions in society strengthened, but the damage done to the overall urban community was so harmful that its effects will long outlive the modernist buildings.

Reformers did not renew or rehabilitate cities for many of their residents; instead, they demolished large numbers of homes and pushed citizens into neighborhoods on the edges of freshly redeveloped urban areas. While one can use statistics to support arguments for either unsuccessful or successful urban renewal projects, the reality of America's cities today tells a clear story. No one has fully renewed this country's inner-cities, and the proof is evident in the homes, the schools, the unemployment rate, and the crime. Urban renewal efforts of the mid-twentieth century tell a story of limited triumph and larger failure.

In this paper, I will demonstrate how the University of Pennsylvania, the City of Philadelphia, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the federal government all worked together to carry out the process of urban renewal in West Philadelphia. In particular, I will focus on the history of the University's expansion and redevelopment, in coordination with these other agencies, to become a major institution in the area planners dubbed as "University City." By presenting an in-depth look into Penn's motives, plans, and actions from the mid-1940s into the 1970s, culminating in the controversy surrounding the University City Science Center, I will tell the story of University City's development into a scientific, academic, and medical hub and the University of Pennsylvania's growth into the international institution it is today.

Sources for the bulk of this thesis include the Trustee's Minutes and Reports of the University of Pennsylvania; the president's annual evaluations of academic years; University and city plans, surveys, and research; consultant studies performed for the University and the City; correspondence between University, city, and state officials; interviews one Penn graduate student conducted with figures influential in the achievement of West Philadelphia's urban renewal; and other archival documents. I have also obtained data from student and University publications and public relations information.

While I am examining the urban renewal that took place in Philadelphia and at the University of Pennsylvania during the mid-twentieth century, this story is a microcosm of the nationwide transformations that characterize post-World War II American history. Leading the way in deterioration and urban renewal efforts, the City of Philadelphia experience during this era was exemplary of the nation's concerted effort to solve the problems of its cities through urban planning and redevelopment. The effects, both good and bad, can also serve to represent the results of similar sequences of events occurring throughout the country.

The University's 1948 Martin Report: The City of Philadelphia Is There From the Start

Throughout the history of the University of Pennsylvania, officials and trustees have evaluated the physical plant of the school and its current and future needs. As a result of the 1913 Cret Plan, which focused on the westward expansion of the City of Philadelphia and its resulting impact on the campus, the University began stressing the need for comprehensive planning, open space enclosed by buildings, and a restructuring of traffic to reduce congestion and noise. According to Harold Taubin's 1976 report entitled "A Brief History and Compilation of Trustee Actions Concerned with the Planning and Development of the West Philadelphia Campus," "the development of academic, research, and community service activities and their supporting physical environment have been best accomplished when they have been planned and developed as mutually supporting functions." Taubin was basing his opinions on the chain of events following World War II, when the Philadelphia City Planning Commission certified the "University Redevelopment Area" as part of the City's Urban Renewal Program and the Penn Trustees completed and passed the 1948 Martin Report. Both of these plans called for neighborhood conservation and renewal as well as the expansion of the University of Pennsylvania in West Philadelphia as a means to do so. In the subsequent three decades, the University worked with city, state, and federal governments in the acquisition of real estate, its physical plant development, and its expansion throughout the University City area.²

In 1919, the City Charter called for the creation of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Officially established in 1929, the fifteen member commission began to

¹Harold Taubin, "A Brief History and Compilation of Trustee Actions Concerned with the Planning and Development of the West Philadelphia Campus." University of Pennsylvania, Department of Facilities Development/Operational Services, 1976: 2. University Archives and Records Center (UARC), UPJ 9.4, B 5. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

² Ibid., 2.

contemplate regional planning for the Philadelphia Tri-State District during the depression years. Not until 1942 did the city adopt a new ordinance redefining the roles of the Planning Commission. Consisting of nine members--five being "citizens" and four "exofficio" -- the ordinance directed the commission to focus their planning efforts on the metropolitan area of Philadelphia and to prepare recommendations for zoning as well as a six year capital improvement plan related to the city's finances. The commission acted as an advisory agency to the city council.³

In 1945, state officials passed the Urban Redevelopment Law, assigning certain duties to the planning commission and authorizing the creation of the Redevelopment Authority. The planning commission now had to certify redevelopment area plans in conformance with a comprehensive general plan, and must include in them the following: the boundaries of the area, with a map showing existing uses of the land; the proposed uses after redevelopment; the standards of population densities, land, coverage, and building intensities in the area; a preliminary site plan; proposed changes in zoning, maps, and street layouts or levels; a statement regarding rehousing dislocated families; estimated costs of area acquisition and preparation for redevelopment; and necessary continuing controls. The RDA had the power to obtain from the planning commission its recommendations and redevelopment plans for designated areas of redevelopment. Additionally, it could follow up with its own investigations, recommendations, and proposals.⁴

During this period of the mid-1940s, Edward Hopkinson Jr. assumed chairmanship of the Planning Commission. He was simultaneously a leader in Philadelphia and a Trustee of the University. Robert Mitchell, a young urban planner previously working with the national planning board in Washington, D.C., was the first executive director of

³ Walter H. Blucher, "The Philadelphia City Planning Commission: An Appraisal," (Chicago: August 1954), 1-2.

⁴Ibid., 5-6.

the commission Hopkinson appointed. Philadelphia officials specifically brought Mitchell to the city to establish a city planning program and spur renewal efforts.⁵

Soon after his appointment, Mitchell and Edmund Bacon, the Managing Director of Philadelphia Housing Association and successor to Mitchell as Planning Commission director, created the "Greater Philadelphia Exhibit" at the Better Philadelphia Exhibition in 1947. Sponsored by the Planning Commission and supported by Hopkinson and other Philadelphia leaders, their exhibit demonstrated the potential for improving Philadelphia economically and physically through urban renewal. The exhibit enlisted the enthusiasm of a broad range of citizens and during the several months that city planners displayed it in the Center City Gimbel department store, over half a million people saw it. Following this, officials moved the exhibit to the Civic Center museum, next to the University, to be used as an ongoing teaching tool. In this location, mostly elementary and high school students viewed the work.

While the plans focused mostly on Center City, Harold Taubin, later the director of the University Planning Office and author of a comprehensive University planning and development history, said that "its intent and purpose was to show, well, if we can do it in Center City, we can do it throughout Philadelphia, and obviously West Philadelphia is just across the river, and in effect part of Center City or just an extension of it." ⁶ All this changed the Trustees thinking with regard to the University's role and commitment to its urban location and its opportunities as a result, especially with Trustee Hopkinson calling attention to the potential development of West Philadelphia.

In 1946, the Trustees had launched a Development Fund Raising Campaign for \$32 million dollars to meet the educational and physical development needs of the University. Following the Better Philadelphia Exhibition in 1947, the coordinators of this fund-raising

⁵ Interview with Harold Taubin, "Memories Project." UARC, UPB 1.9 MM, box 4, ff 9.

⁶ Ibid.

program asked the Trustees for some type of future plan of the University so they could further develop and strengthen their efforts.⁷

In 1947-48, the Philadelphia City Planning Commission conducted a confidential study on housing quality in the University Area, sampling twenty percent of the homes. The city had already certified one half of this selected area for redevelopment--defined as the area between the Schuylkill River to the east, Market Street, Schuylkill Avenue, South Street, Spruce Street, Woodland Avenue, and 42nd Street--but decided to further investigate several things: "the degree of blight in terms of housing quality, to identify specifically those factors which contribute most to the low quality of housing within this area, and to show where these are most prevalent. "⁸

Compared to census figures of 1940, the area had expanded commercially and residentially. The northern edge specifically had deteriorated because of the Market Street elevated train, but the city was already beginning to carry out plans to tear this down and transform it into a subway as far west as 42nd Street. Designated as Sub-area 1, the long, east/west strip of land bordered by Market Street, Chestnut Street, 42nd Street, and the Schuylkill River was by far the most deteriorated, according to the survey. The eastern edge of the University area was full of industrial development because of the easy access to the river and the railroad. Chestnut Street, Walnut Street, and Woodland Avenue were major traffic arteries in the area, with some commercial presence. Lastly, scattered throughout the area were some hotels, apartment houses varying in size, churches, fraternity houses, and parochial and public schools.⁹

More specifically, the City Planning Commission's report suggested targeting certain unappealing problems and recommend possible solutions. For example, a lack of open space in this densely populated area led to insufficient yard space for the residences,

⁷ Ibid.

⁸Philadelphia City Planning Commission, Philadelphia Housing Quality Survey: University Area Report. Philadelphia, Pa: The Authors, 1949: i. UARC, UPJ 9.4, C 1.

⁹Ibid., 3-4

obstructed daylight in half of the dwelling units, and trash-filled vacant lots. In the surveyors' opinion, the mix of residential, commercial, and industrial land use was a sign of blight. Furthermore, many landlords converted single-family structures into a number of units laden with faults, such as a lack of new toilet and bath facilities, reductions of large rooms into sub-standard sizes, and an inadequate number of stairwells or fire escapes. Because a low percentage of these owners lived in these dwellings, deterioration spread even more. For what the residents did pay, they did not get their money's worth. Lastly, the survey uncovered that non-white families constituted a majority of the residents (53%) concentrated in the previously mentioned Sub-area 1, the worst of all the areas.¹⁰

As a result of these findings, the Commission concluded that both Penn and Drexel needed space for expansion to help revive the area. Certain controls, such as concentrating heavy traffic to certain streets and restricting non-residential uses to certain areas, would help fix some problems while proper redevelopment, such as providing more parking, would remove others. For area 1, the city decided that large scale demolition and rebuilding were the only options. For the remainder of the designated area they suggested installations and major repairs to improve the units worth saving. In general, a cleansing of decayed areas would help reduce the overcrowding of land, and since many of these areas were on narrow "back" streets, the City called for a clearing of these too.

In order for the city to carry out these rehabilitation efforts, several things were necessary. First, both Penn and Drexel would have to work with the city to develop plans for their expansion. Second, after the city moved the Market Street elevated train underground, it would need to plan for the redevelopment of this specific area. Last, landlords also would have to provide more small efficiency apartments for students--in the University area, a single person occupied one out of every five units.¹¹

¹⁰Ibid., 5.

¹¹Ibid., 6-8.

Although the Commission was able to theorize about proper redevelopment for University City, it realized that economic factors prevented them from achieving that change alone. The cost of labor and materials at that time made it hard to remedy all the problems, and additionally, the City could not immediately demolish many units because of the difficulty in housing displaced residents. Consequently, the report called for a comprehensive program involving the cooperation of public agencies, real estate owners, and the residents.¹²

With the City Planning Commission certifying the "University Redevelopment Area" as part of their urban renewal program and the University's fund raisers calling for a plan of future development, Dr. George W. McClelland (University President), Mr. Earl G. Harrison (Chairman of the Campaign for the University Development Fund), and the Trustees Committee on Physical Development decided to put the matter of future development plans--ways and means--in the hands of an Architects' Committee, chaired by Sydney E. Martin. On their first meeting, February 12, 1948, the men considered multiple storied buildings with elevators, requiring less ground and making for better economy in operation. But, for this to work, they knew that each building would have to house more than one department, and more money would be needed at a given time before starting construction. While this may be the approach should the University someday want to expand beyond this 1948 plan, the architects decided against high rise buildings at that time because they did not want to alter the existing skyline of campus. Instead, "it was the Committee's conclusion that for the time being it would be best to adhere to the traditions of a vast number of American colleges and erect academic buildings and student housing on a scale with our existing structures"¹³ On October 25, 1948, the Trustees Committee approved the plan submitted by Martin's committee, otherwise known as the "1948 Martin Report."

¹²Ibid. 10.

¹³University of Pennsylvania Report of the Trustees Committee for the Physical Development of the University, October 25, 1948. UARC, UPA 1.51.

Specifically, the plan called for the University to control the area bounded by 32nd Street on the east, 40th Street on the West, Walnut Street on the north, and Hamilton Walk (just south of Spruce Street) on the south. The plan acknowledged the developing tools of implementation in Philadelphia, such as the city's powers of eminent domain and street closings, and the General State Authority Program to fund urban renewal. Within the proposed region, the school could develop a pedestrian-oriented central campus, with a general physical development standard characterized by open space, superblocks, landscaping, and low buildings (five stories or less). Outside of this area, the planners wanted the University to continue to hold Rivers Field under the railroad; the medical, dental, and veterinary schools properties; the Zoological and Botanical Buildings, including the Botanical Gardens; the Provost's house, the Army ROTC building; and the Law School property.¹⁴

At this time, Sydney Martin had been in touch with the City Planning Commission and had received approval for all University proposals for street closings--Woodland Avenue from Spruce to 34th Street, and 36th, and 37th Streets between Spruce and Walnut Streets--but the city did not agree with the proposal that the University acquire the area bounded by 32nd, 34th, Walnut, and Chestnut Streets to be used as a municipal parking area. On the other hand, the University incorporated the city's idea for a "great cross town boulevard" (30 feet wider than Broad Street) on the path of 38th Street into their plan to be used as a divider between the men's undergraduate college on the east and the proposed women's college on the west.

Other suggestions in the 1948 plan included removing the present library building at 34th and Locust in an effort to make Locust Walk the backbone of the proposed plan--a wooded path closed to vehicular traffic. They also recommended an academic building in place of Logan Hall and the Hare Laboratory, as well as potentially replacing the Wistar Institute with stores and a Faculty Club, but these proposals were not essential to the plan,

¹⁴Ibid., 2.

only things that the University may want to effect in the remote future as steps in the ultimate perfection of the campus plan.¹⁵

To finish their report, the committee designated specific projects and proposals based on the needs of different constituents within the University. First, they called for a new Physics Building, with a site available at that time at 33rd and Walnut. The city had designated the general area of the University for rehabilitation so this was therefore feasible. Furthermore, through the city's power to acquire land by condemnation and subsequently sell it, the University should acquire six houses that fronted Chancellor Street, giving them control of the entire lot from 32nd to 33rd Streets, Walnut Street to Franklin Field. If this should happen, the city could close Chancellor Street within these boundaries and the University could build the new Physics Building, as well as landscape the entire area.¹⁶

With regard to a new library and Wharton School building (to be named Dietrich Hall), the architects chose a site at 36th and Walnut for the former and one on the south side of Locust Street, between 36th and 37th Streets, for the latter. In their estimation, the University would have funds to construct the Wharton Building before the library, so they discussed this in more detail. At that time, the University controlled the designated site and had 90% of it cleared. It could begin construction immediately, and when finished, move all University administrative activities to Logan Hall from the buildings located within the triangle bounded by 36th, Walnut, and Woodland Avenue, thus making room for the new library. If the University also moved its financial administrative offices, at that time in a temporary building between Bennett Hall and the Moore School of Electrical Engineering, then the entire University administration would be under one roof. Lastly, before proceeding with building the new library, the University would have to relocate seven fraternities and some shops that were located in the designated triangle site.¹⁷

¹⁵Ibid., 3-4.

¹⁶Ibid., 5.

¹⁷Ibid., 6.

Other potential academic structures the planners suggested included a new Chemistry building on the site of the existing Chemistry and Hygiene Buildings (southeast corner of 34th and Smith Walk), and a new multiple-story office building for the administration built at 36th and Locust, making the demolition of Logan Hall and the Hare Laboratory possible to clear space for more expansion. For the Women's College, the planners wanted to develop the area bounded by 38th, 40th, Walnut, and Spruce Streets to accommodate 500 residents and 700 day students. Borrowing from the University's 1913 Cret Plan, they also wanted to create a greensward from the present Law School building, located at 34th and Sansom, that would extend through to Walnut Street in an effort to integrate the school with the rest of campus.¹⁸

Concerning fraternities, the planners did not want to relocate any that did not conflict with plans for immediate construction. They did recommend, though, that the University ultimately relocate men's fraternities within the area bounded by 36th, 37th, Walnut, and Locust Streets and the adjoining area between 37th, 38th, and fronting Walnut Street; men's professional fraternities just north of the Veterinary School at 39th and Spruce; and women's sororities at 38th and Walnut Streets.¹⁹

With the completion of the south side of the "Big Quad," the planners expected sufficient dormitory space for undergraduate men. For the males in the medical, dental, and veterinary schools, they slated new dormitories on the south side of Spruce Street, between 39th and 40th, and for those in the Law School, on the west side of the proposed greensward. They also planned female dorms on the north side of Spruce Street, from 38th to 39th. If the University should successfully acquire the properties on Pine Street, from 39th to 40th, the City Planning Commission was in favor of closing the street to vehicular traffic. Consequently, the University would build faculty apartment houses.²⁰

¹⁸Ibid., 6-7.

¹⁹Ibid., 8.

²⁰Ibid., 8.

The Martin committee also included the expansion of the hospital buildings as planned by the Chicago architectural firm Schmidt, Garden, & Erickson. For outpatients, their plan called for the erection of the Thomas Sovereign Gates Memorial Pavilion, an eight story building facing Spruce Street on a site between 34th and 36th. The nine story inpatient building would occupy the site of the Nurses' Home and extend from the White Pavilion to Hamilton Walk. To make room for the proposed new Chemistry building, the University would move the Hygiene Building to a proposed new wing of the medical school.²¹

Soon after University officials approved the plan, the federal government passed the Housing Act of 1949, authorizing it to pay cities for at least two-thirds of the difference between the cost of acquiring and clearing a blighted area, and the price the land brought after the city sold it to a private developer.²² Urban renewal was becoming a national trend.

Concurrent with the Trustees' approval of the 1948 Martin Report was their appointment of Harold E. Stassen as president of the University. At the close of his service to Penn, President Stassen produced a report to the Trustees entitled Four Years at Penn: September 17, 1948-January 19, 1953, which reviewed his overall experience and the progress to which he contributed. During his tenure, the gifts, pledges, and bequests to the University Fund totaled almost \$13.5 million, with the 1946 Development Campaign increasing its total from \$5.7 million to \$9.4 million by January 1, 1953. The University had met the goals set for the Gates Pavilion and Dietrich Hall, but the estimated costs rose during construction. To make up for this as well and further strengthen the building and development plan, Stassen stressed the need for new corporate giving. Out of 217 corporate or corporate-related donations, totaling \$3.95 million, ninety-seven had previously never given money. Stassen felt that corporate donations to higher education

²¹Ibid., 7-8.

²²Interview with Edmund N. Bacon, "Memories Project." UARC, UPB 1.9 MM, box 2, ff 13.

was a growing trend and saw potential from these businesses for a steady, favorable future source of funds.²³

While the University coordinated its planning efforts to meet the city's renewal goals for their surrounding urban neighborhood, the city adopted a new Home Rule Charter in 1951, providing for an "independent" planning agency with enlarged powers and responsibilities. Specifically, the commission had to prepare several things: a Capital Program and Budget; proposed zoning ordinances for the Mayor and City Council to review; regulations for the subdivision of land and the plans dealing with this; and a comprehensive Physical Development Plan of Philadelphia to improve the city and map out its future growth with the goal of providing adequate housing, transportation, distribution, health, and welfare for its residents. According to the new charter,

No public way, ground or open space, or building ... shall be developed . . . or constructed unless recommendations of the City Planning Commission as to location and size pursuant to the Physical Development Plan shall have been first requested and obtained ... 24

By this time, the Philadelphia City Planning Commission had issued the University Redevelopment Area Plan. This 1950 report coincided with and officially incorporated much of what the University had come up with in the 1948 Martin Report, proposing redevelopment and land uses that would benefit the colleges as well as providing an up-to-date exploration on the state of the University area. One city's project underway at that time was the removal of the Market Street Elevated. The projects proposed by area agencies and partially underway were the expansion of Penn west to 40th Street between Walnut and Spruce Streets and the expansion of Drexel. The City's major proposals for the upcoming years included the closing of Woodland Avenue from 38th to Market Street; the development of 38th Street as a boulevard, from Woodland to Market; the extension of a subway-surface tunnel from 36th and Ludlow to 40th and Woodland; and the closing of

²³Harold E. Stassen, Four Years at Penn: September 17, 1948-January 19, 1953, UARC, UPI 50.10.

