

**Displacement Demonized?: Towards an Alternate Explanation for  
Penn's Poor Relationship with West Philadelphia**

by

Elyse Sudow

A Senior Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for

Honors in American History  
University of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

April 9, 1999

Faculty Advisor: Mark Frazier Lloyd

Course Director: Robert F. Engs

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Once before a big race, my crew coach told us that Benjamin Franklin once said, “little strokes fell great oaks” meaning that we had to focus on the successful execution of each individual stroke in order to cross the finish line with a victory. Many times while working on, and worrying about, this thesis I have reminded myself of this quote and the idea that consistent hard work will result in a victory. I feel like I have achieved a victory by completing this thesis, but it never would have been possible without the help of my professors, friends, and family.

I would like to give a huge standing ovation to my faculty advisor Mark Frazier Lloyd. He has gone above and beyond the call of duty, devoting countless hours to talking through ideas, helping with research methods, and reading and discussing drafts. Constantly encouraging me to “stick to my guns,” he has guided me to write a paper that makes me proud.

Professor Robert F. Engs, thank you for your guidance in writing this paper. Your insights and opinion has been invaluable both as a scholar and as someone who lived in West Philadelphia during the time that I wrote about.

I would also like to thank Marty Hackett, Curtis Ayers and the rest of the University Archives staff.

Sydney, I am sad to say that this will be the last paper to go through “Syd’ s skool o’ wurdz.” Thank you for “hostilely” attacking this paper with your fine point red pen and never getting mad at me when I split my infinitives or use too many dashes. More importantly, thank you for being a constant source of support and friendship ALWAYS.

Mom, Dad and Aly—thank you for supporting, encouraging, and putting up with me through this whole process.

And finally to Adam, you made finishing each page a pleasure, too bad I'm still waiting at Concourse B.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1 Attitudes Towards Expansion.....	7
Chapter 2 The End of <i>In Loco Parentis</i> .....	23
Chapter 3 Misperceptions of Race and Crime.....	41
Chapter 4 A Cop on Every Corner?.....	59
Conclusion.....	76
Bibliography.....	80
Critical Bibliography.....	83

## INTRODUCTION

*[Penn] has gone on colossal building binges, ripping up whole neighborhoods like some crazed Eastern European dictator, displacing residents and businesses for its own high-minded imperial aims.<sup>1</sup>*

Samuel Hughes  
*The Pennsylvania Gazette*  
November 1997

For more than thirty years the University of Pennsylvania has provided its urban neighbors with an extraordinary array of opportunities and services. Free or deeply discounted teaching and research, accredited workplace training and experience, athletic facilities and programs—each of these opportunities and services made available through a community relations program established and funded at the highest levels of University decision-making. At the close of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, however, even though Penn has demonstrated long-term institutional commitment and shouldered substantial expense, its relationship with the West Philadelphia community that surrounds it remains deeply troubled, so much so that the division is immediately apparent to students at Penn. As soon as a prospective Penn student takes a campus tour or comes to University City, barriers that exist between the University and its surrounding neighborhood are evident, and obvious real differences separate University property from non-University property. For example, the commercial development West of 40<sup>th</sup> Street particularly on the north side of campus consists of a 7-11, a Thriftway, a beer distributor and a gas station. This type of development can be contrasted with University development projects East of 40<sup>th</sup> street, which cater to the University population. On the Northern half of campus, east of 40<sup>th</sup> Street there are a plethora of stores—two banks, four coffee shops, Barnes and Noble,

---

<sup>1</sup> Hughes, Samuel. “The Philadelphia Story” *The Pennsylvania Gazette* November 1997, 25

Urban Outfitters, Kinko's Copy Center, Eastern Mountain Sports, and many others. The difference between these two areas, only separated by a few blocks, is striking.

Along with the visible divisions between Penn and the West Philadelphia neighborhood, a general sentiment of negativity exists on campus regarding Penn's treatment of the surrounding community. The negative sentiments towards Penn's continual expansion and improvement are expressed repeatedly in current publications. On a regular basis, articles in *The Daily Pennsylvanian* articulate injustices inflicted upon the community by the University. When the University unveiled its most recent development plan, students read that:

Penn is once again trying to remake University City. Although the days of urban renewal, when you could kick people out of their residences are over; the University is busily shuffling stores, facilities and dollars around... Given the disastrous consequences of the University's actions in the 1960's and 70's, it is hard to rest assured that all of this current activity is really what's best for the Penn and West Philadelphia communities.<sup>2</sup>

Members of the University community discuss Penn's most recent wave of development in conjunction with past physical plant expansion, but negative undertones exist; "Urban renewal, for one, no longer connotes promise of the future but rather mistakes of the past."<sup>3</sup> People are continually taught that the Redevelopment Authority's (RDA) land acquisition in the 1960's was unjust:

Penn, the West Philadelphia Corp., and the city redevelopment authority were coming into the neighborhoods in the early 1960's making overtures to people, especially some of the older people about selling out... when they came to Penn [the RDA] didn't just pick up shacks and shanties... by 1967, '68, '69, they had bought up a gigantic number of individual properties... Its effect

---

<sup>2</sup> "Getting Past a Bad Precedent", *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 13 October 1998

<sup>3</sup> "Building Spree of 60's and 70's comes back to haunt U.", *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 3 November 1998

has been to surround Penn with parking lots and create ill will among those displaced.<sup>4</sup>