²⁴Walter H. Blucher, "The Philadelphia City Planning Commission: An Appraisal," 3-4.

34th Street from Walnut to Spruce after it had completed 33rd Street improvements and the Schuylkill Expressway.²⁵

With the achievement of these goals, the city believed that more opportunities would exist for revising land use to remove the previously defined blight from the areas adjacent to the college campuses. At the time, the city wanted to redevelop the run-down area between Chestnut and Walnut from 32nd to 34th Streets into eight- and thirteen-story garden apartments, serving as a desirable entrance into West Philadelphia from Center City. The Commission also believed that the land directly adjacent to this area was not too debilitated and, with some rehabilitation and small scale improvement, would continue to be free of serious blight. The area north of Penn needed more consideration.²⁶

The report acknowledged the University's proposal to acquire a strip of land west of 34th Street to connect its Law School with the main campus to the south. Between this section and an office building on the corner of 36th and Walnut, the Commission believed a good opportunity existed for a planned retail center for the University. Additionally, they recommended that the area west of 37th Street maintain its residential status through rehabilitation where possible and be cleared and redeveloped where necessary. Given this, the commercial establishments fronting the University should be limited and instead developed between 34th and 36th Streets, Market to Chestnut, like the existing commercial area on 40th Street extending south of Market. After they finished removing the elevated train and cleaned up Market Street, the city wanted to concentrate intensive commercial centers at specified locations, such as a shopping center within the triangle bounded by Woodland, Spruce, and 38th Streets. They desired the aforementioned garden apartments to connect with the existing residential areas on Chestnut and Walnut and felt that any

²⁵Philadelphia City Planning Commission, University Redevelopment Area Plan, Philadelphia, Pa: The Authors, 1950. UARC, UPJ 9.4, C 2.

²⁶Ibid., 3.

industrial development should remain east of 31st Street and between Market and Ludlow from 33rd to 34th Streets.²⁷

Soon after the city's creation of this plan, the University in 1951 sought the help of the RDA in acquiring 2.4 acres for Dietrich Hall, a building for its Wharton School. Involving the condemnation of ten properties and the expenditure of \$130,000 in University funds, the RDA provided their first aid to higher education in Philadelphia. A year later, the University attained 1.3 acres for its future Physics Building through the RDA condemnation of another ten properties and at the cost of \$46,000 in University money.²⁸

Within his report, Stassen commented on the progress of these projects as well as two others that the Trustees deemed development priorities in April 1949. Because of the availability of sites, a greater potential for fund raising, and the importance of quick campus improvement, the University chose to build Dietrich Hall and the Gates Pavilion first. By 1953, the former had been built for the Wharton School at a cost of \$2.4 million, and the latter was almost completed, costing \$6.55 million. Next on the list was the Physics Building, the construction of which the University delayed until its site was available, involving the acquisition through the RDA of the previously mentioned six houses on Chancellor Street. The fourth priority at that time was the new library--Stassen believed this to be the most important development--but a combination of difficulties, including inadequate funding, had led to its deferment..

According to Stassen, all campus improvements had followed the 1948 Martin Report. With the help of the city, the RDA, and the Philadelphia City Planning Commission (chaired by Edward Hopkinson), the University was on its way to rebuilding and rehabilitating its surrounding area. Important to the continuation of this project was the city's closing of Woodland Avenue and the routing of surface trolleys through a subway. Other needs included new women's dorms, an enlargement of the Law School, a new

²⁷Ibid., 4-5.

²⁸Trustees Minutes, vol. 27--321, May 20, 1960. UARC.

nurses' home, more inpatient facilities at the University Hospital, and a new Chemistry Wing.²⁹

²⁹Stassen, Four Years At Penn, 8-10.

Harnwell's Early Years: The Babies Had Boomed so the University Expands

During the 1950s, the University continued its planning process and expansion throughout West Philadelphia. One main reason for this was the Trustees' 1953 selection of Dr. Gaylord P. Harnwell as President of the University. Harnwell documented the development of the next decade best in his annual presidential reports, and by focusing on these in combination with the Trustees Minutes of that time, one will get a clear picture of what the University was planning, doing, and hoping to achieve.

During his first year as University president, Harnwell began thinking about creating one division of development and public relations for activities looking towards future growth and development. Under this division, he and the Trustees would appoint a permanent director and create a development staff of the University. They began considering this move because of the projected doubling of applications by 1965 and the lack of adequate physical facilities and money to accomplish this.

By the end of his first year, Harnwell and the Trustees had arranged permanent financing for new undergraduate men's dormitories. Also, the University had completed the Gates Pavilion and the Physics Building (to be opened the following fall term), spending \$2.1 million dollars that year on these projects.³⁰

In this report, Harnwell also made the first reference to the University's relationship with its surrounding urban community. Regarding public relations, Harnwell said that

A continuing problem for the University--in common with all institutions located in urban centers--is the development of cooperative relationships with the immediate community. There is a need to make a determined effort to relate more effectively, through educational and public service, the University to the area in which it lives.³¹

³⁰Gaylord P. Harnwell, Report of the President to the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania for the Academic Year 1953-1954. UARC, UPI 25.1.

³¹Ibid., 49.

But, in spite of this comment, Harnwell did not relate how the University planned to work with its surrounding community at this time.

By the end of 1955, the University had taken major steps in coordinating its planning efforts and creating a framework for the future of the school. During the fall term of the 1954-55 academic year, the Harnwell administration commenced an intensive, five-year Educational Survey, enlisting all major constituencies of the University to assess every aspect of the University's mission and operations and stressing the importance of physical environment in relation to learning and research. At this point, the University embarked upon the most coordinated effort in its history to become an international institution and a center of research and scholarship. Harnwell and the rest of the University initiated this survey to discover the current state of the University and the future direction in which all elements of it should head. As Harnwell described in his 1955 annual report,

... a University-wide group of thirty-two faculty members has undertaken the assignment of creating a faculty committee structure, supplemented by the ablest talent from the outside to insure perspective and objectivity, to carry out a searching and systematic evaluation of our entire educational program.³²

The major impetus for this far-reaching study was the projected rise in the college-age population for the next two decades. According to Harnwell's report, by 1970 or 1975, a 100% increase in applicants would face colleges and universities across the country--Penn should expect an annual increase of 4-5%. In preparing for this, Harnwell felt that the University's growth should conform to the highest standards in educational philosophy and performance while attracting the best scholars, teachers, and students of the future. The Educational Survey set out to look at the needs of the individual schools and consequently determine the necessary balance in personnel, plant, and other facilities.³³

As the University planned to evaluate its entire function, it continued expanding its physical plant according to the 1948 Martin Report and subsequent planning efforts. By

³²Gaylord P. Harnwell, University of Pennsylvania Report of the President: 1955, 7. UARC, UPI 25.1.

³³*ibid.*, 15-16.

the end of 1955, the Development Fund contributions (a large part of which the Trustees designated for physical plant) rose from \$9.5 million to \$11.2 million. The school opened the \$3 million Physical Sciences Building to the departments of Physics, Mathematics, and Astronomy and added three houses to the men's dorm system. In the near future, Harnwell predicted "a virtual face-lifting" of the campus, represented by the closing of Woodland Avenue between 34th and 37th Streets. He also mentioned University negotiations with the RDA taking place at that time for the area between 32nd, 34th, Chestnut, and Walnut Streets.³⁴

To pay for these capital improvements as well as the expected increased operating expenses over the next 15-20 years, Harnwell listed six sources of funding: tuition; endowment; alumni and other interested individuals and corporations; industry; foundations; and local, state, or national governments. At this time, a tradition of local government monetary support did not exist, but the Mayor of Philadelphia had set up a commission to survey the needs of institutions of higher education in the area and to define the city's responsibilities to its citizens. Some state aid was available, but in Harnwell's opinion, the Commonwealth support would not increase too much unless it developed a new pattern of state control over educational policy. The federal government also was not providing a lot of money for private education, but the University hoped this pattern to change in the future. Foundation support was small, but helpful, and industrial support, while also not too large, was on a rising trend.³⁵

In May 1955, the Trustees resolved to buy or acquire--either directly or through cooperation with a state or federal agency-- any or all of the real estate between 32nd, Walnut, 34th, and Chestnut Streets for student and/or faculty housing. They decided not to borrow an amount exceeding \$2 million for these purchases and any subsequent building expenses.³⁶ Living up to this resolution in October, the Trustees approved the purchase of

³⁴*Ibid.*, 17

³⁵*Ibid.*, 18-19.

³⁶Trustees Minutes, vol. 26 - 174, May 13, 1955. UARC.

four houses on Chestnut Street, between 34th and 35th Streets, and six houses on Sansom Street between the same two blocks. These acquisitions were part of an effort to provide housing for 150 Law School students, and the Trustees reserved \$700,000 for this purpose.³⁷ Two months later, this figure rose to \$900,000, but the housing effort made the University eligible for a loan of up to \$600,000 (at 2.75%) through the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the federal government.³⁸

In January of 1956, the Trustees authorized the President of the University to negotiate with parties interested in the development of West Philadelphia in an attempt to solve "problems relative to the streets" that concerned the school itself or its property and development. At this time, in accordance with some of the City's earlier recommendations, the Trustees proposed closing Woodland Avenue, widening 38th Street, and developing the eastern approach to campus. At their April meeting, they approved the purchase of three more properties between 34th and 35th Streets on Sansom as well as four other acquisitions in the campus area.³⁹

In June 1956, the Trustees agreed that many of the buildings existing within the triangle formed by Woodland Avenue, Walnut Street, and 36th Street would need to be removed for a new library. According to the minutes of this meeting, they believed that many of these structures were depreciated, run-down, and ugly. Because they needed large amounts of money to restore them, they instead suggested the demolition of several buildings as soon as the leases expired and they could afford it. They also recommended an additional \$5875 for buying land between 37th and 38th Streets on Woodland Avenue, as well as the use of Robert C. Hill's \$640,000 legacy to acquire from the RDA the area between 32nd, 34th, Walnut, and Chestnut Streets.⁴⁰ Physical plant priorities at this time

³⁷Trustees Minutes, vol. 26--206, October 4, 1955. UARC.

³⁸Trustees Minutes, vol. 26--220, December 16, 1955. UARC.

³⁹Trustees Minutes, vol. 26--233, January 17, 1956. UARC.

⁴⁰One year later the Trustees, rescinded this request, incorporated the bequest into the University's General Fund, and pledged \$400,000 of the Fund towards the Faculty Club.

included a new Faculty Club (site to be designated), the Moore Building for Electrical Engineering (to be built on the vacant land along the west side of 32nd Street), and the previously mentioned library and Law School dormitories.⁴¹

When Harnwell released his presidential report on the 1955-56 academic year, he expressed the University's desire to continually improve society through development. With birth rates still on the rise, he again related his belief that Penn did not have the facilities to handle the estimated increase in enrollment. At this time, the President of the United States, the Governor of Pennsylvania, and the Mayor of Philadelphia had all appointed committees on higher education. Scholars and politicians across the nation began to discuss the issues surrounding the growth of these educational institutions. Responding to this and the potential for Penn to solicit public aid, Harnwell commented on the University's "independent" status. As he said in his report,

Independence is a relative term. Though our policies in the first instance are determined by our own Trustees and faculties, we are not independent of public opinion or the vast complex of social groups from which we must draw our support, from which our students come, and to which our alumni return.⁴²

At this time, the University began experiencing financial problems, as the cost per student was higher than each's tuition. While Penn enjoyed a tax-free status as a subsidy from the municipality and the Commonwealth and received gifts and grants from people, corporations, and the government, this financial support was often limited in its availability to specific enterprises.⁴³ Harnwell may have hinted here (to whomever read his report) that the school needed increased unrestricted funds to continue its development into a well-regarded, international university.

To boost Penn's public image, Harnwell devoted a section to "The Larger University Community" in this report. As he stated, the University had an obligation as a

⁴¹ Trustees Minutes, vol. 26--388, June 7, 1956. UARC.

⁴² Gaylord P. Harnwell, Design for Excellence: University of Pennsylvania Report of the President, 1956, 7. UARC, UPI 25.1.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 8.

corporate citizen obtaining a variety of public and private support to integrate its professional services with the needs of its community. Because of the University's location in Philadelphia, it had a responsibility to serve as a source for the community's intellectual and cultural life. Furthermore, students were immersing themselves in the relatively new phenomenon of community service. Their efforts included the University Boys' Club for neighborhood children (under the direction of the Christian Association and the Physical Education department); the Campus Chest fundraising campaign for community projects; "Help Week" for local churches and welfare agencies; drama productions for civic and charity organizations, the staffing of three settlement houses; the University Camps for Boys and Girls; the distribution of food to Puerto Rican immigrants in Philadelphia; and the raising of money for forty-nine community agencies.⁴⁴

Moving on to the University's physical facilities, Harnwell expressed the hope for a \$4 million group of women's dorms on a site east of 34th Street, between Chestnut and Walnut, which the RDA proposed to make available. With \$75,000 in grants from the Donner Foundation and federal research construction funds, the University was also building the William H. Donner Center for Radiology. Financed by individuals, organizations, and the federal government, Penn expected to complete its expansion of HUP's Rehabilitation Center by late 1957. A new West Philadelphia Health Center on 43rd and Chester Avenue had been completed, and grants from the US Public Health Service assured the early construction of a research laboratory wing of the School of Medicine and more labs in the Dental School. Also at this time, the University was seeking funds for a new \$4.9 million building for its Department of Surgery.

Non-medically speaking, having obtained enough property on the north side of Sansom Street, between 34th and 36th, the University had begun work on the new Law School dormitories and dining hall just west of the existing Law School building. The school also wanted to build an addition to the Fels Center, which housed the University

⁴⁴ibid., 21-25.

Institute of Local and State Government. By the fall of 1955, Penn had finished the Butcher Dormitory, the last of the three men's dorms proposed by 1948 plan. The city's removal of Woodland Avenue was imminent at this time, and the University was interested in demolishing twenty-one properties along this road and Walnut Street (west of 34th) to provide a site for the new library. Also on the near horizon were the Faculty Dining Hall, a class-laboratory addition to the Moore Building, and a new lab wing for the Chemistry Department.⁴⁵

To Harnwell, the University's was quickly developing its facilities, but a lot more was necessary. Houston Hall, the student union, was no longer sufficient for its purposes. Undergraduate men required more recreational and activity areas. A humanities research-class facility, more space for the School of Fine Arts, a new wing to the University Museum, and a building for the School of Education and other social sciences also filled the minds of University officials in their vision of the future campus.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ibid., 26-30.

⁴⁶ibid., 31

1956-60: The General State Authority Gets Involved

During 1956-57, the University experienced significant changes that affected the school for years to come. On September 4, 1956, the Business Vice President John L. Moore began to present weekly physical plant need surveys, materials, and analysis to the Presidential Staff Conference.⁴⁷ In November of the same year, Harnwell mailed a letter to K.R. Burke, Executive Director of the General State Authority (GSA), requesting to acquire a site and build the new library under Public Law 545, which empowered the GSA to construct additions and improvements, and then lease these facilities back to universities receiving the GSA's financial aid. The estimated cost: \$12.8 million.⁴⁸

Enclosed with this request, was the promotional proposal entitled, "The Need for a New General Library Building." In an effort to persuade the GSA, the report cited the library as vital to all 80 buildings of the University. Continuing, the authors expressed the University's ideas and plans, such as those prepared for the Penn-owned triangle tract formed by Walnut, Woodland, Locust, and 36th Streets. Thirty old buildings occupied that tract, but residents were vacating twenty-one of them for demolition in 1957--the University would demolish the others as soon as various University offices could be relocated. In the words of the proposal, "It will replace a block of antiquated, irreparable eyesore structures with a park like area dominated by beautiful, modern, tree-fringed building."⁴⁹

At the proposal presentation the next day, Mr. Burke requested from William H. DuBarry, Vice President for the Corporation of the University of Pennsylvania, a set of Penn's expansion priorities following the library. On November 9, 1956, Mr. DuBarry responded with a letter listing a prioritized \$24.8 million building schedule for 1957-1967.

⁴⁷Interview with Harold Taubin, "Memories Project." UARC, UPB 1.9 MM, box 4, ff 9.

⁴⁸Gaylord Harnwell (November 7, 1956) Letter to K. R. Burke. UARC, UPA 4, 0098.

⁴⁹Ibid., "University of Pennsylvania: The Need for a New General Library Building": 6.

The library was at the top of the list, with its \$12.8 million price tag, followed by buildings for the School of Education and for Departments in the area of Family and Social Service, \$3.5 million; the Veterinary School, \$1 million; General Services (housing the University's supporting services), \$2 million; R.O.T.C. Armory and Field House, \$1 million; Humanities classrooms, \$2.5 million; and Fine Arts/Architecture and City Planning, \$2 million.⁵⁰

DuBarry also enclosed with the letter an entire building schedule, in four parts. The first was a listing for new buildings completed between 1946-1956, totaling \$18.6 million.⁵¹ Part II had that year's (1956-57) other proposed new buildings for which contracts had been or would have been let as soon as the University secured another \$680,000. The next part listed the non-prioritized new building proposals for 1957-1967, including the ones set forth in the body of the letter as well as \$1 million set aside for acquiring real estate. The fourth part was the cost of renovations to existing buildings and physical plant.⁵²

Following this letter, in December of 1956, the University sent a formal "Request for Construction of Educational Facilities" to the GSA. Beginning with the background makeup and numbers of the University, the document discussed the potential accommodation--hinging on additional physical plant and personnel--of up to a 50% increase in enrollment that current studies had estimated for the next fifteen years. At this time, the University

believed that the increase in applicants for enrollment will be such that this contemplated growth can be accompanied by a rise in those standards of academic excellence which have attracted to the institution's doors one out of every eight college students in the Commonwealth, as well as young people from every geographical region in the country and some 65 foreign countries.⁵³

⁵⁰William H. DuBarry (November 9, 1956). Letter to K. R. Burke. UARC, UPA 4, 0098.

⁵¹ Development of these buildings has been documented earlier in the paper.

⁵²*Ibid.*, 2-3.

⁵³University of Pennsylvania. (December 1956). "Request for Construction of Educational Facilities," 1. UARC, UPA 4, 97.

As 1957 rolled around, the Trustees designated a specific "University Area"--the boundaries extending from the southwest corner of Chestnut and 32nd, west on Chestnut to 36th, south on 36th to Walnut, west on Walnut to 40th, south on 40th to Baltimore, and east on Baltimore to 38th at the School of Veterinary Medicine, with the addition of the Woodland Cemetery tract--and resolved to acquire these lands for University use.⁵⁴ Later that year they specified that as the properties became available, the appropriate University administrative officers had the authority and \$100,000 from the General Fund to buy and renovate these lands as long as the cost did not exceed 10% of a reliable appraisal.⁵⁵ With the combined aid of city, state, and federal governments (the first instance of this in the county), the University realized its previous goal and acquired 10.5 acres of land between 32nd to 34th, Walnut to Chestnut Streets, involving 139 properties and total funds of \$2.7 million dollars.⁵⁶

Harnwell and the Trustees were beginning to think big during the 1956-57 academic year. The University had constructed more than \$18 million worth of new facilities since 1952, obtaining the funds largely from private sources. Furthermore, an additional \$5 million in physical plant was taking place that year, and the University planned on spending \$13.5 million more over the next few years. In its formal request for the GSA, the University asked for state aid to build any one of or all six new facilities, totaling almost \$21.8 million. These were the same as mentioned in DuBarry's letter, minus the R.O.T.C. Armory and Field House and the Humanities classroom building. If granted, the money would help the University "meet the enlarged educational needs of the Commonwealth in the future."⁵⁷ The General State Authority and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania were getting involved.

⁵⁴Trustees Minutes, vol. 26--333, January 15, 1957. UARC.

⁵⁵Trustees Minutes, vol. 26--333, June 7, 1957. UARC.

⁵⁶Trustees Minutes, vol. 27--321, May 20, 1960. UARC.

⁵⁷University of Pennsylvania. (December 1956). "Request for Construction of Educational Facilities," 4-5. UARC, UPA 4, 97.

At the close of this eventful year, President Harnwell released his annual report, entitled "Unity of Purpose."⁵⁸ The Educational survey was progressing, the University expanding and planning, and the local, state, and federal governments were all helping Penn out in some way. Locally, the University properties were immune from taxation and the University was a beneficiary of the RDA. Furthermore, the RDA, with its money and powers of eminent domain, had assisted the University in acquiring real estate, and the city had closed a number of streets--most importantly the section of Woodland Avenue that ran through the heart of campus. The Commonwealth was providing some direct grants, and the correspondence with the GSA was progressing. The federal government provided direct aid in the Veteran's Bill, money for the hospital building and research, and research grants.⁵⁹

As part of the Educational Survey, University staff began revising the 1948 Martin Report in their formulation of a comprehensive University expansion plan. According to Harnwell, the University efforts needed to be integrated with the city and the surrounding community, requiring frequent consultation with each. In April 1957, the presidents of Penn, MIT, University of Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, and Yale met to discuss how to improve the environment of urban universities. This was an attempt to form a support foundation for studying the common problems of the environment they faced.⁶⁰ Harnwell saw the opportunity for an urban university to put theories into practice to reverse community decline, so Penn created several community outreach projects, including the Center for Human Resources, which attempted to rehabilitate Mantua youth; Teacher Aid and other assistance programs for West Philadelphia grade and high schools; and recreational activities for area youth.⁶¹

⁵⁸Beginning in 1957, the *Bulletin* printed the president's annual reports.

⁵⁹Gaylord P. Harnwell, "Unity of Purpose: The University of Pennsylvania Report of the President, 1957," *Bulletin LVIII*, no. 5 (December 1957). UARC, UPI 25.1.

⁶⁰Trustees Minutes, vol. 26--355, April 12, 1957. UARC.

⁶¹Maurice S. Burrison, "The Good Neighbor Policy in West Philadelphia," University of Pennsylvania Office of Planning and Design, 1971: 4. UARC, UPJ 9.4, A 11.

Meanwhile, the notable progression of campus development manifested in the demolition of a group of buildings on the south side of Walnut, west of 34th, and along Woodland Avenue, opposite College Hall. The University planted this part of the library site with grass. Underway were the Law School Dorm, the Donner and Rehabilitation Centers of the Hospital (HUP), as well as an addition to the Moore Building. Penn had completed building the Fels Institute and a new computer center. Of the \$20.5 million needed to complete present and proposed projects of the overall plan, the University had secured 70% of the funds. Over the previous decade (1947-57), the University spent \$21.5 million on buildings and attained or found available an additional \$13.4 million, achieving its 1946 goal of \$32 million. For its long-range plan, including many of the projects presented to the GSA, the University needed another \$30 million.⁶²

To the University's benefit, the GSA allocated \$4 million dollars in September of 1957 for the construction of an undergraduate Library and Classroom Building. In May of 1958, Penn presented to the GSA a reexamination of its project priorities submitted in 1956. Proposed for the 1959-1961 biennium, the University requested \$18.67 million to construct five new buildings, including a Center for the Social Sciences, a Veterinary Research and Instruction Center, a classroom building for the liberal arts school, a Graduate Library and Research Center (part of the original \$12.8 million request), and a Fine Arts Building.⁶³

In the introduction of his annual report for the 1957-58 year, Harnwell evoked the words of Professor Horace Howard Furness, scholar and Trustee of the University sixty-four years earlier, regarding the University's growth at that time (in terms of buildings, acreage, departments, courses, faculty, and students):

But are they (these outward signs) the University? "Stone walls do

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³"Presentation to the General State Authority from the University of Pennsylvania for the Construction of Educational Facilities," May 1958., UARC, UPA 4, 97.

not a prison make," nor do they make a university. We may cover acres with buildings filled with every appliance for tuition, and yet they may all be as dead and as unproductive of any good to the world . . . as are the monastic cells in the desert of the Thebiad. A university, in this country, should be ... a center, whence . . . through the active enthusiasm of its Faculties, an intellectual life shall be diffused far and wide.⁶⁴

Eagerly awaiting the completion of the Educational Survey, Harnwell emphasized the importance of an institution's "competent and objective" examination and search for improvement, especially when outsiders were hired to conduct part this investigation. Like Furness, he stressed the larger roles a university must serve in society--locally, statewide, nationally, and internationally.⁶⁵ The University was on a continuing mission to transform itself from a predominantly regional school to an international center of higher learning, research, and culture.

Since 1948, the University added twenty-nine new buildings according to the Martin Report, and other projects were underway. At this time, Penn had asked the RDA to take title to two more blocks as part of the newly dubbed "University City" plan. Additionally, the school was working toward creating a development corporation to obtain title to and preserve land until it was ready for use. Commenting on the downsides of expansion, Harnwell recognized the surfacing needs for more parking, playing field space, and permanent sports facilities--all of which had yet to resolved by the University. In an attempt to integrate the campus with living and working facilities, Penn wanted to develop the area as a whole to foster an environment where "a true academic community may flourish." Speaking on this, Harnwell expressed the role of the University in West Philadelphia:

We are assuming leadership in coordinating the efforts of public agencies and neighboring citizens and institutions in combating deterioration of our West Philadelphia neighborhood. Every effort will be made to revitalize our community and make it again, as it

⁶⁴Gaylord P. Harnwell, "The Mission of a University: Report of the President, 1958," *Bulletin* LIX, no.4 (November 1958): 6. UARC, UPI 25.1.

⁶⁵*Ibid.*, 9.

once was, a desirable residential area.⁶⁶

At the start of the following academic year (1958-59), the University of Pennsylvania, the Pittsburgh University, and Temple University issued a press release describing their joint effort to obtain GSA assistance and funds. Dubbing the project "The Pennsylvania Way," (also the name of their monthly newsletter), these institutions began a public information effort to let people know about the needs of higher education, the services they provide, and the financial burden they incur. They wanted the Commonwealth to augment the services of Penn State University and the fourteen other state teachers' colleges by extending its aid to key, independent university's in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. At the time of the press release, the state was providing one quarter of its total funds to higher education to these three schools, or 15% of each's total operating budgets. These universities enrolled almost 70% of the state's graduate students, granted over one half of the state's masters and doctorate degrees in arts and sciences, served as sources for undergraduate and adult education, and acted as state centers of professional training and research.⁶⁷

The institutions requested from the 1959 State Legislature an increase in support. Penn required money for four reasons: general operations, contingent on the need to make up estimated operating deficits; medical and veterinary schools, upon which the state depended; specific public services; and construction of needed capital facilities to be leased to the University. With inflation, student enrollment, and competition for quality faculty all on the rise, the University desired state funding--additional to that already granted for the library--to expand its facilities.⁶⁸

In a letter dated December 7, 1959, Harnwell expressed to Pennsylvania Senator Berger his desire for \$6.995 million of GSA support to construct the aforementioned Social

⁶⁶ Ibid., 43. For photographs of University development and proposed buildings, see Appendix A4.

⁶⁷ "Pennsylvania, Commonwealth of (GSA) IX" folder. UARC, UPA 4, 0098.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

Science Center and Veterinary Research and Instruction Building. In spite of the \$50 million the University had raised for capital improvements from sources other than the state, it still required more money.⁶⁹ On December 21st, the state legislature passed House Bill 2386 (or the GSA Bill) awarding the University the full \$6.995 million--\$4.775 million for the Social Science Center and \$2.22 for the Veterinary building.⁷⁰

By the close of the 1959-60 year, the University had established an effective relationship with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It had received funding for three of its original 1956 project proposals--the undergraduate library, the Social Science Center, and the Veterinary Research and Instruction Center--and continued to send requests for more support in May of 1960 and the ensuing years. It had teamed up with Pitt and Temple in a joint presentation to state officials, and the three schools began "The Pennsylvania Way" public information campaign to enlighten the residents of Pennsylvania.

⁶⁹Gaylord P. Harnwell, (December 7, 1959). Letter to Senato Berger. UARC, UPA, 0098.

⁷⁰E. Craig Sweeten, (December 21, 1959). Letter to Gaylord P. Harnwell. UARC, UPA, 0098.

A New Frontier: Expansion Continues as the University Adopts a Fresh Approach Towards Planning

As dealings between Penn and the Commonwealth progressed, the University's purchasing of land in the "university area" continued to increase in intensity, and the Trustees began to recognize the necessity to create realistic long-range goals with specific objectives, priorities, and estimated costs in mind. Thus, in 1959 the school devoted a staff of full-time professionals (directly responsible to the President) to the planning program⁷¹ and less than a year later appointed the Committee on the Integrated Development Plan, composed of members of the Trustees, Administration, and Faculty.

By January of 1959, the University had spent half of the previously designated \$100,000 to purchase and renovate within the university area, and the Trustees had appropriated another \$200,000 to continue these efforts--specifically to buy two new sets of properties for Graduate dorms: four on the south side of 3700 Locust Street and six on the north side of 3800 Spruce Street.⁷² In February, the Trustees authorized the University administration to negotiate a contract for the use of land bounded by 32nd, 33rd, Walnut, and Sansom Streets to develop 175,000 square feet into academic and housing buildings, athletic facilities, and a 750-car parking garage. They also recommended the development of the area bounded by 38th, 40th, Spruce, and Walnut Streets for a "superblock" of undergraduate and graduate housing (especially Wharton graduate students) and some classroom buildings.⁷³

In May of 1959, the administration replied to Frances J. Lammer, Executive Director of the Philadelphia RDA, regarding a joint project to use portions of West Philadelphia for University purposes to rehabilitate "blighted areas." In this reply, the University did not commit to the project, but expressed interest and reserved the right to

⁷¹Harold Taubin, "The University of Pennsylvania Story: How an Institution Determines Its Development Aims and Needs," (speech given at the Sheraton Hotel in Philadelphia on 25 March 1963). UARC, UPJ 9.4, B 5.

⁷²Trustees Minutes, vol. 27--74, January 15, 1959. UARC.

⁷³Trustees Minutes, vol. 27--91, February 1959. UARC.

amend and adjust their proposed land use. The University projected its total spending at about \$5.5 million, or \$2 million per block.⁷⁴

With the close of the 1958-59 school year, the University completed its five-year Educational Survey. As mentioned earlier in this paper, this survey served as an in-depth investigation into all aspects concerning the University of Pennsylvania, including the mission of the University, the interaction between students and faculty, the training of teachers, resource availability and limitations, and most relevant in this historical account, the physical expansion. Based on the survey's findings, the University set itself on course to expand its campus, broaden its student body and faculty, increase its research activities and graduate programs, and as a whole, develop into a global university and center of knowledge.

With regard to physical plant, this survey concluded that the means existed for developing new facilities, renovations, new buildings, an expanded campus area, and adequate housing, especially because of the Federal-City Urban Renewal Plan, as redesigned for landlocked urban schools in Section 112 of the National Housing Act.⁷⁵ This 1959 amendment provided states and cities with federal funding for their urban renewal and redevelopment efforts. As a result, the University strengthened its partnerships with the city and the Commonwealth, and from this point on, could receive an even higher level of support from these agencies. The theories of urban renewal swept the nation, and institutions across the country began to expand as part of a government-supported effort to revitalize deteriorating urban areas.

The University's expansion efforts coincided with this trend, and by October of 1959, the University was undertaking 20 more physical plant projects--eight in various stages of completion, four in the drawing stage, and eight in different levels of planning. Some of these included a new wing for the Chemistry Building, expansion of the steam

⁷⁴Trustees Minutes, vol. 27--124, May 8, 1959. UARC.

⁷⁵Harold Taubin, "The University of Pennsylvania Story: How an Institution Determines Its Development Aims and Needs."

and electric system, a medical research lab, the Nurses' Residence Hall, the Radvin Institute, and the Women's Residence Hall. Additionally, by this time the University had spent \$25,000 in their effort to buy the aforementioned property on Locust and Spruce, and the Trustees authorized the remaining \$175,000 to be used in the purchase of land in other areas as well.⁷⁶

In March of 1960, the Trustees established committees on the formulation of the Integrated Development Plan, an attempt to implement the findings of the Educational Survey in a long-range development program. Committees on educational planning, physical plant growth, operations, and staff had the responsibility to submit recommendations to the presiding Joint Committee--consisting of Harnwell, Trustees, administration, and faculty--for final approval and synthesis into an overall University plan.⁷⁷

In his 1959-1960 Presidential report, Harnwell stated that "the University's physical campus is expanding rapidly into its encircling urban environs; at the same time, we are endeavoring to ameliorate some features of this environment."⁷⁸ To encourage more faculty to live in the campus area, Penn was developing West Philadelphia into a more spacious, attractive, and residential neighborhood. To expand the educational opportunities for the expected increase in student enrollment, the University viewed the addition of residential facilities as a priority. Ideally, the school wanted undergraduates who lived off-campus in private housing to move into new University facilities, thereby opening the surrounding residential areas to graduate and professional students, as well as faculty. An overall campus plan at this time was reaching advanced stages under the newly established University Planning Office. It was to include land acquisition areas needed for

⁷⁶Trustees Minutes, vol. 27--183, 192, October 16, 1959. UARC.

⁷⁷Trustees Minutes, vol. 27--277, March 11, 1960. UARC.

⁷⁸Gaylord P. Harnwell, "A Compliant Education of Youth: The University of Pennsylvania Report of the President, 1960," *Bulletin* LXI, no. 3 (November 1960): 23. UARC, UPI 25.1.

development, land-use allocations, locations of proposed new buildings, street closings, and parking provisions.⁷⁹

In April 1960, the Trustees resolved to negotiate with the Sun Oil Company to buy their real estate at the corner of 37th, Spruce, and Woodland. In a related yet separate decision, the Trustees again pledged to seek the assistance of the RDA, this time to procure 1.2 acres between 36th and 37th Streets on Walnut for the Annenberg School of Communications as well as the triangular area bounded by 38th, Woodland, and Spruce Streets. The estimated cost for the Annenberg site was not more than \$500,000 (about half of which would come from University funds) and the project involved 20 properties--scheduling the completion of family relocation for July 1. In obtaining the triangular area, the Trustees estimated a cost of \$250,000 and claimed that the funds were available. They did not specify in their May meeting how many properties would be involved, but they did refer to their request for the RDA condemnation powers.

As proof of the cooperation between the University and city officials at this time, the City Council passed and the Mayor approved Bill #50 by May of 1960. This bill gave the go-ahead for certain street closings in the University Area, such as Woodland Avenue (from University Avenue extension to 33rd Street), Locust Street (36th to 37th), and McAlpin Street (from Walnut to Locust Streets--through the site for the Annenberg School).⁸⁰

Meanwhile, 1961 approached and the University continued to evaluate its long-range goals and planning process for its further development. In a February meeting of the Trustees, President Harnwell reviewed the planning activities of the University, the West Philadelphia Corporation,⁸¹ the City Planning Commission, and the interrelationships of

⁷⁹Ibid., 24, 26.

⁸⁰Trustees Minutes, vol. 27--320-321, May 20, 1960. UARC.

⁸¹The West Philadelphia Corporation was a joint effort to improve and redevelop the area that came to be known as "University City." It was organized in 1959 by the University of Pennsylvania, Drexel Institute of Technology, Presbyterian Hospital, Philadelphia College of Osteopathy, and the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science, and will appear with more

these with the RDA, drawing particular attention to two of the West Philadelphia Corporation's proposals for the area south of Market Street. With the aid of these panels, Harold Taubin, the original Director of the University Planning Office, outlined a long-range plan for the physical development of the University and presented the following: a Development plan for University City-West Philadelphia Corporation Area of Interest; existing University buildings and campus conditions; the University Development Plan--Stage 1--1960-65; and the University Development Plan--Stage 2--1965-75. The President then pointed out the progress being made in the planning process, the need to submit an approved development plan to the RDA in connection with their intent to proceed to acquire grounds in the University City area, and the need for the 'Trustees' views to be reflected in this final plan.

In the ensuing discussion at this meeting, the present parties considered the implications for present property owners, the business risks involved in calculating the probable income producing capacity of new commercial and residential facilities, and the possibility of minimizing the consequences of these risks on the University by forming a separate corporation. Following this, the Trustees resolved to adopt the University Development Plan as the chief guide for the school's physical development and authorized the administration to declare part of Area 1, south of Market Street and bounded by 38th and 34th Streets, as an area of interest with the understanding that the University may want to be the redeveloper itself. In reaching this decision, the Trustees specifically took into account some elements of the plan that included the following: existing and proposed land uses; the land acquisition required to carry out the plan (together with a showing of the anticipated extent to which existing structures will need to be demolished and cleared); the location of existing and proposed community facilities and open spaces; land use and zoning; and the buildings and areas requiring conservation and design attention in the University area. While the final agreement gave the President the power to amend this

details in later sections of the paper.

plan, the Trustees still maintained overall authority and needed to approve all changes and policy implementations.⁸²

One main goal of the Development Plan was for a unified and pedestrian-oriented campus--centered between 34th, Spruce, 40th, and Walnut Streets--with traffic rerouted around this area. It also emphasized improving the identity of the University in the community and fostering a residential community of faculty, scholars, and students -- hopefully resulting in more faculty moving into the University area with their families. Projecting a fifty percent increase in student enrollment by 1975 (to 26,000), the Plan concluded with a table listing fifty-nine projects to be completed over a two phase period between 1965-75.⁸³

While the University was exploring new areas to develop, its goals remained remarkably similar to the 1948 Martin Report--a community of scholars residing in and around a campus closed off to vehicular traffic. Nevertheless, the potential to carry this out to an even greater extent than ever assumed in 1948 presented itself by the 1960s. The Educational Survey documented this potential in 1959 and the increasing support of the local, state, and federal governments, progressing from the 1950s into the 1960s, made it feasible. The purpose of the ongoing planning process at Penn was to continually build upon previous visions in response to the availability of funds from a variety of sources. The University wanted to remain up-to-date with its objectives and goals.

Several months after the release of the Development Plan, the University continued to work with the city in the redevelopment of West Philadelphia. In a May meeting, the Trustees resolved to dedicate to the city of Philadelphia three "parcels of University land lying within the bed of [the] University Avenue Extension as established on the City Plan" in exchange for two "parcels of City land remaining from the extension of the same street through the Public School property at Thirty-eighth and Spruce Streets" and the further

⁸²Trustees Minutes, vol. 27--426, February 10, 1961. UARC.

⁸³University Development Plan, 1961. UARC, UPJ 9.4, B 3.

closing of Woodland Avenue from 37th to the University Avenue Extension and the closing of 38th from Woodland to Spruce, thus enabling more University development.⁸⁴

Furthermore, the Trustees resolved to pay the General State Authority one dollar as compensation for the entire block bounded by 39th Street, Delancey Street, University Avenue Extension (38th Street), and Woodland Avenue as well as four properties between 38th and 39th Streets on Spruce. Being that the GSA had by this time provided funds for the University's construction of a complex housing the School of Education, the School of Social Work, and the Psychology Department, the Trustees also resolved to pay one dollar for two properties on this site--3701 Locust Street and 210 South 37th Street.⁸⁵

Harnwell's 1960-61 report documented the planning progress of the University and the ongoing cooperation between Penn and the Commonwealth. To him, the University Development Plan established "the physical organization, use and extent of the University campus; and the general location of individual buildings, their estimated volume requirements, and their relationship with each other." It identified "the physical development goals, standards, and design objectives of the University."⁸⁶

Regarding the state, Harnwell referred to the Governor's Committee on Education report released in the spring of 1961, which proposed that the Legislature continue helping state-institutions, but not increase this aid until these universities present a detailed program of education for the 1960s to the Governor, State Council, and Legislature. Responding, the University submitted a fifty page report representing its future plans and interest in helping to solve state and community college problems. In addition to the funds that the state had already appropriated to the University for the undergraduate library, medical school, and veterinary school, during that year the GSA also allocated another \$12.6 million for the Fine Arts Building, the Graduate Library, and additional physical sciences

⁸⁴Trustees Minutes, vol. 27--461-478, May 19, 1961. UARC.