This thesis takes as its starting point the current conventional wisdom that the University of Pennsylvania and the neighborhood of West Philadelphia have a contentious, even violent relationship and that the conflict has its historical origins in the displacement of area residents due to the University's physical plant expansion in the 1950's and 1960's. As demonstrated in the paragraphs above, the conventional wisdom is frequently expressed in print, but rarely challenged. By questioning the role that displacement played in University-community relations this thesis aims to bring to the foreground many other factors that helped create the unfriendly standoff between Penn and West Philadelphia. When Penn and the Redevelopment Authority invoked eminent domain in order to obtain blocks of West Philadelphia owners were given fair market value for their properties. How did the community react to this proposition? Did they mind selling under these conditions and in some cases, leaving homes behind, if they were receiving just compensation? How could displacement be completely at fault for the existing relationship when those displaced are no longer part of the West Philadelphia community? Did the increase in student population, especially that of residential women students, affect Penn's interaction with West Philadelphia? How were socioeconomic and racial demographics changing in West Philadelphia, and what effect did these changes have on the relationship between the University and the community? And finally, since crime rates increased in Philadelphia and throughout the United States, how did this increase in crime affect Penn? What did the University do to protect students and

---

<sup>4</sup> "Penn re expanding hopes it learned its lesson", *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 4 May 1998

faculty? Did increased crime cause the University's perception of West Philadelphia to change, and how was the University's reaction to crime perceived by the community?

While examining these questions in the search for an alternate explanation for the current relationship between Penn and West Philadelphia, it is necessary to be aware of the contextual history surrounding the two communities. During World War II, the United States government poured money into defense spending, and universities with research capabilities benefited from this spending; Penn was such a university. Government research to win the war, and eventually fight the Cold War, became an important source of income for the University. In order to maintain economic stability, Penn had to win defense contracts by having the best research teams as well as the most current research facilities. With the passage of the GI bill at the end of World War II, the population of college-bound students increased. Again, in order to remain competitive with other universities, Penn had to increase its housing facilities and classroom space. It can be argued that as Penn's prestige increased Philadelphia was able to maintain its ranking among other northeastern cities. At the same time, the ability and desire of many middle-class families to relocate to the suburbs not only aided in Penn's land acquisition, but also created a large population turnover in West Philadelphia as "Blacks [moved] from the rural South to northern inner cities, and Whites [fled] from the inner cities to the suburbs."<sup>5</sup> Finally, the effects of the Civil Rights movement, as well as later urban riots around the country, played a part in creating the ill will between the University and the community.

---

<sup>5</sup> Halberstam, David, *The Fifties*, (New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1993),137



The University of Pennsylvania and the City of Philadelphia have had a mutually beneficial relationship since the founding of the Penn in 1749. The University has brought prestige, money, and name recognition to the City of Philadelphia. As a large research institution Penn attracts well-regarded faculty who take advantage of Penn for the richness of research opportunities available. The neighborhood benefits from the economic resources Penn brings to the area, and in turn, Penn benefits in the form of land, financial, and human resources provided the City and its residents:

It's a reciprocal relationship... You've got to keep people like the Penn graduates here in order to have the work force to attract the employers—at the same time as that you need to be attracting the quality employers into the City to give the Penn graduates who really like to stay here the choice.<sup>6</sup>

The University is “the largest institution in [Philadelphia] and the largest [private] employer” in the City, and hundreds of jobs covering a diversity of skill levels are available at the University.<sup>7</sup> Penn has also improved the economic situation of the city due to its research capacity. With the creation of the University City Science Center (UCSC), Penn developed a way to allow its faculty to pursue entrepreneurial initiatives in cutting edge research while continuing their work in academia. This policy was mutually beneficial as the University was able to keep prominent professors, and the professors were given an outlet to achieve their research goals and make money outside of the classroom. The University has been able to attract government funds in the form of research grants due to its capacity for research and the skill of those available to carry out the research.

---

<sup>6</sup> Malmros, Kent “A Mayoral Race That Matters” *The Daily Pennsylvanian* 25 February 1999

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

The University of Pennsylvania is currently in the midst of another massive expansion, and there has been a lot of reflection on the legacy of the expansion that occurred in the 1950' s and 60' s. The negative relationship between the “town and gown” is alluded to, and assumed, in many current publications. Many of the contributing factors, however, are ignored and the full weight of causation is given to the issue of displacement. Hopefully, this thesis will give a broader picture of the reasons behind the conflict so that the University of Pennsylvania truly can correct its past mistakes regarding urban redevelopment.

## Chapter 1

### ATTITUDES TOWARDS EXPANSION

Current publications perpetuate the idea of Penn as a neighborhood bully by assuming that Penn played the role of the big wealthy university who came with a heavy hand and enforced unwanted policy on the surrounding neighborhood. In order to accurately assess the validity of this opinion, it is important to understand the history of the University. Penn traces its institutional origins to 1740 and its professional schools—medicine, law, dentistry, veterinary medicine and others—have long assured it a place among America's elite universities. Penn joined the Ivy League at its founding in 1954, thereby associating itself with the nation's premier universities. Though the Ivy League distinction brought Penn a certain amount of prestige, by the early 50's Penn was in need of a major facelift. Penn had outgrown the expansion and building boom of 1880 to 1930. Not only were the buildings old and worn, but the student population had increased so that more facilities were necessary. At that time the University was a commuter school and failed to attract the best students from all over the country. By World War II, top students viewed Penn as their safety school, looking instead to Harvard, Princeton, or Yale as their first choice for admission. In order to attract top students, and increase the University's national prestige as well as its endowment, an overhaul of the physical plant was necessary. The University saw a need to increase government-funded research, which would attract prominent faculty, and would in turn attract top students. Gaylord Harnwell was selected to the post of University President in 1953 and his administration carried out massive changes for the University of Pennsylvania and in the surrounding community.