⁸⁵Ibid.

⁸⁶Gaylord P. Harnwell, "Signposts: University of Pennsylvania Report of the President, 1961," *Bulletin* LXII, no. 2 (December 1961): 23-24. UARC, UPI 25.1.

facilities. The University had also secured about \$460,000 for the preliminary designs and planning of an Administration and General Services Building, physical education facilities, and medical school teaching facilities.⁸⁷

Reinforcing the Development Plan, the University created the Integrated Development Plan in 1962, based on the results of the 1959 Educational Survey as well as the deliberations of trustees, faculty, and administration in joint committee hearings. Correlating with its predecessor, this newer report also stressed the desire to create a community of scholars in which the physical environment achieves educational and social objectives and promotes interaction between faculty and students. The authority and coordination of this effort rested with the President's office, the Trustees, and the Administration. Furthermore, the 1962 Integrated Development Plan predicted sources of funds for projects (1962-70), but stressed the need for annual planning reviews because of an expectation of new sources and changes that may occur.⁸⁸

As presented in Harnwell's report, the Integrated Development (ID) plan specifically called for six male and four female undergraduate houses and high rises for graduate students. With the University's opening of the Van Pelt undergraduate library in June, 1962 and its addition of the Dietrich graduate library forthcoming with the help of the GSA, the University also desired another wing for its museum and an expansion of its Computer Center and Language Laboratory. The plan also proposed a Graduate Studies Center to act as a headquarters for the Graduate Schools of Arts and Sciences and for postdoctoral studies. The humanities departments needed offices, seminars, classes, and lecture halls, and planners wanted to renovate College and Logan Halls and replace the Hare Building. While the GSA was providing structures for Psychology, Education, and Social Work, Penn also wanted a group of buildings west of Dietrich Hall for a graduate

⁸⁷Ibid., 24-25.

⁸⁸The Integrated Development Plan, 1962 edition. UARC, UPJ 9.4.

and professional center for the social sciences and their application in government and business, especially for the Wharton School's new efforts in management science.

For physical sciences and engineering, the ID plan specified remodeling the Towne Building and scheduled the completion of a four story Laboratory for Research on the Structure of Matter at the northeast corner of 33rd and Walnut Streets for the fall of 1963. The United States Department of Defense assumed over half the cost of this project and the GSA provided \$3.7 million for a multi-story building adjacent to the existing Physical Science Building, scheduled for completion in 1964-65. Planners proposed a Particle Physics Lab for a plot on Walnut across from this addition, but this was subject to Congressional approval because of its association with the Atomic Energy Commission. Additionally, the University needed new chemistry classrooms and labs, so the I.D. plan included an eight story building for this purpose.

Regarding the professional schools, the Law School needed remodeling and the University was to move the Graduate School of Fine Arts into the old library, Furness, and an adjacent structure provided by the GSA. In the medical affairs division, the plan was to link the Medical Lab Building with HUP by three new structures--a clinical research tower, a teaching facility, and a medical library--off of Hamilton Walk. Penn needed to finish remodeling the Dental School. build new West Philadelphia facilities for the Veterinary School, build a new building for the School of Nursing, and provide more quarters for the Graduate Hospital.

To pay for all these projects, the University relied on the same sources that had been providing support for years: tuition and fees; gifts and grants from individuals, corporations, and foundations; and grants, contracts, and other aid from city, state, and federal governments. With regard to the city, its assistance in land acquisition was motivated by its desire to renew West Philadelphia, but by now, it had even more reason to help the University because, through some of the school's privately funded programs, the city qualified for additional federal aid. Furthermore, the University tied the I.D. Plan to

the timing of the city's Six-Year Capital Program, which controlled the functions of the RDA. The state, acting through the GSA, had been helping Penn expand so that the University could assume an increased responsibility for higher education in the Commonwealth and offer more facilities. The federal government had been contributing to the internationality of the University through loans to students as well as grants and contracts for construction and research.⁸⁹

This Integrated Development Plan was a watershed in the development history of the University. Approved by the Trustees on May 4, 1962, it included specific recommendations for the school's future--reaching as far as 1975--with regard to every aspect of University life. Like the original Martin Report of 1948, this plan served as the basis for the University's development decision making process for decades to come. As Harnwell described it in his 1962 presidential report,

The Plan is in both name and fact an Integrated Plan, for it recognizes that a university must, as a whole, be guided by a consistent educational program, set for and by itself, and concordant with its aspirations and traditions and with resources which may be mobilized and adapted to the accomplishment of its institutional purpose.⁹⁰

In his opinion, universities should be centers of knowledge and innovation, and, in partnership with the RDA, the city, the state, and the federal government, Penn was re-establishing stability and cultural advantage for the local community by forming a congenial residential neighborhood of students and faculty.

In a speech entitled "The University of Pennsylvania Story: How an Institution Determines Its Development Aims and Needs" given at the Sheraton Hotel in 1963, Harold Taubin reflected on the University planning program--past, present, and future. According to him, this process should begin with a critical self-analysis of the University and whether it had lived up to its self-imposed statements of excellence, including a service to the

⁸⁹Gaylord P. Harnwell, "An Environment for Learning: The President's Message, 1962," *Bulletin* LXIII, no. 4 (December 1962). UARC, UPI 25.1.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*, 1-2.

community. Before planning, the University also needed to figure out what it required of its faculty, departments, programs, supporting services, and physical plants. In his opinion, Penn did this with their Educational Surveys of the 1950s. Concerning his present day, Taubin believed that "The University planning program has established campus development standards and goals with regard to . . . neighborhood conservation and (where necessary) renewal."⁹¹ Realizing the roles of the University, the city, and the federal government, Taubin suggested a partnership between these bodies. In his opinion, the local municipality could use institutional development as a tool for carrying out its own plan for neighborhood conservation and renewal. This local government could also integrate it into existing methods such as programs for health, education and welfare; police and fire protection; construction and building maintenance regulations; zoning and subdivision regulations; capital improvement and budgeting.

As of December, 1963, the federal government had spent \$1.02 billion dollars on 1634 federally assisted urban renewal projects in 777 cities across the United States. Reflecting on this, Edmund N. Bacon, the executive director the Philadelphia City Planning commission from 1949-1970, commented that the city of Philadelphia had been carrying out a twelve year process of "tearing down and digging up, burrowing, building, restoring, condemning, relocating, and spending" \$2 billion of private, city, state, and federal money "to carry out the most thoughtfully planned, thoroughly rounded, skillfully coordinated of all the big-city programs in the United States. "⁹²

As usual, with the close of the 1963-64 year, Harnwell released his annual report on the status of the University. In this one, entitled An Instrument of National Purpose: The President's Message, 1964, Harnwell began by reviewing his past ten years as

⁹¹ Harold Taubin, "The University of Pennsylvania Story: How an Institution Determines Its Development Aims and Needs," (speech given at the Sheraton Hotel in Philadelphia on 25 March 1963). UARC, UPJ 9.4, B 5.

⁹² Interview with Edmund N. Bacon, "Memories Project." UARC, UPB 1.9 MM, box 2, ff 13.

President of the University.⁹³ In that time, Penn had doubled faculty salaries, tripled scholarship aid, and increased its research contracts and grants to \$26 million per year (more than the total University budget in 1951-52). The operating budget tripled to \$75 million per year, and the endowment doubled to \$86 million. The University completed forty-five major construction projects and increased its physical plant value by 100% to \$111 million. For the next decade, Harnwell envisioned a University investment of over \$200 million for the following: 12,000-15,000 full-time students (as compared to the 10,000 in 1964); stronger faculty; campus expansion from 145 acres to 250 acres, marked by quadrangles closed off to traffic; a teaching and research center; and an overall residential university.⁹⁴

⁹³While one must take into account the fact that Harnwell was not about to chastise himself in his own report, this source still provided factual information regarding the University.

⁹⁴Gaylord P. Harnwell, An Instrument of National Purpose: The President's . Message, 1964. UARC, UPI 25.1.

Penn's Role in West Philadelphia: The "University City" Concept and the Local Community

Before continuing the University's expansion story into the second half of the 1960s, I must relate the parallel transformations that were occurring with regard to the University's status and function as an urban institution located in the heart of West Philadelphia. While urban studies and awareness of neighborhood issues were on the rise at the University during the early- and mid- 1950s, during 1958 and 1959 Penn took some important steps in establishing its role as an institution in West Philadelphia, having begun to actively reflect on its responsibilities in the community. As a result, the school led the effort to establish the West Philadelphia Corporation, a joint coalition of Penn, Drexel, The Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, the Presbyterian Hospital, and the Philadelphia College of Osteopathy. Gaylord Harnwell was elected to be its President (a position he was reelected to and served through the 1970s). As displayed on its informational brochure, part of the original mission statement of the West Philadelphia Corporation read as follows:

The West Philadelphia Corporation is being created within this framework of demonstrable contribution to the City, of commitment to continued city location, and of devotion to Philadelphia's future well-being.

Consistent with the Philadelphia pattern of urban preservation and restoration, the WPC incorporators recognize that any effective community program necessitates a totality of approach. The inevitable aging of housing, the shifts in residential market demand, the increased obsolescence and over-use of community facilities, including schools and recreational areas, the outmoded traffic and circulation patterns, and the like, all in combination dictate an organizational program encompassing all phases of community life. Success demands the marshaling of all available public and private resources brought to bear at one place and at one time.

Accordingly, the WPC establishes as a core purpose--a community which holds and attracts institutional cultural facilities, compatible industrial and commercial uses, standard and marketable residential areas served by adequate schools, parks, churches and shopping, thus providing a supply and range of housing which will appeal to large numbers of the population not

now attracted to the area.⁹⁵

This group also included other business, industrial, and civic groups in an effort to engender community-wide support for the newly dubbed "University City."⁹⁶ The Corporation brought together community leaders from Powelton and Mantua to the north and Garden Court, Spruce Hill, Walnut Park, and Cedar Park to the west in cooperative self-help activities. It also generated programs and supplied expertise and offices to serve as a liaison between community groups, city agencies, and its sponsoring institutions.

In January of 1960, the founders of the W.P.C. convinced Leo Molinaro to be its executive director. Molinaro had concluded his term with Action, a New York agency focusing on national problems that concerned President Eisenhower, and was interested in urban redevelopment, renovation, and renewal.⁹⁷ From the start, the W.P.C. began investigating the nature of the problems in University City by calling upon private researchers, institutional scholars, city agencies, and the business and civic groups to try and build a basis of facts on which to act.⁹⁸ By March of 1960, an economic base study was about to begin, as well as the formation of a land use plan and the University's School of Education's assistance in an educational and cultural activities survey of West Philadelphia.⁹⁹

While the University was actively involved in the community through the W.P.C., in August of 1959, President Harnwell also appointed Barry Freeman as the first University Community Coordinator. His job was to enlist the support of neighborhood

⁹⁵Gaylord P. Harnwell, "An Environment for Learning," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 115, no. 3 (June 1971): 172-173. UARC, UPJ 9.4, A 10.

⁹⁶The West Philadelphia Corporation outlined University City as the area bounded by the Schuylkill River on the east, 52nd Street on the west, the Meidia branch of the Pennsylvania Railroad on the south, and Haverford Avenue on the north.

⁹⁷Interview with Harold Taubin, "Memories Project." UARC, UPB 1.9 MM, box 4, ff 9.

⁹⁸Gaylord P. Harnwell, "Remarks for the October 11, 1960 Luncheon of the Chamber of Commerce of West Philadelphia ." UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

⁹⁹Trustees Minutes, vol. 27-277, March 11, 1960. UARC.

groups in the University area and to plan and achieve improvements for "good family living"--law and order, health services, and recreational facilities. In addition to this position, Freeman at this time also became the Associate Director for the West Area Office of the Philadelphia Health and Welfare Council, an organization formed in 1947 to deal with mounting urban problems.¹⁰⁰

In Freeman's first evaluation report as Penn's Coordinator for Community Relations (August 15, 1959 - May 1, 1961), he stated that community leaders had become aware of his office and began working with him in improving University City. In his words,

Community groups have begun to draw upon the resources of the University to assist in the development of services and the strengthening of community associations. Persons in the University, in turn, are beginning to see University City as an increasingly desirable place to live and a community to which they can make a contribution by application of the knowledge of their field of specialization.¹⁰¹

He continued to comment on predicted problems with relocation and adjustment of new and old residents to the changes taking place as the University proceeds with its redevelopment plans, emphasizing the care necessary to maintain the "richness and democratic value of a community composed of a variety of economic and racial groupings."¹⁰²

Regarding sections of University City where the main goal was rehabilitation, such as the Spruce Hill Area, Freeman wanted to work with the W.P.C. in developing methods to increase the neighborhood residents' participation in the process. Lastly, invoking the popular University phrase "a community of scholars," he stressed the continuation and further growth of projects that improved public schools in the area by encouraging these schools to take advantage of the University's resources where available.¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ Philadelphia Health and Welfare Council, "Annual Report of the Health and Welfare Council: 1959-60." UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

¹⁰¹ Barry Freeman, "Coordinator of Community Relations of the University of Pennsylvania Evaluation Report: August 15, 1959 - May 1, 1961": 6. UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

¹⁰² Ibid., 6.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 6-7.

Two weeks after Freeman produced this report, Harnwell sent a letter to Sidney N. Repplier, the Director in Charge of Charitable Affairs of the Philadelphia Foundation, requesting a research grant of \$13,800 for two social work graduate students. In this letter, Harnwell described a background of the University's stabilization efforts for University City, a community of 160,000 that “presents an uncommon opportunity to achieve and maintain a congenial balance of the economic, racial, and ethnic elements of urban society.”¹⁰⁴ The first project, under the guidance of Freeman, would involve the establishment of block organizations not only to deal with day to day problems, but more importantly to set up a direct communication between the University and the residents regarding the overall development of University City. The second student would conduct an audit of the welfare services in University City for her doctoral dissertation.¹⁰⁵

In response, Graeme Lorimer, chairman of the Philadelphia Foundation Distribution Committee, wanted some questions answered concerning the University's and the W.P.C.'s current actions in the area, as well as potential pitfalls and dangers that may occur.¹⁰⁶ Two weeks later, Harnwell got back to Lorimer with detailed answers and was able to successfully secure an initial pledge of \$9,400 from the Philadelphia Foundation for the two graduate students, to be followed by another \$4,400 by the end of the 1961-62 academic year.¹⁰⁷ . The response that convinced the foundation to finance the research projects began with a description of the organizational structure and purpose of the W.P.C., and then a mention of the recent agreement between the W.P.C. and the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation to construct the University City Research

¹⁰⁴Gaylord Harnwell (May 15, 1961). Letter to Sidney N. Repplier. UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

¹⁰⁵Ibid. , 2.

¹⁰⁶Graeme Lorimer (May 25, 1961). Letter to Gaylord Harnwell. UARC, UPA 4, 0197

¹⁰⁷ "Community Relations I" folder. UARC, UPA 4, 0197. Subsequently, the Philadelphia Foundation granted \$6000 to continue the social work research for the 1962-62 academic year, and Harnwell approved another \$7425 from the President's Contingency Fund to cover costs. If the studies weret to continue for a third year, the foundation pledged another \$3000 in support.

Tower. Describing the land use in the area (forty percent residential, twenty percent streets, twenty percent commercial and industrial, sixteen percent institutional, one percent parks, and the rest vacant), Harnwell asserted that residential use would suffer no substantial decrease following continued redevelopment, and in fact, as many or more people would be living in University City because of proposed high-rise apartment houses for both sides of Market Street. While he admitted that substandard housing would be demolished--largely concentrated between 34th and 40th Streets, Market Street to Powelton Avenue--this would result in the elimination of social and economic blight in the area as "sound community, commercial, and residential facilities" were constructed.¹⁰⁸

According to Harnwell, the University and the W.P.C. planned on redeveloping fifteen percent of University City and revitalizing the remainder through social and physical rehabilitation and conservation. Hoping for a community-wide program (private citizens, neighborhood groups, and local institutions) coupled with local, state, and federal legislation (zoning laws, neighborhood planning, enforcement of local housing codes), they wanted to instill neighborhood pride and "citizenship responsibilities" and convince private lending institutions of the stability and potential of the area so that property owners could secure funds to upgrade their homes and businesses. Lastly, their vision of University City required "a constant vigilance to make certain human rights are protected and human frailties are sympathetically treated by referral to all the fine private and public health and welfare agencies available."¹⁰⁹

As for relocation of displaced residents, Harnwell raised this as a concern as well, yet saw it mainly as a matter of public policy and action that could only be positively influenced, not administered, by the University and the W.P.C. To him, the ultimate quality of relocation depended on the City Administration and the RDA, but at that time the institutions were working with the West Philadelphia Realty Board to help find adequate

¹⁰⁸Gaylord Harnwell (June 7, 1961). Letter to Graeme Lorimer. UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., 2

rehousing and were undertaking a public information campaign before the RDA began its condemnation process.

The W.P.C. was embarking upon a determined effort to resolve the issues surrounding institutions located in an urban environment by fostering educational expansion and scientific programs as well as physical and social development of the community. Seeing University City as a unique experiment in America, Harnwell and the W.P.C. set out to establish "a community of scholars" that accentuated its educational and cultural facilities and intertwined the commercial, industrial, and residential patterns of the larger neighborhood in which it was situated.

During the following year, some faculty and staff of the University conducted a study entitled "Family Needs In University City Planning: A Study of Factors Affecting the Selection of Neighborhoods." Coordinating with the 1962 Integrated Development goal of establishing a nice residential area populated with University students, faculty, and staff, the authors of the report surveyed people from these groupings to discover their opinions of University City and preferences for a neighborhood.

At the time, about one-third of the singles among the administration, professional, and academic staff of Penn lived in University City. Almost thirteen percent of the married couples did the same. The factors that deterred other families from moving to University City included the style of houses; the lack of good public schools; the scarcity of yard space, parks, and playgrounds for children; personal safety; and aesthetics such as lack open space and the "run-down" appearance of the properties. The most popular recommendations for improvement were basically reversals of what was disliked.¹¹⁰

Evident of the changing social consciousness in America, especially in liberal atmospheres such as a university, a majority of the people surveyed were in favor of a racially, socio-economically, and religiously diverse neighborhood. A large number of

¹¹⁰"Family Needs In University City Planning: A Study of Factors Affecting the Selection of Neighborhoods," the University of Pennsylvania . UARC, . UPA 4, 0197.

them were also wary of living in an exclusive "community of scholars." Overall, almost another twenty percent were willing to move to University City if the recommended improvements took place.¹¹¹

Apparently by February of 1964, the University's actions in University City were having some immediate desired effects. In his annual report, Harnwell referred to Penn's self-interest in West Philadelphia, strengthened by the fact that in 1963, 753 University families or individuals lived in the campus area as compared to the 329 who were there three years earlier. He then went on to describe the University's efforts to explore new areas of service through the expansion of industry and employment in West Philadelphia. Believing that the magnet for new industry was research talent, he continued to comment on the W.P.C.'s desire for the creation of the University City Science Center, a project proposed in 1963 for a \$100 million facility extending between 34th and 40th Streets on Market Street.¹¹²

Following this, Harnwell devoted a section to "The University as a Neighbor," serving as a resource for the community and the nation. Penn's Institute for Urban Studies--the research arm of the Graduate School of Fine Arts Department of City Planning--was the national leader in the scholarship of growing cities. Other disciplines contributed to the growing knowledge of America's cities, including the Department of Landscape Agriculture; the Wharton Department of Regional Science; the Fels Institute of Local and State Government; the Law School's research on "live" problems of community life; the Albert M. Greenfield Center for Human Relations, concerned with intergroup relations; and the Sociology Department's development of a yardstick for measuring juvenile delinquency. Directly within University City, Penn officials began the "Big Motivation" program, to raise the educational sights of local teenagers. The University, Drexel, and the

¹¹¹Ibid.