The University is regularly villainized for the expansion that took place under Harnwell's presidency, but without the land acquisition and building initiatives that occurred during that time, Penn would be a very different university than it is today. In fact the "problem" of expansion was not seen as a problem in the late 1950's through the early 1960's. Instead the proposed redevelopment was viewed in a positive light by virtually all of those involved.

By looking at the laws, as well as community reaction to the condemnation and expansion in the 1950's and 60's, it becomes evident that at the time the Redevelopment Authority (RDA), the University and the City Planning Commission were not seen as evil. Their critics did not brand them until years later. The conventional wisdom that suggests the negative relationship between Penn and West Philadelphia is a result of the condemnation of private property for the University and subsequent physical plant expansion use is not entirely accurate.

The Pennsylvania Urban Redevelopment Act passed on May 24, 1945 provided the legal basis for Penn's expansion.<sup>8</sup> The progress of the University of Pennsylvania's land expansion can be traced through the *Journal of the City Council of Philadelphia*. Gaylord Harnwell, speaking as both the President of the University of Pennsylvania and the West Philadelphia Corporation (the latter set up in 1959 to "attract new resources to University City and to reverse the decay that threatened the area after World War II"), discussed the importance of the national Urban Redevelopment Act in 1963 before the Housing Unit of the United States House Banking Subcommittee<sup>9</sup>. "For my own

---

<sup>8</sup> Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia Minutes, 28 March 1946. Files at the Redevelopment Authority, 1234 Market Street, Philadelphia.

<sup>9</sup> Beck, Lawrence and Stephen Kerstetter, "Residents Suspicious of the University," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 27 January 1967

University I believe I may say without exaggeration that without this legislation it would not have been possible for us to meet the physical demands our growing program makes upon us.”<sup>10</sup> The Act passed at the end of World War II was seen as a tool to cure “urban blight,” and it was also a reaction to the situation in the United States at the end of the war. There was a housing shortage and a baby boom and as many families moved to the suburbs, city governments were forced to focus on improvement. Specifically, in Philadelphia, Penn’s success had great bearing on the City’s success. As a private institution, the University does not contribute to the city’s tax revenue, but the benefits it generated were great in other areas. As the City’s largest private employer, the University offered jobs to a diverse population. A prestigious research and learning institution, if cultivated properly, can become the crown jewel of a city. Penn not only attracted business and government contracts, as well as a class of intellectual elite to Philadelphia, but also provided blue-collar jobs, thereby enhancing the wealth of the city. All could agree, it seemed that by improving the University’s prestige, research and educational facilities, Philadelphia would benefit.

The Urban Redevelopment Act of 1945 was a state act that created Redevelopment Authorities to “engage in the elimination of blighted areas and to plan and contract with private, corporate or governmental redevelopers.”<sup>11</sup> The redevelopment authorities created out of the Act had the power of eminent domain, or the taking of private land for public good with just compensation, the power to issue bonds, and to borrow money. By 1950, the Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia had

---

<sup>10</sup> “Hamwell speaks before House Unit,” *The Evening Bulletin*, 20 November 1963

<sup>11</sup> Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia Minutes, 28 March 1946.

created the University City Redevelopment Area, and subsequently divided the district into five parcels.

The City Planning Commission designated the general area around the University as a redevelopment zone. The classification of the University as a redevelopment zone played a key role in Penn's ability to expand into surrounding West Philadelphia. With this classification the city had the authority to acquire properties within the area by condemnation, and then sell them to private buyers as long as the buyers proposed plans for the land which met with the planning commission's approval. Many influential figures in Philadelphia, on the City Planning Commission or working for the RDA, had connections to Penn. One example of the overlapping relationship between Penn and the City was G. Holmes Perkins. Perkins was Dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts at Penn, Chairman of the City Planning Commission, and the owner of two properties in the 3400 block of Sansom Street. Perkins bought the houses on Sansom Street in 1958 because he was privy to both the University and the City Planning Commission's redevelopment plans for the area. He knew that Sansom Street was slated for condemnation and because of this, properties at that location were likely to increase in value. Perkins was one of those whose perceived conflict of interest led to harsh criticism of the process of redevelopment.

While Federal, State and city redevelopment agencies were taking form, Penn was also conducting internal planning. In 1948 President George McClelland announced the report of the Trustees' Committee on the Physical Development of the University which set forth a long-range plan to expand the University's campus enormously. This Report detailed the "Martin plan," given that name because the chairman of the Architects'

Committee was Trustee Sydney Martin. On February 12, 1948 the Architects' Committee held its first meeting, at which it decided "what part of West Philadelphia they [needed] to take over. [They also decided] to adhere to the traditions of a vast number of American colleges and erect academic buildings and student housing on a scale with [the] existing structures."<sup>12</sup> The eventual plan called for "the University to ultimately control the areas bound by 32<sup>nd</sup> Street on the East, 40<sup>th</sup> Street on the West, Walnut Street on the North, and Hamilton Walk on the South."<sup>13</sup>

In general, the Martin Report incorporated more open space into the University and provided for the Westward expansion from 34<sup>th</sup> Street along the Locust Street backbone, thereby minimizing disruption of the preexisting fundamental elements of the University's layout. The Plan included some of the following specific elements: it proposed that Locust Street be closed to vehicular traffic and be turned into a "wooded walk"; a physics building was proposed to be located at 33<sup>rd</sup> and Walnut; sites for the relocation of the Wharton School and the library were proposed; and a woman's college was to be located in the area bounded by 38<sup>th</sup>, 40<sup>th</sup>, Walnut and Spruce Streets. These are only some of the recommendations of the Martin Report. While many elements were never implemented, the general idea guided the development of the University for the next quarter century.