¹¹²Gaylord P. Harnwell, An Instrument of National Purpose: The President's Message, 1964. UARC, UPI 25.1.

Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science brought high school sophomores to their campuses to excite them about the option of attending college.¹¹³ These three institutions, working with the Philadelphia Board of Education, also started the University-Related Public Schools Program to strengthen and reinforce the work of six elementary schools and the West Philadelphia High School.¹¹⁴ During the 1964 summer, the University ran a job-training program for one hundred high-school dropouts¹¹⁵ and a camp for four hundred and fifty "underprivileged" girls from Philadelphia.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, undergraduates at Penn were increasingly involving themselves in community service projects and volunteer tutoring for neighborhood students.

Meanwhile, racial tension in the city of Philadelphia was mounting. In late August of 1964, riots broke out for three days in an all black section of North Philadelphia. Following this, heightened discussion of race-related issues spread throughout campus. Penn's student-run newspaper, the *Daily Pennsylvanian*, printed an ongoing dialogue during the fall semester relating to the riots, police brutality, and the economically depressed state of African-Americans in Philadelphia. Concern was growing about crime in the University area, and members of the Penn community as well as neighborhood residents began to vocalize their reactions to the redevelopment that had been occurring in West Philadelphia.

In interviews conducted by a Penn graduate student during 1988, three very influential planners and supporters of West Philadelphia's urban renewal spoke on the state of affairs in the mid-1960s. Edmund N. Bacon, who served from 1949-1970 as the Executive Director of the Philadelphia Planning Commission and as the University Development Coordinator from 1968 to 1970, remembered how he hated having to tell

¹¹³Ibid.

¹¹⁴"Reference Summary," prepared by Harold Taubin, 1988. "Memories Project." UARC, UPB 1.9 MM, box 4, ff 9.

¹¹⁵"100 Dropouts Participate in Penn Program," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 80:22 . (Nov. 12, 1964): 1, 3, 5.

¹¹⁶"University Runs Girl's Camp," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 80:34 (Sept. 21, 1964): 5.

people to move from their homes. As officials in other cities with federal money were doing, Bacon fought against demolition before relocation. Specifically, he vehemently regretted the decision to have surface parking lots and so much open space for playing fields in place of existing homes. When asked about the public discontent, Bacon admitted that he constantly faced resident protest, often in the form of tears or derogatory remarks. Overall, he felt that the University made out well--achieving a nice, compact campus that was not too wasteful of space; nevertheless, he expressed his discontent with the extent of urban renewal by saying that

I don't think that any of these institutions can look themselves in the eye and justify tearing down people's houses in order to have their car sit on concrete, sit on asphalt, with this huge piece of earth reserved for its particular purpose the way it is.¹¹⁷

Harold Taubin, the University Planning Office Director from 1959 to 1966, the secretary of the Executive Planning Committee on the Physical Plant,¹¹⁸ and the Senior Analyst of Penn's Department of Facilities Planning (1966-1986), described people's reactions to the relocation systems set up as part of the redevelopment program. Claiming that the city and the University did not select properties to be demolished "arbitrarily," he reflected on the consultation with and relocation opportunities presented to owners and families renting units and the creation of a relocation office in the area for this purpose. The University mounted a public information campaign and often held luncheons and meetings to respond to questions and concerns of local residents and merchants. Some of Penn's neighbors saw this period as one of "unprincipled destruction, and unthoughtful takings of land and property" in which powerful institutions and the local government took advantage of the most vulnerable community members. Others viewed this time as a good

¹¹⁷ Interview with Edmund N. Bacon, "Memories Project." UARC, UPB I.9 MM, box 2, ff I3.

¹¹⁸ In January of 1962, Harnwell disbanded the existing physical plant planning committee structure and formed the Executive Planning Committee, consisting of himself, the provost Dr. David R. Goddard, Mr. Henry R. Pemberton (the University business and financial vice president), Dean Perkins, and Harold Taubin.

experience that provided new housing and relocation opportunities. Despite the University's direct attempts to inform the residents and local businesses about its redevelopment plans, Taubin believed that a "residue of bitterness" remained, continuing even to the time of the interview (and, in my opinion, to the present).¹¹⁹

The third of this powerful trio of men was G. Holmes Perkins, who was Dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts (1951-1971), Chairman of the Philadelphia Planning Commission from 1958-68, and Chairman of the Executive Planning Committee on the Physical Plant since its inception in 1962 until 1965. Heavily involved with urban affairs and renewal since 1945, Perkins felt that during the 1940s through the early 1960s,

In general, people were welcoming the efforts of the federal government and the city to try and go in and clean up the slums. And there was enormous support for it from the [Philadelphia] city government, Clark and Dillworth as the mayors at that time.¹²⁰

It was not until the mid-1960s that people's support for urban renewal began to wane, and, according to Perkins, one must take into account the changing attitudes of the public when viewing the relationship between the University and the community.¹²¹

As the University progressed in its achievement of the Integrated Development Plan, it also became much more actively concerned with and involved in its larger surrounding community. Representative of the social changes occurring during the 1960s, this new interest led to increased neighborhood improvement efforts and the establishment of the W.P.C. But, also surfacing with the changing times were the voices of community members and expressions of discontent regarding previous redevelopment and proposed projects, such as the University City Science Center. Dislocated residents added their faces to the statistics, and as a result, many people were unhappy with the real life effects of institutional expansion.

¹¹⁹Interview with Harold Taubin, "Memories Project." UARC, UPB 1.9 MM, box 4, ff 9.

¹²⁰Interview with G. Holmes Perkins, "Memories Project." UARC, UPB 1.9 MM, box 3, ff 39.

¹²¹Ibid.

The Mid-1960s: The University and the City Redefine Their Goals for University City With Respect to All Parties Involved

With the onset of community response and the growing involvement of the West Philadelphia Corporation in the future of University City, the University could no longer deny the importance of its surrounding environment in its expansion planning and goals. The City of Philadelphia also reevaluated its development plans for the area and began to focus more on the residential nature and patterns that existed and were desired for the future.

In 1964, the Planning Commission released The West Philadelphia District Plan which investigated the current status of the area, dealt with long-range planning issues, and updated the comprehensive city plan of 1960 with the West Philadelphia District in mind. In 1960, 300,000 people lived in the district and the average age of its buildings was thirty years. Outward movements of white residents had led to their replacement by African-Americans.¹²² In 1940, almost twenty percent of West Philadelphia was black. In 1950, the numbers rose to twenty-eight percent and by 1960, over half of West Philadelphia was black, compared to twenty-seven percent of the city. The number of whites between 20-44 years old--the family forming age group and heart of the working force--decreased while younger blacks with larger families increased. Of the estimated 67,000 African-Americans that moved into West Philadelphia between 1950-1960, over 28,000 (42%) were less than fifteen years old. Pressure existed in the district for more schools and recreational facilities.

The income patterns of the district rose between 1950-1960, but declined relative to the rest of the city. While a disparity in income existed between whites and blacks, West Philadelphia African-Americans were overall better off than other Philadelphia blacks. The residents of this district had more years of formal education compared to the

¹²²Philadelphia City Planning Commission, The West Philadelphia District Plan. Philadelphia, Pa: The Authors, 1964. UARC, UPJ 9.4, C 3.

rest of the city, but a majority of both whites and non-whites over 25 had less than a high school diploma. In 1960, West Philadelphia had a slightly higher unemployment rate than the overall city (6.8% vs. 6.5%), despite lower unemployment comparisons for each group respectively--whites and African-Americans. Nevertheless, the black rate at 8.6 percent was almost twice the rate of West Philadelphia whites (4.4%).

The area was definitely a community of homes, but more units were rented than in the rest of the city. Four percent of all the dwellings were vacated. African-Americans owned half of the houses, and within this group, over fifty percent were home owners. In 1960, eighty-five percent of the homes (representing 85,200 dwellings) were sound and needed only routine repairs, but non-whites occupied three-quarters of the remaining dwellings (equaling 13,800 units) that were unsound or lacking good plumbing. These residences were predominantly in the district's areas characterized by low family incomes, high unemployment, and low home ownership. Additionally, the high proportion of overcrowding in these more debilitated areas emphasized the need for improvement.¹²³

Regarding the land use in West Philadelphia, the area was predominantly residential. The housing type varied, with one- and two-family structures typifying the district, but along Market, Chestnut, and Walnut Streets, most of the homes were multi-family. Other clusters of high-rises and multi-family homes were scattered, some near West Philadelphia High School along the northwest portion of City Line Avenue, and others elsewhere. The bulk of recreational land was concentrated in two locations, the Fairmount and Cobb Creek Parks. Commercial structures were concentrated along the lengths of Market Street, 52nd Street, and Lancaster Avenue, while industry ran along the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks. Institutionally, the University and Drexel took up land at the east end of the district and the hospital concentration was located in the center.

Overall structural recommendations in the report included the redesign of Market Street by widening it into a spacious boulevard. Also, the planners proposed a hierarchy

¹²³Ibid., 15-25.

of selectively placed expressways (for example, one along 52nd Street) and enlarged arterial streets (30th, 38th, and 48th Streets). Consistent with earlier visions, they also wanted to continue closing non-vital streets in overdeveloped areas to allow for "greenways."¹²⁴

The section of the report entitled "The District Residence Plan" demonstrated the city's growing emphasis on improving the living conditions and community structures in addition to renewing the physical buildings. This part focused on the living environment, plan for population distribution, and housing issues. The main objective was "to assure that every family or individual who may choose to live West Philadelphia has an opportunity to satisfy reasonable housing wants in a good environment for living."¹²⁵ Other goals were for a freedom of choice in the exercise of living selection and for the resulting district neighborhoods to be diverse in form, density, and housing type in response to their specific needs.

In the plan for population distribution, the purpose was to designate areas for residential and determine how many people would live in each sub-area. Three factors had led to revisions in the city's 1960 Comprehensive Plan: changes in transportation (i.e. the proposed 52nd Street expressway) and their subsequent effects; growing consideration of new urban design ideas and the form of the District, such as locating patterns of high density "activity centers" on Market Street with respect to Center City and constructing high-rise buildings at significant points to serve as district "gateways"; and an effort to reduce structural crowding on land and human crowding within residences, especially those converted from single to multi-family use.

Because of the large mobility of West Philadelphia residents, the authors concluded that, with some exceptions, "the District shows relatively few subareas which stand out as distinct entities or form highly organized local units."¹²⁶ Furthermore, the constantly

¹²⁴Ibid.

¹²⁵Ibid., 57.

¹²⁶Ibid., 60.

changing social patterns made it difficult to plan permanent capital facilities in direct relation to the people that they would serve. As a result, the location and construction of these service-oriented buildings would have to remain responsive to the changing needs of the population.

Attacking deficiencies in housing quality, the planners kept in mind that their "clients" were the families and individuals living in West Philadelphia at the time. As a result, they believed their objective should not be to minimize relocation but instead to increase people's opportunities to move from substandard homes and improve their environment. Important as well was "the elimination of all barriers based on race, creed, or color," keeping with the city's "long-standing" policy.

With regard to the institutions located in West Philadelphia, the report emphasized the importance of the universities and hospitals. Not only did they improve the physical structure of the district, but they also employed close to ten thousand people. Additionally, they attracted research industries and businesses; stimulated the housing market; frequently held cultural and recreational activities; provided adult educational opportunities and health services; and were a source of community service and beneficial neighborhood programs.

In discussing the relationship between the city and these institutions, the authors explained that in approving institutional expansion plans and devising renewal policy, they compared the realization of overall goals to the potential downsides. Recognizing that "[the institutions'] goal of providing opportunities for education and development transcends the geographic boundaries of a particular District," they wanted ". . . to strengthen the role of institutions while relating them more closely to their surroundings."¹²⁷ To the city planners, the potential science center and proposed university-related housing plans would benefit the district and the city, and fit in perfectly with the comprehensive plan for Philadelphia.

In a follow-up report, the Planning Commission set some guidelines for redeveloping the University City sub-areas, such as a mix of residential programs and

¹²⁷Ibid., 64.

commercial development as well as an avoidance of total land clearance. It also examined the existing and proposed projects that coordinated with the RDA and the West Philadelphia Corporation. In the southern area of University City--designated as the area within Market Street on the north, the Schuylkill River east, the Media line of the Pennsylvania Railroad south, and 52nd Street west--RDA institutional renewal programs were underway and the University and the Planning Commission were planning on aiding in the construction of additions to the Philadelphia General Hospital, the Children's Hospital, and the Convention Center. RDA operations would require additional relocation resources for the 1965-1974 period as the Central Relocation Bureau would have to relocate 1100 families from the project area. Relocation loads from redevelopment efforts on Chestnut Street (to begin in 1968) and in Spruce Hill (four RDA projects scheduled for 1968 and expansion of the renewal program west to 43rd Street after 1968) would also have to be assumed. In the Cedar Park neighborhood, the federal government was in the process of certifying 220 mortgage insurance applications to finance rehabilitation of existing structures. This aid, made possible by the city and the Federal Housing Administration, would provide long-term, low cost mortgage financing to property owners.¹²⁸

Other proposed programs would require an accommodation of people moving east to Walnut Hill and Cedar Park and technical assistance in home conversion. Public housing development would also be effective in meeting the housing needs of more impoverished people and the elderly if realized in conjunction with other urban renewal, conservation, or clearance projects. The Philadelphia Housing Authority wanted to clear areas of blight and deterioration, acquire and rehabilitate older row-houses for larger families, and provide the area with low-rent public housing. The Redevelopment Authority's objective was to eliminate the "slums" and encourage the construction of new housing by reselling acquired land to developers. While major relocation would be

¹²⁸ Philadelphia City Planning Commission, Development Programming as Applied to West Philadelphia. Technical Report Number Eight. Philadelphia, Pa: The Authors, 1964. UARC, UPA 9..4, C 8.

necessary, the RDA hoped that federal mortgage assistance and new, cheaper houses would help raise property values for home-owners.

To provide necessary community facilities and bring homes up to or above the housing code standards, this arm of the city government wanted to actively aid in the conservation and renewal of selected areas by providing technical assistance and strengthening citizen organization. In conjunction with the W.P.C., the city sought to improve the overall residential, commercial, and environmental conditions in University City and West Philadelphia. Similar to the other proposals, rehabilitation and technical assistance were means to redevelop the area, but other objectives included the renovation and display of "demonstration homes" (to show ways in which old houses could be modernized) and the revitalization of the north-south commercial area along 40th Street. The potential for successful programs in this area was heightened because of institutional renewal and the growing trend of higher-income institutional staff and constituents living near their workplaces.¹²⁹

Speaking of which, in May of 1964, the University Trustees amended the Development Plan to build some facilities for the proposed undergraduate dorm on Spruce Street, Woodland Avenue, and 38th Street. They also authorized the construction of undergraduate men's residences on the northwest corner of 39th and Spruce Streets and the development of the east side of the block bounded by 34th, Walnut, 36th, and Sansom Streets for the Humanities and a bookstore.¹³⁰ Evident to any who wished to pick up the freshman issue of the *Daily Pennsylvanian* that year were the new plans for continuing the development of a modern University City amidst the "slums" of West Philadelphia. Touting a \$150 million project, the school hoped to provide facilities which could serve a 50% increase in enrollment to 26,000 and housing for 15,000, encompassing 250 acres (75% greater than at the time of the article). Also included in these plans were the \$6

¹²⁹Ibid., A7-A9, A11-A12, A20

¹³⁰Trustees Minutes, vol. 28-498, May 5, 1964. UARC.

million Social Science Center, an addition to the Fine Arts building, a graduate library connecting to the recently built Van Pelt Library, a commercial plaza along Walnut Street, a new School of Medicine building, and another gymnasium.¹³¹ As University officials began to envision the school of the future, the University Planning Office stated that the school would assist in the relocation of all people affected by the expansion. Later in September, the Trustees set dates for some of the mentioned projects as well as Veterinary alterations, the new Physical Science facility, and the Belton Center Dormitories.¹³²

Two months later, President Gaylord Harnwell's annual report appeared in the Pennsylvania Gazette entitled "Pennsylvania in 1964: Change." Discussing the functions of the University, Harnwell explained how Penn served the United States and its immediate environment in all fields. It had also undertaken service initiatives for its "underprivileged, undereducated, and underemployed neighbors"¹³³ and through the W.P.C, had benefited the social, health, and welfare services of University City.

To finance continuing University expansion and redevelopment efforts, in 1964 the Trustees had announced a \$93 million Development Program fund-raising campaign and a call for \$2 million per year in alumni giving for new buildings, scholarships, and professorships as outlined in the annually updated Integrated Development Plan. As part of Harnwell's annual report, a photographic display with his captions demonstrated the transformation of campus. Represented were the intersection of Woodland Avenue at 34th and Walnut Streets, showing the Van Pelt Library and the cleared land neighboring the pedestrian walkway where row houses and traffic once dominated Woodland Avenue; the recently completed women's dorms (Hill House), Laboratory for Research on the Structure of Matter, and a parking garage going east from 34th Street along Walnut; the cleared land across from the unchanged men's dormitories at 37th and Spruce Streets; the new biology

¹³¹ "Modern New 'University City' Rises From W. Phila. Slum," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 80: Freshman Issue (September 1964) : 1, 15, 17.

¹³² Trustees Minutes, vol. 29-4, September 11, 1964. UARC.

¹³³ Gaylord P. Harnwell, "Pennsylvania in 1964: Change," Pennsylvania Gazette 63, no. 2 (November 1964): 13.

building and open lawn space where Macfarlane Hall once stood on Hamilton Walk: the unobstructed view of the Law School from the athletic field adjacent to the new women's dorms, an area that used to contain row houses and the old Milner Hotel; and the quiet image of Locust Street, now known and used as Locust Walk.¹³⁴

In Harnwell's report a year later, he reiterated much of what was in his previous article, particularly emphasizing the social and research functions of the University.

Exemplary of a growing consciousness of and concern for its urban surroundings and neighbors, Penn was seeking

to serve the nation's needs--to ameliorate poverty, to bring opportunity to the disadvantaged, to reduce the noisome effluents of congested industries, and to improve the total well-being of the people living closely together in our cities.¹³⁵

Urban universities had begun using their surrounding communities as laboratories for exploration and implication of social science research on real problems. The University of Pennsylvania had helped found the W.P.C. to improve University City. It had worked with the City Planning Commission in devising long-range development plans and with the RDA for urban renewal. With the Board of Education, Penn had implemented institutional programs in local schools, and through the scientific and technological work of the future non-profit University City Science Center, the University would attempt to improve the industrial and economic health of the entire Delaware Valley.¹³⁶

Regarding the \$93 million capital fund-raising campaign announced the previous year, by November of 1965, the University had received over \$40 million in gifts and pledges and \$1.5 million in the annual donations from alumni, parents, and friends. In addition to the projects mentioned in Harnwell's 1964 report, soon to come on the Penn campus were a medical and research building, a new undergraduate house, the remodeling

¹³⁴Ibid., 15-23. See Appendix C 1 for the photos, a list of buildings constructed since 1952, and a map of campus.

¹³⁵Gaylord P. Harnwell, "Pennsylvania in 1965: A Special Report," Pennsylvania Gazette 64, no. 3 (December 1965): 11. UARC, UPM 8125.