The concurrent development of the University's long-range plan and the enactment and creation of legal authorities through the Redevelopment Act, the creation of redevelopment authorities, as well as the creation of the University City Redevelopment Area, created a unique opportunity. The interests of the University and

---

<sup>12</sup> President George McClelland, Report of the Trustees' Committee on the Physical Development of the University. UARC, October 1948

the City were aligned. Both the City and the University would benefit from a larger and better physically endowed campus in West Philadelphia. The University through the framework of government agencies, including the City Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia, began a systematic expansion.

The City Council of Philadelphia had to pass all proposed condemnation bills in order for the condemnation process to proceed. In most cases, the Redevelopment Authority would propose a bill in a letter to the mayor. The bill would be read and assigned to a committee (usually Municipal Development and Zoning) where it would be read for a second time and put on the calendar to be voted on by the whole Council. Part of the process required an “advertised public hearing”. This forum allowed for any residents or homeowner to voice his/her dissent. To stop the condemnation process, opponents of the proposed ordinance needed to object during the public hearing and prevail upon City Council to amend or reject the bill.

If displacement caused by the condemnations of the 1950’ s and 1960’ s was the root cause of the negative relationship between the University and the neighborhood, common sense would suggest that the displaced West Philadelphia home and business owners protested fiercely to save their blocks, or at the least pressured their City Council Representative, Harry Norwitch, to vote against the proposed condemnations. This does not appear to be the case. Nearly all of Penn’ s land acquisition occurred between 1950 and 1966, and in those years there is little recorded protest.

The first instance of the RDA’ s use of eminent domain in relation to Penn’ s expansion was in 1951. It secured two redevelopment units, the “Wharton Unit,” which was the area between Locust Street, Woodland Avenue, 36<sup>th</sup> Street and 37<sup>th</sup> Street, and

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.



the “Physics Unit”(currently David Rittenhouse Lab) at the intersection of Walnut Street and 33<sup>rd</sup> Street. By resolution of April 5, 1951, the City Council referred these development proposals to the City Planning and Zoning Committee of the City Council for public hearings and its recommendations. Part of the lawmaking process is to hear all sides of the public opinion. Public hearings, in which any citizen may express his or her views, facilitated that process. If the community was to object to University expansion, it could make its case at the time of the public hearing. The *Bulletin* reported little protest to the first wave of Penn’s expansion. An article with the headline “Owner Clings to Old Home, Blocks Penn’s New Building” appeared on March 16, 1952, and described a lone homeowner, Mark Taylor, waging a personal fight not to leave his house. By June 22, 1952, however he had agreed to a compromise. “Holdout Home Owner Yields; Penn begins \$2,500,000 Job” demonstrated that if the RDA could pay enough for a person’s property, he or she would agree to step out of the way of Penn’s expansion.

In February 1957, there was protest surrounding the RDA’s proposal to “execute its redevelopment plan” for Hill House. Bill Number 1102 which called for the condemnation of Project A, units 1 and 2, was dubbed a “sneak bill” by the residents and business owners who occupied the area bounded by 32<sup>nd</sup>, 34<sup>th</sup>, Walnut and Chestnut Streets.<sup>14</sup> The Redevelopment Authority proposed to acquire 167 parcels of land for subsequent sale to the University. Penn in turn planned to use the land to build a women’s dorm (later named Hill House). 150 property owners and residents within the affected area protested that if the University were allowed to acquire the land then 134 families and 124 single people would suffer displacement. In reaction to the public

outcry, Harry Norwitch, the City Council member representing the University's district in West Philadelphia "expressed indignation several times about not having been fully acquainted with the program."<sup>15</sup> It is hard to imagine that Norwitch was unaware of the expansion plans, because the City Planning Commission, the Redevelopment Authority and the University were all involved. The University of Pennsylvania was of paramount importance in his district, and it is likely that Norwitch chose to take a politically opportunistic position at the time of the public protest.

As hearings went on, the neighborhood committee weakened. In his March 19, 1957 article, Burton A. Chardak said that residents "[were] not opposed to University expansion but are concerned with how much they'll get."<sup>16</sup> The main concern changed from saving their property to getting a good and fair price for their land. One article discussed a committee whose purpose was to "discuss fair prices for seized properties."<sup>17</sup> Residents of "Project A, units 1 and 2" were most afraid of losing financially because of Penn's expansion. John Mariana, the proprietor of a barber shop on Walnut Street, a residence at 3226 Sansom Street, three other houses in the area, and three daughters who also owned property on Sansom Street, as well as a brother who lived at 3308 Woodland Avenue, was quoted in *The Inquirer* of March 1957, "We're willing to sell, provided we get a good price."<sup>18</sup> This family, which had a large financial and emotional investment in the community, was not upset by displacement so long as they received proper compensation for their property. Bill 1102 passed on June 13, 1957 with a 14 to 1 vote. Harry Norwitch was the only Council Member to vote against the "ordinance approving

---

<sup>14</sup> "150 Neighbors Fight Building Plan", *The Evening Bulletin*, 27 February 1957

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> "Residents want 'Fair Price' for Land Sought by Penn", *The Evening Bulletin*, 19 March 1957

<sup>17</sup> "Residents Yield on UofP Tracts", *The Evening Bulletin*, 19 March 1957

the proposal for the redevelopment of a portion of University Redevelopment Area between Chestnut Street, Walnut Street and 32<sup>nd</sup> and 34<sup>th</sup> Streets.”<sup>19</sup>

The next step in the University’s land acquisition process occurred on December 17, 1959: “The Annenberg School of Communications, to be financed out of a generous private grant, [is] part of the University of Pennsylvania’s continuing effort to expand its physical plant and teaching facilities to meet the growing demand for higher education and to allow the University to continue to play its valuable role in the growth of Philadelphia.”<sup>20</sup> This time Councilman Norwitch introduced the bill to approve the RDA’s proposal for the “redevelopment of a portion of the University Redevelopment Area designated as Annenberg School of Communications.”<sup>21</sup> This proposal dealt with the area bound by 36<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Streets and Locust and Walnut Streets. Six families, 69 single people and six businesses were relocated due to this phase of expansion. In the two-year period from 1957 to 1959, Councilman Norwitch had changed his stance on the redevelopment of West Philadelphia. Instead of voting against redevelopment, he was proposing it—possibly to appeal to a different set of constituents.

Public reaction to this phase of Penn’s development was favorable. The University as an institution stated that it was dedicated to the future of West Philadelphia, and administrators “emphasized that they did not want to absorb or destroy the identity of neighborhood groups.”<sup>22</sup> The University looked to both the University of Chicago and Columbia University as examples by which to create a “community which holds and attracts institutional and cultural facilities, compatible industrial and commercial uses,

---

<sup>18</sup> “Sansom Street in Rebellion”, *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 3 March 1957

<sup>19</sup> Journal of the City Council of Philadelphia Vol. I January 17, 1957-June 27, 1957 p.566-67

<sup>20</sup> Journal of the City Council of Philadelphia Vol II July 16, 1959-December 28, 1959

<sup>21</sup> Journal of the City Council of Philadelphia Vol. II July 16, 1959-December 28, 1959

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.”<sup>23</sup> The University’s acquisition of the land for the Annenberg School of Communications met no documented protest from the community. It was seen instead as a development that would make West Philadelphia more attractive to those living outside the neighborhood as well as an opportunity to strengthen Penn’s educational mission and generate a favorable public image.

Bill 1120, “an ordinance to request the reservation of funds to look at University City Unit Number Three,” passed unanimously on August 17, 1961 by the City Council. 34<sup>th</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup> Streets, and Market and Filbert Streets, currently known as the University City Science Center, created the boundaries for a sub-unit within University City Urban Renewal Unit #3.<sup>24</sup><sup>25</sup> No protest or neighborhood challenge was recorded in the newspapers regarding this phase of Penn’s expansion. In fact, in September of 1961 *The Bulletin* published an editorial praising the eminence of educational and medical centers in Philadelphia and supporting Penn’s expansion: “It is good news that the University of Pennsylvania plans to grow almost 50 percent in the next ten years... This expansion is in addition to what has already been done and which the public has seen in the past two or three years in the so called ‘University City’ which links Penn and Drexel and wipes out virtual slums which had surrounded the schools.”<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> “College to Buy Homes Halt W. Phila Blight”, *The Evening Bulletin*, 22 April 1959

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> Journal of the City Council of Philadelphia Vol. II July 20, 1961-December 28, 1961

<sup>25</sup> Adam Klarfeld from appendix, see appendix A

<sup>26</sup> “Expansion of the U of P”, *The Evening Bulletin*, 5 September 1961

Penn's expansion and collaboration with Drexel and other institutions to create University City Science Center through the RDA's use of eminent domain was strongly supported in the press. The University City Science Center was formed as a non-profit corporation for applied research in 1963. The purpose behind the scientific/industrial research center was to bolster the economic and cultural status of Philadelphia as a center for technical and scientific research.<sup>27</sup> Protest relating to the creation and expansion of the University City Science Center did not begin until after City Council's public hearings and passage of an enabling ordinance in November 1965. Even then, after land was condemned and construction had begun, protest appears to have been led by student protest, not community members. Student protest against the Science Center evolved from the antiwar movement. The January-February 1969 issue of *The Pennsylvania Gazette* published President Harnwell's response to seven SDS demands regarding the science center were published. The students were concerned with a variety of issues relating to the Science Center. Regarding displacement of community residents, the students demanded "that decisions involving the expansion of the University and the allocation of its resources be made by the University community as a whole."<sup>28</sup> By early 1969, however, buildings were already erected on the Science Center property. In *A History of University City Science Center* the start date for construction is not stated, but there is a list of projects underway in 1967. It can be inferred that buildings existed on the property in order for projects to be underway. In February 1969 a rally on College Green protesting "the actions of the University and the University City Science Center

---

<sup>27</sup> "Six Days in College Hall", *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, March 1969

<sup>28</sup> "The President Replies to Seven S.D.S. 'Demands'", *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, January-February 1969 Vol 67 #5

towards the West Philadelphia community” exploded into a six-day sit-in in College Hall.<sup>29</sup> The protesters were concerned with the availability of low cost housing and land for the community and demanded a ban on classified military research at the Science Center. But by the time the students protested it was too late to reverse the process of redevelopment and condemnation. The protest did much to raise awareness, but could not have changed Penn’ s plans for expansion.

Acting under Bill 1102 and its successors the RDA had condemned the land and taken title to the area in the mid-1960’ s. Those displaced by the RDA’ s taking of land by had left the neighborhood several years before the 1969 protests by SDS and other University groups. The student’ s anger over displacement appears more rhetorical than substantive, and less important than other SDS agenda items such as military-related research. Any real political action against displacement was overdue. By 1969 the time to save individual homes and property had passed. The protests were lead by students, not those in the non-university community.