¹³⁶Ibid., 11-12.

of the Towne Building, a new physical science wing for David Rittenhouse Labs, a new gymnasium and pool building and the Moore School Graduate Research Center. The latter three projects, along with the Fine Arts building, were sponsored by the General State Authority.¹³⁷

University growth and development continued through the 1965-1966 academic year, but so did an increased awareness of how this expansion and the University as a whole functioned in the local, state, national, and world contexts. Universities in America were no longer ivory towers--on the contrary, they served man and society--as Harnwell pointed out in his 1966 report, "The World's Problems Have Become the University's Problems." Again heralding the research and community efforts of the University, Harnwell also praised the formation of the Community Involvement Council (CIC) by student leaders in conjunction with the University Human Resources Program. This organization was to provide information on community service projects to student organizations, to be a liaison for community groups seeking volunteers, and to encourage student service participation. In its first year, the CIC ran twenty-five projects involving over 800 students.¹³⁸

Also during the 1964-65 school year, the University formed the Council on Urbanism and Related Human Resources to survey the urban-related activities of its eighteen schools, centers, and institutes. According to Harnwell,

Citizens are rehabilitating their houses, a beautification program is underway, schools are becoming better, merchants are refurbishing their premises, the economic profile is rapidly improving, and a spirit of social coherence and responsibility is being engendered.¹³⁹

Furthermore, although the W.P.C. had constructed only one building of the University City Science Center, more were scheduled for the future. Penn and other educational and

¹³⁷Ibid., 13. See appendix C2 for a complete list and brief description of current and planned construction projects for the 1965-66 school year.

¹³⁸Gaylord P. Harnwell, "The World's Problems Have Become the University's Problems," Pennsylvania Gazette 65, no. 3 (December 1966): 8, 17. UARC, UPM 8I25.

¹³⁹Ibid., 24

medical institutions were the proprietors of this project, and with a group of civic-minded leaders serving on the board of directors, they hoped to share their knowledge and skills more effectively with other industrial and governmental groups without hindering their educational, research, and clinical functions. Simply, the University in the mid- to late-1960s was mobilizing its resources to help cure urban ills and serve the common good.¹⁴⁰

¹⁴⁰Ibid.

"Lend Me Your Ears": Heightened University-Community Involvement Doesn't Deter Burgeoning Development Criticisms

With the onset of the 1967-68 school year, universities across the country became arenas of student activism and protest, especially with regard to the disparity of opportunity in America and the federal government's military involvement in Vietnam. Nevertheless, according to Harnwell's 1967 report, at Penn, a "quiet revolution" was taking place within the student body. One percent of the seven thousand undergraduates participated in demonstrations, while eight percent were involved in thirty-seven community service projects. Service groups were consolidating and expanding--the Community Involvement Council merged with the Tutorial Board, which managed five tutoring projects--and students were increasingly getting involved in their larger community.

One aspect of this community was the University itself, and students began demanding better communication with the administration regarding their opinions on the educational policy-making of the school. The faculty and administration heard their voice and responded, allowing undergraduates to sit on various University councils, including the male and female versions of the Committee on Instruction of the College. Also representing the student body was the recently formed Student Committee on Undergraduate Education (SCUE), whose members evaluated attitudes and opinions on the Pennsylvania educational experience and made recommendations for change.¹⁴¹

As activism grew on campus in the form of increased involvement in the community and the school's decision-making process, students began to criticize more forcefully the negative consequences of the University's expansion and redevelopment actions. In October of 1967, three students published an article in the penn comment, an undergraduate student publication, criticizing the University's "encroachment" into West Philadelphia. Citing the existing problems plaguing the neighborhood, such as poor

¹⁴¹Gaylord P. Harnwell, "The Quiet Revolution," Pennsylvania Gazette 66, no. 5 (January-February 1968): 3-21.

housing, unemployment, police friction, and an inferior educational system, the authors believed that previous and further University expansion could eventually lead to a race riot. In particular, the University City Science Center and the Presbyterian Hospital being built in the area known as Mantua (just north running parallel to Penn and continuing west to 48th Street) had moved over 800 families into worse housing located in a more concentrated, dangerous area. According to the three students, many of the families were too old to get new mortgages and would be forced to rent. Other negative side effects included feelings of ill-will towards Penn, a predominantly white, upper-middle class community, and an increase in commercial exploitation because prices in University City increased (e.g. supermarkets and furniture stores).¹⁴²

Furthermore, the disparity in socioeconomic levels between community members and members of the University community had already created problems of theft, resulting in an effort by Penn Guards and Philadelphia police to solve this by segregating the two communities. In doing this, police harassment and suspicion of people who did not look like Penn students often resulted, and, for example, neighborhood children playing on University parks and property had been thrown off the grounds. Friction between the community and the police only exacerbated with continued expansion and unpopular, unfair safety measures.

The residents could not stop the condemnation of their homes--a minority of them discussed rioting, but the majority of the displaced were older (in their sixties) and were not in favor of that alternative. Instead, many were forced to relocate to Mantua, spreading feelings of bitterness in a highly populated, volatile area. Because of this, the authors felt that violence would become a more attractive option for community members if the University did not take responsibility in West Philadelphia, regardless of the city

¹⁴²Jerry Bernstein, Chris Stalberg, and Stuart Sugarman, "Encroachment: How Penn is Contributing to a Race Riot in West Philadelphia," penn comment 4: 2 (October 1967): 6-9.

government's actions. To them, Penn's efforts had not been nearly sufficient to counterbalance the negative effects of its expansion.¹⁴³

Student angst over University expansion was heating up, and in the winter edition of University, a liberal magazine published by undergraduates, Joan Cooper wrote a scathing article criticizing planned University and West Philadelphia Corporation expansion in Area III, the sub-area of University City from 34th to 40th Streets, north of Market to Lancaster and Powelton Avenues. Basing much of her information on Maj Borei's 1965 *Thesis In Human Relations*, Cooper attacked the University's ongoing development in West Philadelphia as well as the proposed University City Science Center. As she sarcastically wrote,

To the delight of the University of Pennsylvania, its business partner, the West Philadelphia Corporation (the University owns the controlling interest and President Harnwell heads them both) has provided an efficient solution to the 'Neighborhood Problem.' It is to eliminate the non-University community and erect a Mega-Science Center in its place to lure prestige, profit, and professors to our disinfected doorstep.¹⁴⁴

She continued to say that while representatives had supposedly interviewed and found new homes for the 1100 families who were to be displaced, her research showed that this did not occur for many Area III residents. On May 10, 1963, the RDA had announced its demolition and clearance plan of the area to all who would be affected, but subsequently admitted that they had not made adequate provisions for the residents. When the community protested, the mayor mandated a concession of 7.6 acres of the designated Science Center land for residential use, but this was claimed by the Philadelphia School Board for a \$14.8 million public and magnet high school.

Cooper finished off her article by expressing her belief that the University should celebrate not only the "brochure items--museums, libraries, cultural institutions" but also the mixture of people and cultures within its urban environments. To her, Penn had

¹⁴³Ibid., 6-9.

¹⁴⁴Joan Cooper, "Area 3," University, (Winter 1967): 9.

ignored "the challenge of the city" and would most likely continue to do so, as evident in their plans to remove all non-university related housing in Area IV (33rd to 40th Streets, between Spruce and Walnut) by 1975, resulting in the elimination of another 1249 units.¹⁴⁵

Cooper had voiced a challenge to the University that many students, faculty, and community members also had on their minds: would Penn admit and live up to what they believed were its responsibilities to its surrounding community? According to Harnwell in his 1967-68 report, the University was not only expanding its improvement efforts in the community, it had also continued--in the Council on Urbanism and Related Human Relations and the University Center for Urban Research and Experiment--actively evaluating the role it should play in its urban setting. In the section "Pennsylvania's Involvement Beyond the Campus: New Dimensions of Public Service," Harnwell extensively informed the reader of how "The past decade has witnessed the emergence of the University as an institutional catalyst in the mobilization of community leadership and resources in its own West Philadelphia neighborhood, now known as University City." 146

Penn had provided men and money for community improvements and, with other schools and the leadership of the W.P.C., developed needed organizations and services. Local schools and homes were also better off as a result. Based on studies conducted by these institutions and the city on migration patterns, residential planning for the future, population projections, transportation, and University City's ability to attract industry and commerce, the group consensus on the top priority was to erect the \$100 million University City Science Center complex on both sides Market Street between 34th and 40th Streets. The existing \$1.5 million Science Institute, a subsidiary of the UCSC on the southeast corner of Market and 36th Streets, was rapidly becoming a national research and

¹⁴⁵Ibid., 10-11.

¹⁴⁶Gaylord P. Harnwell, "Towards the 1970s: Seeking a 'New Model,'" Pennsylvania Gazette 69, no. 3 (November 1968): 29. UARC, UPM 8125.

development center for the life sciences. Only in existence for two years at this time, it had already secured over \$2.4 million for medical-related research.¹⁴⁷

Medically speaking, the W.P.C. had created the Mental Health Consortium, a fourteen month old association of six hospitals and the University's Medical School, Department of Psychiatry, and School of Social Work. Its goal was to provide immediate service to the mental health needs of the community at "Trouble Centers" scattered throughout West Philadelphia. With the hospitals providing back-up support, these facilities would also teach and train students in the University's Division of Community Psychiatry. In the business field, Wharton's Management Science Center was working with the community on business and industrial problems. Through Project Mantua, University scholars acted as an advisory group for Mantua community leaders and helped with networking, but they left the decision-making up to the residents.

In an attempt to stabilize a deteriorating area and "re attract" University families to the city, Harnwell cited the University's guarantee of \$25 million in mortgages since 1965 to help personnel buy and restore West Philadelphia homes. One hundred and ten families bought property under the plan, consisting mostly of faculty and administrative staff, and the School of Education had recently joined with nine local schools to develop pilot programs. Additionally, University supporters had organized private corporations to acquire residential properties for off-campus student housing and Penn worked directly with community groups on recreational, educational, safety, and neighborhood improvement projects. Lastly, the University supported and the W.P.C. administered a fund for people buying property in Mantua that financed settlement charges over and above the almost 100 percent mortgage granted by the Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷Ibid.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., 30-32.

To represent the University's perspective on its role in West Philadelphia, Harnwell quoted Howard Mitchell, the director of Penn's Human Resources Center:

Numerous other instances could be cited of the expansion of the University's public service role in recent years. Suffice it to say that it impinges on all facets of contemporary society and that demand for special services has been at an accelerating rate.¹⁴⁹

Nevertheless, many Penn students and faculty, and especially displaced residents, did not share Mitchell's favorable outlook and were voicing their adverse opinions throughout the late 1960s. While proactive University efforts to improve the conditions of University City for its residents undoubtedly demonstrated Penn's strong commitment to the neighborhood, the aid, or lack thereof, provided to those residents who were displaced by redevelopment had proved to be insufficient. As a result, condemnation of the University's actions in the area grew even louder, outweighing increased University contributions to its community in the minds of the student body.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., 33.

Protest Turns to Action: The University City Science Center, the 1969 Sit-in, and the Quadripartite Commission¹⁵⁰

While Penn was displaying their development achievements to alumni at the start of the 1968-69 year, students and faculty were continuing to raise the question of the University's responsibility to its community, and in particular to the housing needs of those dislocated by the Science Center. Ira Harkavy, a well-known student activist and leader at the time, was already calling for a return of two and one-quarter acres of land that was slated to be used for the UCSC. In his opinion, the West Philadelphia Corporation was the chief redeveloper in this area, and with University President Harnwell in charge of this organization, Penn had the power to change things.¹⁵¹ Faculty member Dr. Barry Slepian, assistant professor of English, had also slammed the University in his article "Image or Reality?". He contended that the University should take more of an active role in the community, in addition to the efforts it was already currently making. While he admitted that programs existed for students and faculty to provide community service, he believed that these efforts cost the University little (the Community Involvement Council received only \$2400 per year) but provided it with extremely positive and largely unwarranted public relations.¹⁵²

The Volunteer Community Resources Council (VCRC), a privately funded social agency created in 1966 to help deal with the problems of Unit III residents, conducted a one year study and reached a number of conclusions: nobody fully compensated many residents for financial hardships resulting from the relocation, such as increased rents;

¹⁵⁰*Daily Pennsylvanian* articles constitute the majority of the sources for this section, Not only do they provide an outstanding chronicle of events (one journalist authored many of the articles), they also serve as an expression of the direct student voice and often the voice of community members. The University did not directly represent the latter group too much in its publications of the time.

¹⁵¹Rona Zevin, "Plethora of Proposals Pushed to Ameliorate Maelstrom of Malaise," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 84:33 (Sept. 11, 1968): 1.

¹⁵²Dr. Barry Slepian, "Image or Reality?", *Daily Pennsylvanian* (February 9, 1968): The News Bureau of the University of Pennsylvania.

moving expenses, promised to all in need did not reach 30 percent of the families and was insufficient for an additional 15 percent surveyed; 80 percent of those surveyed relocated without help from the city's Redevelopment Authority (RDA) or from any outside agency; many moved into substandard housing; almost one third moved into worse living conditions; and the largest number of relocated residents moved to Mantua, a location (as stated previously) that was incapable of absorbing additional residents.¹⁵³

For the months that followed, student awareness and protest of the University's actions heightened, as witnessed by an increase in the number of articles regarding the topic in the *DP*, and especially by the content of these writings. Although the UCSC represented to University officials a step in the right direction, to many students it was a "visible symbol of much of what they believed ailed [the University of] Pennsylvania and universities throughout the country--a moral indifference to the plights of the neighboring community ..."¹⁵⁴ While student criticisms were rising in number and in volume, Provost David R. Goddard affirmed his stance on University-community relations in his 1968 annual report, stating that

Universities cannot be all things to all men. If we saddle our institutions with responsibilities they cannot effectively discharge or shift them to burdens which more appropriately belong to other agencies, we run the risk of damaging the integrity of academic endeavor and fragmenting its basic purposes.¹⁵⁵

Nevertheless, "student rebellions" and protest across the nation's college campuses led to new University introspective efforts. The school was forced to question things of the past and establish new doctrine, rhetoric, and organizational structures necessary for the present and the future. In response, on October 11, 1968 the Trustees announced the

¹⁵³Judson Brown, "'Massive craters' Replace Homes of 3,000 in Area III," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 84:69 (October 30, 1968): 1, 3.

¹⁵⁴Bob Hoffman, "In a Year of Violent Campus Action, Peaceful Protest Succeeds at Penn," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 85: Summer Issue (July 1, 1969): 6.

¹⁵⁵Harnwell, "Towards the 1970s: Seeking a 'New Model,'" 33.

creation of a task force of students, faculty, administration, and Trustees to study the structure of the Penn community.¹⁵⁶

To the students, this new task force was not enough to represent all of their concerns. Because the administration had failed to effectively address the problems associated with Area III redevelopment, student protest culminated on February 18, 1969 into a sit-in at College Hall, home of the University President's office. One of the main contentions of the rally was for the University to openly accept responsibility and accountability in its surrounding community and to return land previously designated for the University City Science Center--a twenty-three acre site. In 1960, 3925 people lived on the UCSC site. By 1964, when the W.P.C. announced its development plans, 2653 remained. Some of these residents relocated on their own, but a housing shortage had resulted because of inadequate relocation policies, slow construction of low-cost housing, and an increase in student occupancy of West Philadelphia homes, driving up rents and pushing more residents out. The protesters also demanded that the University and W.P.C. Boards of Trustees supply money for the construction of low-cost housing and ban classified military research at the UCSC.¹⁵⁷

Supported by faculty and community members, the demonstration at first proved to be a success, with the Trustees and administration of the University agreeing to a set of demands six days after the protest began. As the University statement read, "The Trustees declare a policy of accountability and responsibility that accepts the concerns and aspirations of the surrounding community as its own."¹⁵⁸ The UCSC banned classified military research and the Trustees stated that they would try to secure finances from external sources for a \$10 million community development fund. Another result was the establishment of the Quadripartite Commission on University Community Development,

¹⁵⁶Ibid., 13-14.

¹⁵⁷Judith Ann Fowler, "Six Days in College Hall: 'A Strange War in Which All Sides Won'," *Pennsylvania Gazette* 67, no. 6 (March 1969): 8-9.

¹⁵⁸Ibid., 14.

consisting of representatives from the students, faculty, community, and administration-trustees. Its main purpose was to review and approve all existing plans for further University expansion, as well as to administer the school's subsequent efforts to develop low-cost housing. The University gave the new commission an initial \$75,000 budget and, when future expansion plans would result in residential demolition, Penn agreed to provide an equal number of units at equitable prices.¹⁵⁹

At first, this commission had a direct effect, donating its entire original allocation of \$75,000 to Renewal Housing Inc. (RHI), a community development group from which some commission members were drawn.¹⁶⁰ But, exactly two months later, the *DP* reported that despite University assurances that funds were already available from the promised \$10 million pledge, the president of Renewal Housing Inc. and co-chairman of the Quadripartite Commission Lorenzo Graham was completely unaware of this.¹⁶¹

Regarding the University's response to the societal transformations that were taking place during the 1960s, Harnwell commented that

When the wave of World War II babies was rolling toward college age and the Russian orbiting of Sputnik stung our pride in our national brainpower, it was by no means certain that American higher education could rise to the heights demanded on it. Perhaps it is still uncertain, for our troubled cities and troubled races remind us that we still face more problems than we have yet solved.¹⁶²

Although Harnwell was hopeful in the University's ability to meet these challenges, the Quadripartite Commission did not feel that the University City Science Center was necessarily the answer. By the summer of 1969, the commission had made its first concrete proposal to the University and the boards of the UCSC and the Penn Presbyterian Hospital, calling for a halt of the expansion into a specific neighborhood of about 30 acres

¹⁵⁹Ibid.

¹⁶⁰Bob Hoffman, "Q-partite Holds Closed Meeting," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 85:5 (February 25, 1969): 1, 5.

¹⁶¹Mark Schlesinger, "Day Claims Fund Ready For Housing," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 85:27 (April 25, 1969): 5.

¹⁶²Gaylord P. Harnwell, "\$100 million Smile . . . and a Toast to Penn," *Pennsylvania Gazette* 67, no. 7 (April 1969): 8-9.

in Area III. It recommended that this land specifically be secured for the previously promised housing development, and that this be undertaken under the auspices of Graham's Renewal Housing Inc. According to Harkavy, one of the students on the commission, the success of this new resolution would depend on the genuine commitment and individual efforts of University trustees who served on the boards of the UCSC and the Presbyterian Hospital).¹⁶³

As a result, the Trustees decided to set up a subcommittee whose duties would be to work with city redevelopment officials to figure out the potential for low-cost housing on the specified land.¹⁶⁴ One of the first actions of the Trustees was an agreement with the UCSC to halt expansion during July, August, and September of 1969.¹⁶⁵ They also encouraged the Quadripartite Commission to establish a subcommittee that would deal directly with the University president to promote a more effective functioning of the group within the existing structures of Penn.

In September of 1969, the University Trustees announced that eight commercial banks had provided a \$5 million loan fund and other mutual savings banks had agreed to provide \$20 million that could be borrowed for community residential development.¹⁶⁶ In spite of this, soon after Penn students returned from their summer vacations in 1969, the Quadripartite Commission began experiencing some difficulties. Reviewing the seven month existence of the commission, a *DP* journalist raised the questions of legitimacy it had been subject to since its inception--mainly posed by community members themselves. All of the major community leaders on the committee had considered resigning, and of the original five, only three remained: Lorenzo Graham of RHI, Young Great Society (YGS)

¹⁶³U. Asked to Hold Expansion, "*Daily Pennsylvanian* 85: Summer Issue (July 1, 1969): 2.

¹⁶⁴*Ibid.*

¹⁶⁵Harnwell, "An Environment For Learning," 180.

¹⁶⁶*Ibid.*

President Herman Wrice, and Andy Jenkins of the Mantua Community Planners (MCP).¹⁶⁷

Disagreement over whether the commission was the legitimate vehicle to administer and conduct further redevelopment in University City plagued the QP, and as Larry Goldfarm, Commission chairman put it, "who the hell are we to organize the community?"¹⁶⁸ Some people challenged Graham's RHI as the true representative of the larger African-American population in West Philadelphia, and other community groups and members called for the opening of community representation to other elements of the area.

Addressing this, Graham had already publicly stated the need to broaden the community representation, and several weeks before the article was published, he expressed his desire to resign and allow others the opportunity to serve on the commission. The commission itself responded to these questions of legitimacy by planning the creation of a "community congress" in October, where any community group or member could voice their opinions and select at-large representatives. With this in mind, the Commission foresaw their future community representation as consisting of three permanent seats, one each for RHI, YGS, and MCP, and three additional seats to be filled by people elected at the congress.