By 1965 the political process had put in the RDA’ s hands all the authority it needed to acquire the land necessary for Penn’ s redevelopment plans. On June 6, 1962, the City Council passed an ordinance authorizing the sale of three plots of City property to the University. The property was located between South Street and University Avenue, northwest of the Schuylkill Expressway. The ordinance stated that “it was in the best interest of the City that the three tracts or parcels of City-owned ground be exposed for public sale.”<sup>30</sup> This land transaction in the summer of 1962 is significant for several reasons. First, because the parcels were conveyed directly by the City to the University,

---

<sup>29</sup> “Six Days in College Hall A Strange War in Which All Sides Won”, *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, March 1969 Vol. 67 #6.

no redevelopment plan or hearings were needed as a condition of the sale. Therefore Penn had the flexibility to hold the property until money could be raised to develop the parcels. This transaction also suggests that the City was acutely aware that it would benefit from the University's expansion and decided to take the easy way out, thereby ignoring the redevelopment needs of the non-university community.

As early as 1963, the RDA, the City Planning Commission and the University were looking as far West as 40<sup>th</sup> Street to continue to support Penn's expansion. On January 23, 1963 an ordinance was approved by the City Council appropriating \$242,462 to survey University City Urban Renewal Area #4. As defined in that ordinance, Urban Renewal area #4 encompassed a large part of the present day campus extending from the northwest corner of 34<sup>th</sup> and Sansom Streets to 36<sup>th</sup> Street, north to Chestnut Street, west to 38<sup>th</sup> Street, south to Walnut Street, west to 40<sup>th</sup> Street, south to Locust Street, east to 39<sup>th</sup> Street, south to Spruce Street, east to 37<sup>th</sup>, North to Walnut Street, and then east to 34<sup>th</sup> Street and north to the point of beginning.<sup>31</sup> The January 23, 1963 ordinance, along with an ordinance passed June 23, 1964, which amended the boundaries and approved the University's development plan for the area, provided the basis for the RDA's urban renewal plan for University City Unit #4.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Adam Klarfeld, appendix

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> The June 23, 1964 ordinance approved the University's development plan beginning at the intersection of 40th and Walnut Streets, East to 38<sup>th</sup> Street, North to Sansom Street, East to 37<sup>th</sup> Street, North to Chestnut Street, East to 34<sup>th</sup> Street, North to Ludlow Street, East to 33<sup>rd</sup> Street, South to the former Sansom Street, North to the rear of 3025 Walnut, East to the Schuylkill Expressway, West to Convention Avenue, to 34<sup>th</sup> Street, North to Hamilton Walk, West to 36<sup>th</sup> Street, SouthWest to University Avenue, NorthWest along the perimeter of the Woodland Avenue Cemetery, NorthEast to the intersection of Woodland Avenue and Baltimore Avenue, North to Pine Street, West to 3907 Pine Street, North to Delancy Street, East to 39<sup>th</sup> Street, North to Spruce Street, West to 4029 Spruce Street, North to Locust Street, East to 40<sup>th</sup> Street, North to the point of beginning. See appendix A

The City Council approved the RDA's proposal for the redevelopment of University City Unit #4 in an ordinance that passed on November 24, 1965. As evidenced by the City Council records, this segment of the University's expansion had been public knowledge for two years prior to the actual passage of the plan and resulting condemnation of property. No opposition to this ordinance, or the development plan for University City #4, was reported in the newspapers at the time the bill was before City Council.

Shortly after the approval of the redevelopment plans for University City Unit #4, the University withdrew the proposed redevelopment plan for the portion of Unit #4 that included the 3400 blocks of Walnut and Sansom Streets. Penn had planned to build an educational building on the property, but economic constraints forced the University to revise the RDA-approved plan to include an 11-story building with extensive commercial space. The University planned to generate revenue on its prime real estate in the 3400 block of Walnut Street by erecting a commercial building with the top floors to be leased to private tenants. This action gave Penn time as well as financial basis for raising money for the planned improvements. The RDA rented the abandoned properties at low rates to cover its carrying costs on the property. At the time the tract from 34<sup>th</sup> to 35<sup>th</sup> Street, between Walnut and Sansom contained stores, a restaurant, and rowhouses composed of 37 properties, most of which were already owned by the RDA. The University's "new" neighbors, renters on the 3400 block of Sansom Street, did not approve of the latest development plan. They formed the Sansom Committee to fight the development of the 3400 blocks of Walnut and Sansom Streets. Elliot Cook, the chairman of the Sansom Committee led the legal battle against the University in efforts to



stop the development of “Sansom Block”. In an ironic twist, however, these protesters had actually benefited from the initial condemnation of land by the RDA. The Sansom Committee was looking for a “double benefit.”

Once the specifics were known, the Sansom Committee’s fight took on a different meaning in the history of Penn’s development. The Committee was fighting for its own economic purposes, not for the betterment of the West Philadelphia community. Nevertheless, it played a huge role in creating the conventional wisdom on campus that Penn was determined to advance its own interests at all costs. In an article for *The Inquirer*, Paul Taylor wrote, “it is a David and Goliath affair, pitting the spottily organized resident and business community against a conglomerate of universities, hospitals, and research institutions.”<sup>33</sup> In this case, however, the “spottily organized community” was hardly representative of the West Philadelphia community. While members of the Sansom Committee had educational ties to Penn and West Philadelphia, they were not the original property owners and not really members of the non-University West Philadelphia community. The real community had sold its properties to the RDA and relocated after the 1965 City Council ordinance approving Urban Renewal Unit #4. The Sansom Committee was in fact well organized and amply funded. The Sansom Committee is not an appropriate example of the West Philadelphia community affected by Penn’s expansion. This is not to trivialize what La Terrasse and others added to the area, only to point out that the campaign to save the 3400 blocks of Walnut and Sansom Streets was not what its supporters claimed.