In spite of these plans, one radical city-wide organization, the Philadelphia Community Union, still questioned the commission's authority to plan redevelopment and allocate funds as it chose. The spokesman for this group, Gerry Goldin, wanted the commission to serve as a channel in which funds were raised, funneled into the community, and spent as the community decided.¹⁶⁹

People directed other criticisms at the RHI, especially regarding its efforts to rehabilitate seven homes in Area III. While Graham believed his group had effectively

¹⁶⁷Bob Hoffman, "The Quadripartite Commission: Seven Months Old," *DP* 85:46 (September 29, 1969): I, 2, 5.

¹⁶⁸*Ibid.*, 2.

¹⁶⁹*Ibid.*

interpreted the complex federal guidelines under the Federal Housing Act, he admitted that the cost for the rehabilitation had exceeded original estimates and RHI's budget. But, this was in large part due to the unpredictability of the workload and money required to rehabilitate these old homes.

With the help of funds already invested by YGS, and a new pledge by the Commission to split the remaining \$7000-\$8000 extra to finish this symbolic first project, developers predicted that the houses on Warren Street would be completed within the next month, if Graham accepted the plan.¹⁷⁰

Concurrent with all these problems, and potentially the solution to them, was the QP's creation of a new redevelopment plan for Area III. Attempting to integrate the need for low income housing with the claims of the institutional developers, including the UCSC--who already had indicated that they were not going to be bound by the recommendations--the Commission hoped that this new report would answer many of the questions surrounding funding, community support, and the Commission's competence and legitimacy. If this occurred, the main goal of community redevelopment would again become the top priority for everyone.¹⁷¹

Unfortunately, when the Commission released the plan in October of 1969, it failed to answer these questions and actually came under attack by community residents. Calling for the construction of 400 additional low income homes in Area III, community members meeting with the four student representatives of the Quadripartite Commission criticized the plan for several reasons. First, the estimated \$16,000 selling price of the homes far exceeded the range of poor West Philadelphia residents in the area, whose incomes were less than \$3000. Also, when their homes were claimed for institutional expansion several years earlier, they were priced at \$5000.¹⁷²

¹⁷⁰Ibid., 5.

¹⁷¹ Bob Hoffman, "Community Residents Attack New Area 3 Housing Plan," *DP* 85:75 (November 7, 1969): 1, 5.

¹⁷²Ibid., 1.

Another contention of the community residents was one they had already raised--the lack of community involvement in the formulation of the plan and an alleged favoring of special community leaders by the University and the Commission. Additionally, according to Harkavy, three important community groups--RHI, the Volunteer Community Resources Council, and the City-wide Black Council--all had objections to aspects of the proposal. The Philadelphia Community Union, the Concerned Community Council, and even some Penn students also had some serious doubts and reservations about the plan.

But, Harkavy believed that the most important first step in redeveloping Area III was getting the larger institutions to accept "the land-use recommendations" and to return some of the land that they own--details concerning the exact use of the land could be worked out later, in his opinion. Nevertheless, deep resentment towards the plan and its planners still existed, specifically directed at the commission's community representatives and popular black leaders, YGS President Herman Wrice and MCP president Andy Jenkins. Also criticizing their commitment to working with the community, Cathy Barlow, a student member of the commission, revealed that neither regularly attended the meetings and that during the 1969 sit-in negotiations, the University had wanted to turn over all the community redevelopment money to Wrice and the YGS.

Although this did not occur, resentment towards these two men developed, as well as towards the University's Board of Trustees. The latter group came under attack because of differing interpretations of the \$10 million redevelopment fund. Believing that they had "manipulated the commission and misled the community and students," PCU spokesman Goldin claimed that the cost of the newly proposed houses would not be as high had the University lived up to its promise.¹⁷³ Far from forgotten by the commission, the nature of this fund had been the subject of debate for a period of time--the students and community representatives believing it to be an endowment fund, the trustees believing it to be a floating loan arrangement.

¹⁷³Ibid., 5.

In the months that passed, disputes over the redevelopment of Area III continued, and the UCSC failed to address the request made for some of their land by the Commission. In January 1970, the intensity of the situation rose when UCSC board chairman Paul J. Cupp publicly announced that the science center did not plan on returning any of its land for the development of low cost housing. But, after Cupp's comments received unanimous criticism from the Commission, negotiations between the two groups began. As a result, by mid-February, the UCSC agreed to allow some of their land, specifically just less than three acres between 39th and 40th Streets on the south side of Market Street, to be used for housing construction. Formal control and legal claim of the property remained with the UCSC, but the Commission was deemed a "nominee developer," similar to how the Center allowed other institutions to develop on their property. While the change from institutional to residential land use had to be approved by city and federal government agencies, the UCSC promised to aid the commission in achieving this. Following this agreement, the University-Presbyterian Hospital announced its willingness to discuss the reallocation of some of its land for residential use.¹⁷⁴

In March of 1970, the UCSC delivered a report to the University concerning the land they had surrendered to the Quadripartite Commission. Within this report, executive vice-president of the Science Center Lyle H. Peterson explained that the UCSC would have to relocate one of their buildings already existing on the specified three acres, producing unpredictable costs and affecting over 600 people employed in the building--the same number of residents estimated by the RDA to have been displaced by the UCSC's original 26-acre grant. Peterson also pointed out that the land given to the RHI in 1967 had yet to be fully redeveloped into low income housing, mainly due to a lack of "appropriate plans and technical feasibility back-up."¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁴ Hoffman, "UCSC Approves Housing on Its Land," *DP* 85:120 (February 18, 1970): 1, 5.

¹⁷⁵ Maurice Obstfeld, "U. Council Receives UCSC Progress Report From Exec. DP 86:1 (March 17, 1970): 8.

The day following the announcement of this report, Penn student Peter Eglick wrote an article describing UCSC plans for a Hilton Hotel on 38th and Market Streets. In this article, Jules Benjamin, a graduate student on the Commission, expressed his feelings about the irony of Area III, specifically with the proposed \$7 million hotel project being directly adjacent to an impoverished community--"slums on one side and the UCSC on the other." He also felt that the Commission did not show enough foresight to make demands concerning the remaining acreage of the science not originally requested.

Peterson maintained that the land to be used for the hotel complex would not rest on a former residential area, and in fact was formerly commercial and run-down.¹⁷⁶ Regardless, this proposed project demonstrated the determination of the UCSC to complete plans for redeveloping land that was slated for the center from the start, as opposed to being determined to aid in the completion of redeveloping land it had to give up for the community.

This attitude was characteristic of the University's policies at the time, demonstrated by the inefficiency of the Quadripartite Commission to raise funds and the lack of support it received from the school's administration and Board of Trustees. In the April issue of the Pennsylvania Gazette, the Commission is criticized by Frank Betts, the president's assistant for external affairs, as providing advice which has not been valued enough to spark "broad-based University support or action."¹⁷⁷

Since the 1969 sit-in, only seven new housing units were completed in Area III, and the Commission's entire tenure was marked by quarreling and an inability to accomplish its goals. William L. Day, chairman of the University's Board of Trustees, claimed that this inefficiency and lack of agreement were the reasons for the failure of the Commission. Money, he claimed, was never the problem. From the trustee point of view,

¹⁷⁶Peter Eglick, "Hilton May Go Up on UCSC Land," *DP* 86:2 (March 18, 1970): 1, 5

¹⁷⁷Mary Ann Meyers, "Pennsylvania Struggles to Identify Its Role in the Urban Community," Pennsylvania Gazette 68:7 (April 1970): 24. UARC, UPM 8125.

the funds were available from the start, being provided by a coalition of Philadelphia banks called the Better Housing Commission of the Old Philadelphia Development Corporation. In his opinion, if the community leaders had agreed on a proposal, a housing expert would have taken on the full time task of making it work.

Asserting his commitment to low cost housing, Day continued to express his belief that the Commission's work was no longer necessary, mainly because Frank Betts had been "very successful in community relations--He works hard and is well-known and liked in the neighborhood."¹⁷⁸ He also felt that the West Philadelphia Corporation should assume the responsibility of housing, mainly because they are well-financed, have expertise in the field, and are representative of all West Philadelphia.

Day's opinions were definitely not representative of the entire University community, but he was right about one thing: the Quadripartite Commission was beginning to dissolve. In a last attempt to evaluate its role, the commission inactivated itself pending a report by recently appointed President Martin Meyerson's work group created to deal with community concerns. On October 28, 1970, the committee submitted one last proposal to the University, calling "for a foundation-funded matching gift program under which contributors would be asked to match their gift to the University with an equivalent gift for community development."¹⁷⁹ The University was also beseeched to seek matching funds from one or more foundations. Under the provisions of the proposal, the funds would be administered by an independent corporation consisting of University and community representatives.¹⁸⁰

Throughout the following three months, the Commission evaluated itself, and ended up split on ideas for the future. Trustee member John Eckman believed that the 1969 sit-in goals had been achieved, but students and faculty on the commission, such as

¹⁷⁸Phyllis Kaniss, "Whatever Happened to Housing in West Phila?: An Interview with William Day," *DP* 86:53 (October 8, 1970): 3.

¹⁷⁹Joan Rieder, "Pres. Group to Examine Quadripartite Proposals," *DP* 86:74 (November 6, 1970): 1, 2.

¹⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 2.

sophomore Geoff Gilmore and associate professor of communications Sol Worth, believed that the Commission's continued existence was necessary and vital to keeping the housing concerns of the community on the list of priorities of the University.¹⁸¹

Nevertheless, after President Meyerson released his report on February 8, 1971, the Quadripartite Commission voted to dissolve. According to chairman Lesnick,

the notion of an amateur group of faculty and students, offering no credentials or expertise but only an interest in seeing whether they could work constructively with administration and community representatives on common problems, was doubtless too fragile a concept to survive. Tonight we have officially noted its death, a denouement consistent with the wishes of an overwhelming majority of each of our constituencies.¹⁸²

Meyerson's report included his decision that the Commission's matching-fund proposal was not feasible at the time, and that the University was not able to provide funds directly. But Meyerson did assert the school's determination to work with community groups in alleviating some of the social ills of West Philadelphia, including poor housing, and he pledged a commitment to aid in the raising of funds for this purpose and to encourage faculty and student participation in community service. Meyerson concluded his report with the suggestion that if community organizations could come up with a sound plan for reaching the goals he had outlined, he was sure that "the total commitments from various sources will exceed the \$ 10 million figure often mentioned."¹⁸³

¹⁸¹ Bob Hoffman and John Riley, "The Quadripartite Commission: Nowhere and Trying to Go Out of Business," *DP* 86:107 (January 28, 1971): 1, 5.

¹⁸² Bob Hoffman, "Receives Meyerson's Proposals: Q-Partite Commission Votes to Dissolve," *DP* 86:115 (February 9, 1971): 1, 5.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*

Harnwell's Last Years and Meyerson's Succession: Urban Renewal Slows Down and University Financial Troubles Force Development in New Directions

While the University City Science Center occupied the minds of many at Penn during the late 1960s, Harnwell, the Trustees, and other University officials had other things to deal with as well--particularly campus expansion and the realization of the Integrated Development Plan. The University had completed over \$175 million in construction so far in the 1960s in trying to reach the plan's goal of a 250-acre college community. For 1969, they had scheduled the building of a Graduate Center, consisting of two high-rise apartment buildings located between 36th, 37th, Sansom and Walnut Streets, and a "Superblock" containing three high-rise apartment towers and two low-rise dormitories for undergraduates in the area bounded 38th, 40th, Spruce, and Walnut Streets. Trustees had also begun negotiating for the lease of property at 3401 Walnut Street for further development.¹⁸⁴ Twelve other projects, totaling \$35 million, were underway or to be finished by the end of 1968, and planners and designers were working on another \$150 million in improvements. The Integrated Development Plan mapped out initiatives up to 1970, but Harnwell believed that the time had come to start planning for the 1970s)¹⁸⁵

While the trend of the University's importance was still on the rise, money for the future had become a serious issue. From the 1961-62 year to January of 1968, Penn's money had gone from a surplus to a deficit, in spite of increased philanthropic and Commonwealth support, more funds from research contracts and grants, and a conservation effort by faculty and staff. In Harnwell's word's

[The University is] living at a time when it no longer seems wise or even possible to develop university budgets from enrollment projections and to go through the traditional exercise of providing each budgetary unit with allocations equal to or greater than those received in the previous budget year.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁴Trustees Minutes, vol. 31-338, May 28, 1968. UARC.

¹⁸⁵Harnwell, "Towards the 1970s: Seeking a 'New Model,'" 20.

¹⁸⁶Ibid., 15.

Consequently, the University set out to define core activities central to education, evaluate how these currently stood, and figure out a way to improve them to higher standards.

For the time being, though, the University continued its expansion and redevelopment plans. In the April 1969 edition of the Pennsylvania Gazette, Harnwell wrote an article heralding the University's forthcoming realization of its 1964 \$93 million Development Program goal. By May 1, the University campaign was to reach over \$100 million, not including the millions in construction grants from state and federal agencies. Since the program began, Penn had completed fifteen major buildings costing \$40 million and two more (\$11.75 million) were on the way that spring. Seven others, including \$69 million in new student housing (the proposed high-rises and low-rise dormitory), were underway. However, because of rising costs and changing needs, a growing amount of building plans--specifically twelve priority projects--required additional funding and, consequently, the University needed to enter a new phase of capital programming to be carried into the 1970s.¹⁸⁷

Despite growing financial concerns, the University was still in the process of achieving some of the Integrated Development Plan goals, and construction projects characterized areas throughout the campus. Officials scheduled the completion of undergraduate housing in Superblock, enough for 3088 students, as well as a new parking garage and dining hall for the 1970-71 school year. By the spring of 1969, planners would complete the Annenberg Center for the Performing Arts at 37th and Walnut Streets, and for the summer of 1969, builders hoped to finish the graduate towers to house an additional 1550 students and the Class of 1923 Ice Skating Rink between the Pennsylvania Central Railroad tracks and the Palestra. On Spruce Street, the University began working on a Dormitory (to be finished at the start of 1971) within the triangle formed by Woodland Avenue, 38th, and Spruce Street that would also contain commercial facilities on its first

¹⁸⁷Gaylord P. Harnwell, "\$100 million Smile . . . and a Toast to Penn," Pennsylvania Gazette 67, no. 7 (April 1969): 8-9. UARC, UPM 8I25.

floor. Across the street from this, Penn had cleared existing commercial enterprises for Vance Hall, the proposed Wharton Graduate School building. Williams Hall--the GSA sponsored, nine-story Humanities building being constructed at 36th and Spruce Streets, the former site of the Hare Building--would be ready by December of 1971.¹⁸⁸

Meanwhile, after seventeen years of service as the University's President, Gaylord Harnwell announced his plans to leave the post at the start of the 1970-71 academic year. In June 1970, Peter H. Binzen, urban affairs editor of the *Bulletin*, described Harnwell's tenure in his article "I did not start it. I could not stop it. But I was there." Under the Harnwell administration, the University budget increased five-fold, from \$28.6 million in 1953-54 to \$165 million in 1969-1970, and undergraduate tuition tripled. The University's endowment fund, student financial aid, research grants, and staff salaries also steadily rose throughout this period. Faculty numbers increased from 2628 to 4628, as did enrollment (from 15,725 to 19,021). Physically, with the close of Woodland Avenue from Spruce to Market Streets in 1960, the city opened up a 150-acre, trolley-free area of West Philadelphia for Penn's expansion. Since Harnwell became president, the University had spent \$127.5 million on physical plant and awaited funding for another 34 projects estimated at \$36.8 million.¹⁸⁹

In Binzen's opinion, Harnwell had turned the presidency into a full-time job and gave both the faculty and the students more voice in University decisions, as evidenced by students helping to pick Martin Meyerson to be his successor--the first time their input played a role in this type of decision. According to Harnwell in an interview, he did not feel that he had much control as University president. He could see the direction Penn was heading, had some say in it, but could never predict all the variables and influences that

¹⁸⁸"A Skyline of Our Own," Pennsylvania Gazette 68, no. 2 (November 1969): 20-33. UARC, UPM 8125.

¹⁸⁹ Peter H. Binzen, "I did not start it. I could not stop it. But I was there," Pennsylvania Gazette 68, no. 9 (June 1970): 4. UARC, UPM 8125.

developed during his term. Describing the current state of affairs and community relations in University City, Harnwell believed that

The present-day scene is very, very complex. People are proceeding from all kinds of different motives. Our neighbors to the south and west are largely a white community, conservative, old residents. The black community to the north is newer, more impoverished, less able to cope. They've got some very able leaders like Herman Wrice.

But it's a very difficult situation in which they find themselves. You kind of feel this is where they belong; it is their place where they do their thing and it's up to the rest of the world to make it a nice place to do it in.

Our reaction to black students is complicated by the input from the black community who are not students, who are not really concerned with the purposes of the University and who would like to see the purposes of the community served by an institution that was never set up for this.¹⁹⁰

Harnwell firmly believed that the University was beginning to comprehend these issues better and reacting accordingly.

Penn's financial situation was not faring so well, though. Income inflation had not matched inflationary effects on salaries and the building programs, and while the state had provided \$12 million for the 1969-70 year, Pennsylvania Governor Shafer had recommended that this amount be cut in half the following year. Both the University and the Commonwealth were low on funds because, according to Harnwell, the state wouldn't impose taxes that were needed for some of its mandated operations. The state did not deliberately pick on Penn; it was cutting costs that were not "commanded of the legislature to look after." Nevertheless, if the state cut all its monetary aid, the University would have no choice but to change into a different institution.¹⁹¹

One month after he stepped down, Harnwell published an article that was testimony to the dedication he had devoted to his University presidency and the vast knowledge he had achieved during this experience. "An Environment For Learning" served as an in-

¹⁹⁰Ibid., 5.

¹⁹¹Ibid., 8.

depth account of the tremendous change that took place in West Philadelphia during the seventeen years of Harnwell's presidency. Relating the most important elements of Penn's growth as an urban university and the development of its role in the University City community, Harnwell broke his article down into to "An Urban University's Opportunities;" "Intra- and Inter-University Movement Toward Neighboring Community Involvement;" "Ten Years of the West Philadelphia Corporation's Program;" "The University and Urban Health;" and "Indigenous Community Leaders."¹⁹²

Because I have used each Harnwell annual report as a source, this thesis has included most of the events, developments, and history that constituted the bulk of his article--I admit he probably had more knowledge of the subject area, though. To avoid repetition, I will concentrate on a few of the overall opinions Harnwell had reached after having been a major character in the historical drama. Regarding the unique opportunities presented to Penn by its urban environment, by nature the University had come to respond to social and educational needs of its society and immediate environment. But, Penn should conserve and apply its resources with care and discretion because of the potential for waste and misdirection. Harnwell believed that within every school of the University, involvement in the surrounding neighborhood had in some way contributed to both the community's needs and the quality of education at Penn.¹⁹³

Institutional cooperation, most notably the West Philadelphia Corporation, acted as "a very effective forum, catalyst, and coordinator" in identifying beneficial community programs, organizing partnerships between institutions and citizens' groups, and attracting support from various political, corporate, and private sources. Harnwell viewed institutional renewal projects such as the University City Science Center as "an important anchor for Philadelphia's economy" and fundamental in the residential improvements that had taken place in University City. Furthermore, University and W.P.C. initiatives

¹⁹² Harnwell, "An Environment For Learning," 170-186.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 170-171.

engendered the educational, economic, and health care progress of the area. Not to be ignored, though, were the efforts of local community leaders and long-standing neighborhood groups that worked with the institutions and made invaluable contributions in determining the state of their own living environment.¹⁹⁴

Lastly, Harnwell concluded that the growing interaction between the University and its neighbors over the previous fifteen years had left both undeniably changed. Openly admitting the dissatisfaction and difficulties that often characterized this tenuous connection, he embraced them as learning experiences. As he put it,

Such differences as we have had have come from the failures to appreciate fully the various limitations under which one or another of us works, or in the heat of frustration intemperate reactions have obscured the problems or distorted them into interpersonal differences when they were in fact intractable by the means and the people at our disposal. Such occasions have, however, been relatively infrequent and have not escalated out of control of able leadership.¹⁹⁵

As Harnwell gracefully departed from the forefront of University affairs, Martin Meyerson was settling into his new role as president. Two years after joining the University in this function, he charted Penn's course for the mid-1970s. Because of the depressed financial status of the University, the school could no longer develop physically on the expansion level that had typified Harnwell's tenure. Penn still required some plant improvements for the health and science fields and needed to complete the projects already underway, but Meyerson felt that the University had no choice but to change its development direction. Through its future fund-raising efforts, it must apply secured funds qualitatively to people and programs. Defining this new course for the University, Meyerson planned to "seek to minimize commitment of resources to bricks and mortar and concentrate our energies on the fullest utilization of the outstanding complex already developed."¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 173-184.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 186.