November 24, 1965 marked the end of the University of Pennsylvania’s expansion by use of eminent domain. The City Council adopted the RDA’s proposal for

University City Urban Renewal Unit #4 and in a second ordinance, the RDA's proposal for Urban Renewal Unit #3, which defined the Science Center redevelopment sub-unit.<sup>34</sup> The inventory of land available to the University for future redevelopment now met all its goals. In the years that followed, the University systematically implemented its building plans, thereby improving the physical plant and the University's standing with prospective students and faculty. The lack of protest concurrent with Penn's land acquisition is proof that displacement was not the only factor behind the negative relationship between Penn and the surrounding community. In fact, it may have played only a minor role. Expansion brought thousands of new residential students to West Philadelphia. The women's residence hall (now Hill House) opened in 1961, representing the first major presence of women on Penn's campus, and the University administration was forced to confront an entirely unexpected set of issues. Physical plant development led to a new relationship between administration and students, and this relationship was yet to be well defined.

---

<sup>33</sup> "David Vs. Goliath in West Philadelphia", The Philadelphia Inquirer, 11 November 1973

<sup>34</sup> By November 1965 the University held all the land West of 34<sup>th</sup> Street to 40<sup>th</sup> Street bound by Market Street on the North and Hamilton Walk on the South.

## Chapter 2

### THE END OF *IN LOCO PARENTIS*

*On Virgins*

*Editor, The Daily Pennsylvanian:*

*I wish to comment publicly on the shocking changes in social regulations at Penn since I left the University last spring. When I was Dean of Women I kept those little whores locked up where they belong. Now I am sure they are running around having sex with all those obnoxious Penn boys. If I were a mother—which I am happy to say that I am not—I would never send my daughter to a “free love” school like Penn. Oh where has god given virginity gone to? You are all sinners and will someday be punished for your crimes. Wait, Mrs. Alice Emerson whoever you are, until all those Hill Hall bitches get pregnant, then you’ll be sorry. Constance P. Dent Kutztown State College<sup>35</sup>*

Letter to the Editor

*The Daily Pennsylvanian*

February 23, 1967

This letter to the editor appeared in the 1967 “gag” edition of *The Daily Pennsylvanian*. While the letter was written in jest, it clearly illustrates the prominence of the social regulation debate at Penn, and this editorial spoofed the University’s relationship with female students under *in loco parentis*. President Meyerson once joked that students thought *in loco parentis* stood for “crazy like parents.”<sup>36</sup> In reality, it is Latin meaning in the place of parents, and the term describes the University’s policy towards its female students until the-mid 1960’s. Beginning in the-mid 1960’s the University was ridiculed by students for the strict social regulations it placed on female students as Penn played the role of protector. The role of the protector was not unique to Penn, rather it was a common policy on college campuses across the nation. This role, however, stifled the growth of women at Penn by denying them the opportunity to make

their own decisions. Alice Emerson's appointment as Dean of Women in 1966, marked the beginning of the campaign for loosened social restrictions on Penn women.

Tradition suggested that women who were not living at home with parents, or married, needed to be protected in order to keep their image untarnished. However, by 1966 women at Penn found a voice and demanded the opportunity to take care of themselves and their reputations without the help from the University. This chapter will briefly describe where the College of Women fit into the University prior to the mid-1960's, however the main focus will be on the progression of events that led to the end of *in loco parentis* and allowed students to control, implement, and enforce social regulations; it was through this series of events that women gained independence from the University policy of *in loco parentis* and a voice on campus.

Women existed, separate and unequal, at the University of Pennsylvania until fairly recently. To understand how women at Penn achieved rights and privileges similar to their male counterparts, it is necessary to comprehend the changes that occurred at Penn as women achieved critical mass at the University from 1913-1919. The first issue of the *Women's Record* was published in 1913, and although the 1913 Women's yearbook is small and handwritten it is still an example of an increasing female population at Penn. *The Bennett News* was first published in October of 1924. Women were not allowed to work for *the Daily Pennsylvanian* until 1962 and editions of *The Bennett News*, the newspaper of the College of Women, abruptly stopped in September of 1964. The publication of a separate woman's newspaper suggests the demand for such writings existed. In other words, there were enough women on campus that common

---

<sup>35</sup> Letter to the Editor, *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 23 February 1967

<sup>36</sup> Meyerson, Martin "In Loco Parentis", *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 14 October 1971.

events and news existed to write about, and it implied that women were interested in publishing a paper. Sargent Hall first appears at 34<sup>th</sup> and Chestnut Streets on a map in the *Catalogue of the University of Pennsylvania* in 1915. The formation of a female dorm reinforces the fact that the number of women at Penn had reached the point where the University was obligated to offer housing.

The School of Education opened in 1914, offering a chance for students to earn a Bachelors of Science in Education, and “although no exclusion of men from any of these courses, it was obvious that the School of Education with its great preponderance of women was adding large numbers to the feminine contingent at the University.”<sup>37</sup> The School of Education became the accepted path for women to take in order to get an education at Penn. As the female population of Penn increased, various organizations were founded to offer recreation and services to women at Penn. In 1921, with the blessings of University Trustees, women at Penn formed the *Bennett Club* mostly for the purpose of recreation, and in 1925 Bennett Hall was built as a place for women’s classes.