¹⁹⁶ Martin Meyerson, "In Pursuit of Sharpened Goals," Pennsylvania 'Gazette 70, no. 4 (February 1972): 10, 14. UARC, UPM 8125.

An expected decrease in Commonwealth appropriations and the University's financial difficulties had led Meyerson to concentrate on academic, curricular, and general quality improvements. He wanted Penn to reinforce its independence as a distinctive university because it could no longer depend on state and federal funds for developmental progress. The size of the existing physical plan defined the scale of the University in the near future; consequently, Penn should become a more focused school to achieve a better national and international reputation in a limited number of chosen fields.¹⁹⁷

The state of universities in America had changed drastically with the onset of the 1970s. Urban renewal was slowing down, money was scarce, and the college-age population had begun shrinking without indication of stopping. Meyerson reflected on these developments and how they affected Penn in his report, "The University of Pennsylvania: A Five-Year Review." When he had arrived, the University faculty was less "inbred," paying more attention to higher scholarly standards on a national and international level; the undergraduates more cosmopolitan; the campus expanded and improved; and the University residentially-based.

By 1970, Penn had been through an unbelievable era in the history of American higher education. Increased federal support for research had brought new resources and heightened expectations as skyrocketing enrollment, especially in graduate schools, made it difficult for universities to keep up with the demand for more faculty. Public confidence in higher education was high and growing numbers of people began seeing the university as a path to a better life and a source of solutions to America's social problems. In the late 1960s, students emerged as active participants in the governance of colleges and, while not always productive, this new role helped make these institutions more responsive to their entire academic communities.

Again looking back on his first year at Penn, Meyerson expressed his initial reaction to these changes:

¹⁹⁷Ibid., 15.

At the time of my first January meeting with the Trustees, five years ago, it was evident that this era had come to an end. Those of us in universities were entering the decade of the 1970s uncertain about how to manage without growth and a little stunned by our sudden fall from grace in the esteem of the larger society.¹⁹⁸

Sudden reduction in federal support and mounting inflation resulted in budget deficits and the onset of a period marked by financial difficulties. Not surprisingly, the lack of finances was the first problem with which Meyerson dealt. In the 1969-1970 fiscal year, the University budget used up the entire reserve fund of \$1.6 million and still had to run a deficit of \$700,000. The \$93 million Development Fund campaign of the 1960s did not take into account the subsequent operating costs of newly constructed buildings, and the operating expenditures doubled from 1960 to 1965 and then doubled again from 1965 to 1970. Since then, growth had been much slower. Over his first three years, Meyerson had balanced the budget but did not predict this to last long because of increasing energy costs, eroding investment values, and the insufficiency of state aid to keep up with inflation. In the long-run, the University needed to increase its endowment and other private funds, eliminate low priority services, and rely much less on governmental bodies for money.

The second problem Meyerson tackled soon after arriving was the revitalization of undergraduate education, which he believed had been neglected during the 1950s and 1960s in favor of better scholarship, research, and graduate teaching. His third priority was to reconsider graduate education because the University could no longer increase resources in the face of rising costs and diminishing federal scholarships and other funds.¹⁹⁹

Penn had entered a new era. With the completion of the Superblock high-rise towers and low-rise dormitories as well as a new Chemistry building in 1974, the

¹⁹⁸ Martin Meyerson, "The University of Pennsylvania: A Five-Year Review," a supplemental report in the *Almanac* 22, no. 28 (April 6, 1976): 2. UARC, UPL 1090.35.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

University's massive physical expansion had come a close. By 1972, the trend of urban renewal no longer dominated the visions of civic and institutional planners and economic depression hit America. As for Penn, Meyerson had ideas for the future. The University was heading in a new direction, with a focus on improving its educational programs, and Harnwell's previous development policies became a thing of the past.

Conclusion

Was mid-twentieth century urban renewal in Philadelphia successful? The answer to that question depends on who you ask. For universities across the country, the rising importance of higher education in American society coordinated with an outpouring of plans to redevelop urban areas following World War II. Local, state, and federal government agencies, as well as university and institutional officials viewed institutional expansion as a means for improving the environment of America's cities, and an ongoing consolidation of these groups led to the realization of this development.

As for the University of Pennsylvania, it did well for itself. The school has become one of the top universities in the world. Its research and academic reputation would not have reached the levels that they are at today if the Trustees had not produced the 1948 Martin Report and Gaylord Harnwell had not served as President for seventeen years. Penn's expansion and development into an international university whose campus environment is pedestrian-oriented and characterized by open space and greens demonstrates its remarkable planning efforts, fund raising, and realization of carefully designed goals. Additionally, with its growth, the University also became increasingly involved in the affairs of its surrounding community and larger society. While originally hoping to improve the West Philadelphia environment solely through physical plant expansion and urban renewal policies of the city, Penn's attitude towards community betterment developed during the late 1950s and 1960s to include numerous community initiatives and cooperative projects with residents, other institutions, and civic agencies.

Unfortunately, the University's efforts did not cure all of the city's ills, and one begins to question the early planners intentions for urban renewal. Was it supposed to revive and rehabilitate the physical structures of a certain area to improve the quality of life there for new residents, or was it supposed to improve the conditions for people living in "blighted" areas because they did not have the means, the support, and definitely not the money to do so themselves? The history of events has shown that the former was more the

case. Urban renewal in University City, while an honest intent to revitalize a deteriorating area, expand institutions, and do what was deemed best for the city as a whole, only resulted in the physical redevelopment of a certain area within previously designated boundaries. Just north and west of the designated renewal area of West Philadelphia many blighted neighborhood conditions persisted--run-down residences, multiple-family dwellings, and crime--and may have even worsened because displaced residents had to move into these overcrowded areas.

While urban renewal actions definitely benefited the city structurally, economically, medically, and industrially, they also directly harmed people, in particular African-Americans. "Blighted" areas were not rehabilitated; they were pushed to the outskirts of the newly developed University. Planners did not sufficiently account for the needs of displaced African-Americans residents in their visions of modern University City, and as a result, this group got the raw end of the deal. The mindset of many in positions of power during the 1940s, 1950s, and early-1960s did not seem too involved with equanimity. Officials were seeking a greater good for the city and were not as concerned with the minority that would be adversely affected because of their development actions. Not until the civil rights movement and the emergence of racial reform in America did people, both blacks and whites, begin to organize and forcefully protest the wrongs thrust upon displaced residents, as manifested by the 1969 sit-in.

By 1972, urban renewal and the University's expansion had slowed almost to a stop. Financial woes at Penn, a decrease in government aid, and Martin Meyerson's succession of President Harnwell forced the University to change its developmental style heading into the late-1970s and 1980s. Quite simply, the money ran out. But, through its twenty-five years of monumental growth and physical expansion, Penn had been an active participant in an era of American history marked by urban transformation.

As a student at the University of Pennsylvania during the 1990s, I have had the chance to experience University City and Penn fifty years after the adoption of the Martin

Report and almost twenty-five years after the last expansion project of the Integrated Development Plan. I have come to understand that the urban renewal efforts in West Philadelphia, from the perspective of the city, have in many ways proved to have been a success. Almost all of the area within the original boundaries of the planning commission's 1947-48 housing quality survey and 1950 plan is redeveloped or rehabilitated. The University made out pretty well, too. Right in step with urban planners across the country, Penn realized the potential for expansion and growth into an international university through urban redevelopment. Trustees, the presidents (predominantly Harnwell), and University planners and officials recognized the predicted boom in the college-age population and reacted to the increasing importance of higher education in America during the two and a half decades following World War II. The University of Pennsylvania was on a mission to become an international university, a center of scholarly research and professional training, a forerunner in the fields of science and medicine, and an academic community of scholars. In these veins, the school succeeded.

However, as I walk through the neighborhoods bordering the University, spend time in local schools, and participate in community service projects, the reality of urban renewal's failures hit me. Its goal was to revitalize West Philadelphia, but instead it ignored the needs and welfare of the financially depressed residents who, more than anybody else, deserved the support. In the national context, numerous inner-cities share a tale similar to Philadelphia's, and just a casual stroll observing one's surroundings should be enough to convince even the most die-hard urban renewal advocate of its ultimate shortcomings. Today, planners and scholars continue to research and study the problems of America's urban centers, but have yet to fully revitalize these areas and improve the living conditions for their residents. Nevertheless, as the past three decades have shown, many policy makers and larger portions of the public have grown increasingly concerned

with the welfare of all Americans; hopefully, they will continue to develop this awareness and represent it in designs for the future.

Bibliography

Gaylord P. Harnwell

Report of the President to the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania for the Academic Year 1953-1954. UARC, UPI 25.1.

University of Pennsylvania Report of the President: 1955. UARC, UPI 25.1.

Design for Excellence: University of Pennsylvania Report of the President, 1956. UARC, UPI 25.1.

"Unity of Purpose: The University of Pennsylvania Report of the President, 1957," *Bulletin* LVIII, no. 5 (December 1957). UARC, UPI 25.1.

"The Mission of a University: Report of the President, 1958," *Bulletin* LIX, no. 4 (November 1958). UARC, UPI 25.1.

"Remarks for the October 11, 1960 Luncheon of the Chamber of Commerce of West Philadelphia ." UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

"A Compliant Education of Youth: The University of Pennsylvania Report of the President, 1960," *Bulletin* LXI, no. 3 (November 1960). UARC, UPI 25.1.

"Signposts: University of Pennsylvania Report of the President, 1961," *Bulletin* LXII, no. 2 (December 1961). UARC, UPI 25.1.

"An Environment for Learning: The President's Message, 1962," *Bulletin* LXIII, no. 4 (December 1962). UARC, UPI 25.1.

An Instrument of National Purpose: The President's Message, 1964. UARC, UPI 25.1.

"Pennsylvania in 1964: Change," Pennsylvania Gazette 63, no. 2 (November 1964).

"Pennsylvania in 1965: A Special Report," Pennsylvania Gazette 64, no. 3 (December 1965).

"The World's Problems Have Become the University's Problems," *Pennsylvania Gazette* 65, no. 3 (December 1966).

"The Quiet Revolution," Pennsylvania Gazette 66, no. 5 (January-February 1968).

"Towards the 1970s: Seeking a 'New Model,' Pennsylvania Gazette 69, no. 3 (November 1968).

"\$100 million Smile . . . and a Toast to Penn," Pennsylvania Gazette 67, no. 7 (April 1969).

"An Environment for Learning," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 115, no. 3 (June 1971). UARC, UPJ 9.4, A 10.

Interviews conducted as part of the "Memories Project"

Bacon, Edmund N. Interview by "Memories Project" coordinator , 28 May 1988. UARC, UPB 1.9 MM, box 2, ff 13.

Taubin, Harold. Interview by "Memories Project" coordinator, 2 December 1988. UARC, UPB 1.9 MM, box 4, ff 9.

Perkins, G. Holmes. Interview by "Memories Project" coordinator, 4 December 1988. UARC, UPB 1.9 MM, box 3, ff 39.

Mail correspondence

Harnwell, Gaylord, to K. R. Burke, 7 November 1956. UARC, UPA 4, DuBarry,

William H., to K. R. Burke, 9 November 1956. UARC, UPA 4, 0098. Harnwell,

Gaylord P., to Senate Berger, 7 December 1959. UARC, UPA, 0098.

Sweeten, E. Craig, to Gaylord P. Harnwell, 21 December 1959. UARC, UPA, 0098.

Harnwell, Gaylord P., to Sidney N. Replier, 15 May 1961. UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

Lorimer, Graeme, to Gaylord P. Harnwell, 25 May 1961. UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

Harnwell, Gaylord P., to Graeme Lorimer, 7 June 1961. UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

Philadelphia agencies

Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Philadelphia Housing Quality Survey: University Area Report. Philadelphia, Pa: The Authors, 1949: UARC, UPJ 9.4, C 1.

Philadelphia City Planning Commission. University Redevelopment Area Plan. Philadelphia, Pa: The Authors, 1950. UARC, UPJ 9.4, C 2.

Blucher, Walter H. The Philadelphia City Planning Commission: An Appraisal. (Chicago: August 1954).

Philadelphia Health and Welfare Council, "Annual Report of the Health and Welfare Council: 1959-60." UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

Philadelphia City Planning Commission. The West Philadelphia District Plan. Philadelphia, Pa: The Authors, 1964. UARC, UPJ 9.4, C 3.

Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Development Programming as Applied to West Philadelphia. Technical Report Number Eight. Philadelphia, Pa: The Authors, 1964. UARC, UPA 9.4, C 8.

Trustees Minutes

Vol. 26--174, May 13, 1955. UARC.

Vol. 26--206, October 4, 1955. UARC.

Vol. 26--220, December 16, 1955. UARC.

Vol. 26--233, January 17, 1956. UARC.

Vol. 26--388, June 7, 1956. UARC.

Vol. 26--333, January 15, 1957. UARC.

Vol. 26--333, June 7, 1957. UARC.

Vol. 26--355, April 12, 1957. UARC.

Vol. 27--74, January 15, 1959. UARC.

Vol. 27--91, February 13, 1959. UARC.

Vol. 27--124, May 8, 1959. UARC.

Vol. 27--183, 192, October 16, 1959. UARC.

Vol. 27--277, March 11, 1960. UARC.

Vol. 27--320-321, May 20, 1960. UARC.

Vol. 27--426, February 10, 1961. UARC.

Vol. 27--461-478, May 19, 1961. UARC.

Vol. 28-498, May 5, 1964. UARC.

Vol. 29-4, September 11, 1964. UARC.

Vol. 31-338, May 28, 1968. UARC.

University officials and reports

University of Pennsylvania Report of the Trustees Committee for the Physical Development of the University. October 25, 1948. UARC, UPA 1.51.

Stassen, Harold. Four Years at Penn: September 17, 1948-January 19, 1953. UARC, UPI 50.10.

University of Pennsylvania. (December 1956). "Request for Construction of Educational Facilities," 1. UARC, UPA 4, 97.

"Presentation to the General State Authority from the University of Pennsylvania for the Construction of Educational Facilities," May 1958. UARC, UPA 4, 97.

Philadelphia Health and Welfare Council, "Annual Report of the Health and Welfare Council: 1959-60." UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

Freeman, Barry, "Coordinator of Community Relations of the University of Pennsylvania Evaluation Report: August 15, 1959 - May 1, 1961." UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

University Development Plan. The University of Pennsylvania, 1961. UARC, UPJ 9.4, B3.

The Integrated Development Plan. The University of Pennsylvania, 1962. UARC, UPJ 9.4.

Taubin, Harold. "The University of Pennsylvania Story: How an Institution Determines Its Development Aims and Needs," (speech given at the Sheraton Hotel in Philadelphia on 25 March 1963). UARC, UPJ 9.4, B 5.

"Family Needs In University City Planning: A Study of Factors Affecting the Selection of Neighborhoods," University of Pennsylvania, 1963. UARC, UPA 4, 0197.

Burrison, Maurice S. "The Good Neighbor Policy in West Philadelphia," University of Pennsylvania Office of Planning and Design, 1971. UARC, UPJ 9.4, A 11.

Meyerson, Martin, "In Pursuit of Sharpened Goals," Pennsylvania Gazette 70, no. 4 (February 1972). UARC, UPM 8125.

Meyerson, Martin, "The University of Pennsylvania: A Five-Year Review,"

Almanac 22, no. 28 (April 6, 1976). UPL 1090.35.

Taubin, Harold. "A Brief History and Compilation of Trustee Actions Concerned with the Planning and Development of the West Philadelphia Campus." University of Pennsylvania, Department of Facilities Development/Operational Services, 1976. UARC, UPJ 9.4, B 5.

University periodicals and student publications

"Modern New 'University City' Rises From W. Phila. Slum," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 80: Freshman Issue (September 1964).

"University Runs Girl's Camp," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 80:34 (Sept. 21, 1964).

"100 Dropouts Participate in Penn Program," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 80:22 (Nov. 12, 1964).

Bernstein, Jerry, Chris Stalberg, and Stuart Sugarman, "Encroachment: How Penn is Contributing to a Race Riot in West Philadelphia," penn comment 4, no. 2 (October 1967).

Cooper, Joan, "Area 3," University (Winter 1967).

Slepian, Dr. Barry, "Image or Reality?", *Daily Pennsylvanian* (February 9, 1968): The News Bureau of the University of Pennsylvania.

Zevin, Rona, "Plethora of Proposals Pushed to Ameliorate Maelstrom of Malaise," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 84:33 (Sept. 11, 1968).

Brown, Judson, "'Massive craters' Replace Homes of 3,000 in Area III," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 84:69 (October 30, 1968).

Hoffaman, Bob, "Q-partite Holds Closed Meeting," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 85:5 (February 25, 1969).

Fowler, Judith Ann, "Six Days in College Hall: 'A Strange War in Which All Sides Won'," *Pennsylvania Gazette* 67, no. 6 (March 1969). UARC, UPM 8125..

Schlesinger, Mark, "Day Claims Fund Ready For Housing," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 85:27 (April 25, 1969).

Hoffman, Bob, "In a Year of Violent Campus Action, Peaceful Protest Succeeds at Penn," *Daily Pennsylvanian* 85: Summer Issue (July 1,

1969).

"U. Asked to Hold Expansion, "Daily *Pennsylvanian* 85: Summer Issue (July 1, 1969).

Hoffman, Bob, "The Quadripartite Commission: Seven Months Old," *DP* 85:46
(September 29, 1969).

Hoffman, Bob, "Community Residents Attack New Area 3 Housing Plan," *DP* 85:75
(November 7, 1969).

"A Skyline of Our Own," *Pennsylvania Gazette* 68, no. 2 (November 1969). UARC,
UPM 8125.

Hoffman, Bob, "UCSC Approves Housing on Its Land," *DP* 85:120 (February 18, 1970).

Obstfeld, Maurice, "U. Council Receives UCSC Progress Report From Exec." *DP* 86:1
(March 17, 1970).

Eglick, Peter, "Hilton May Go Up on UCSC Land," *DP* 86:2 (March 18, 1970).

Meyers, Mary Ann, "Pennsylvania Struggles to Identify Its Role in the Urban Community,"
Pennsylvania Gazette 68:7 (April 1970). UARC, UPM 8125.

Binzen, Peter H., "I did not start it. I could not stop it. But I was there,"
Pennsylvania Gazette 68, no. 9 (June 1970). UARC, UPM 8125.

Kaniss, Phyllis, "Whatever Happened to Housing in West Phila?: An
Interview with William Day," *DP* 86:53 (October 8, 1970).

Rieder, Joan, "Pres. Group to Examine Quadripartite Proposals," *DP* 86:74 (November
6, 1970).

Hoffman, Bob and John Riley, "The Quadripartite Commission: Nowhere and Trying
to Go Out of Business," *DP* 86:107 (January 28, 1971).

Hoffman, Bob, "Receives Meyerson's Proposals: Q-Partite Commission Votes to Dissolve,"
DP 86:115 (February 9, 1971).