The building of Bennett Hall suggests that by 1925 the number of women at Penn was large enough to warrant the construction of a new five story building on a prominent corner of campus solely for use by Penn women. Through the School of Education, the University offered female students a chance at training to be primary school teachers. Because the job of a grade school teacher was stereotyped to be women’s work that alone served as justification for women to attend Penn’s School of Education. Unfortunately, not all women who enrolled in the School of Education had any intention of becoming teachers, as “many girls entered the School of Education who wanted college life and a

---

<sup>37</sup> Cheyney, Edward Potts. *History of the University of Pennsylvania 1740-1940* (University Press, Philadelphia 1940), 402

college degree but had no expectations of becoming teachers.”<sup>38</sup> The School of Education was not adequately serving the female population at Penn, and in 1933 the School of Education became the Graduate School of Education (GSE) announcing that teaching was a profession similar to being a doctor or lawyer. The strict requirements at the graduate level served as a deterrent for any students who did not want to be teachers, and women briefly lost the opportunity for an undergraduate education at Penn. The College of Women was created and opened in 1933 to fill the gap and create a means for women to get an undergraduate education at the University of Pennsylvania. The development of the GSE and the College of Women was indicative to the evolution in higher education around the nation.

From its opening in 1933, the College of Women maintained a separate dean; a separate advising system, separate classes, and of course, separate housing from the rest of the University. Women were kept as far away from their male peers as possible, and a distinct woman’s culture developed at Penn. In 1962 when Hill Hall opened, the live in population of women at the University increased, and strict dress codes, curfews, and other limiting rules were enforced. Women were not allowed to use Houston Hall until 1963, and *the Daily Pennsylvanian* remained all-male until 1962 and did not have a female editor-in-chief until the winter of 1969<sup>39</sup>. In 1965 the Women’s Student Government merged (WSGA) with the Men’s (SGA) creating a situation in which women’s concerns became students’ concerns. Prior to this merger, there was no place for women to voice problems, ideas, and opinions. Females were tolerated, but not welcomed, and in many cases they were treated as second class citizens.

---

<sup>38</sup> Cheyney, *History of the University of Pennsylvania 1740-1940*, 403

<sup>39</sup> James, Ellen, “The DP Gets Its First Woman Editor,” *The Pennsylvania Gazette* November 1969.

Until the mid-1960's women were required to wear skirts to the library and to dinner. They had to abide by the regulations on curfews, boyfriends, and body weight set forth by the University and published in the "White Bible". Until 1958 men were not allowed in women's dorms at all, and women were only allowed in men's dorms from 12pm through 7pm Sunday through Thursday, 12pm through 8pm on Friday, and 11am through 8pm on Saturdays. The 1960 Penn Student Handbook list curfews for female students as follows: 11:00 P.M. Sunday through Thursday and 12:00A.M. Friday and Saturday. At the time most women did not challenge these restrictions, instead they chose to "perpetuate their role as betty-coed" by accepting the various restrictions in an effort to legitimize themselves on campus.<sup>40</sup> The private lives of female students were on display and open to discussion, "a great many able girls simply [did] not take their college education with the seriousness that corresponds to their intelligence because, hidden in the back of their minds, [was] the suspicion that the anti-intellectual and the cynics may be right; they will marry and not 'use' this education anyhow, so why try too hard."<sup>41</sup> Social roles dictated by society had an unfortunate effect on education in that women were taught that it was all right to be less than serious about school. These deep-rooted social roles are one cause behind the missing female voice on Penn's campus. The women at Penn did not speak out against the rules and regulations placed on them, and therefore the University continued creating and enforcing such rules and regulations, playing the role of parent as well as educator to those girls enrolled in the College of Women.

---

<sup>40</sup> Sarah Federman, "A Preliminary Exploration Into the Rise of the Women's Movement at the University of Pennsylvania 1964-1974" (Paper, University of Pennsylvania, 1998), 6

<sup>41</sup> Karen Childers, as quotes by Sarah Federman (8)

The plight of women at the University of Pennsylvania was consistent with social trends and traditions of the time. Until the early 1960's, universities and colleges bewildered by the idea of women attending college were asking the question "why educate women?"<sup>42</sup> In the minds of many, a woman's job was at home. She was expected to have children and create and keep a good home for those children and her husband. Many thought that it was a waste of money to educate someone when their socially acceptable degree was an "Mrs. Degree." The notion that an well-educated woman made a less attractive wife also prevailed as "There was a fear of overeducating to the point that they would neglect their duty to family."<sup>43</sup> These well established social roles for women in turn caused those that had access to education to take it less seriously because many assumed that in the long run it would hurt their chances of being a good wife and mother. The University was unsure how to relate to these women, and in response "assumed the role of concerned parent."<sup>44</sup>

"[A] quarter of a century of progress—in Penn's program and for Women's Studies in general—was celebrated and debated in a two-day conference held in late September [1998]." In the fall of 1973, 12 courses "challenged the curriculum as usual" and now the Women's Studies program offers 50 courses, which reach approximately 1600 students.<sup>45</sup> In a speech entitled "Mary, Martha and Ally McBeal?: Who and Where is Women's Studies?" Catherine Stimpson narrated a version of the history of feminism in the United States broken up into "3.5 waves", the inaugural wave granted women

---

<sup>42</sup> Federman, "A Preliminary Explanation" 1

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 5

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> "Making Waves," *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, January/February 1999



initial access to educational institutions and the “domain of reason”. She states, “The first wave gathered strength in the west in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and was inseparable from women’s push for access to political institutions.”<sup>46</sup> In the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century the second wave renewed the struggle for institutional access and “sought to transform the institutions of teaching and learning”<sup>47</sup>. “In the 1960’s the struggle over women’s education came with renewed vigor...helped along by the anti-war, civil-rights and broader women’s-liberation movements.”<sup>48</sup> It was during this second wave of feminism that women at the University of Pennsylvania campaigned for, and won, many civil liberties already afforded to their male counterparts, and effectively threw off the constraints of the University policy of *in loco parentis*.

At the founding of the College of Women at Penn in 1933, the University had adopted a policy of *in loco parentis* regarding its female students. Under *in loco parentis*, the University believed that they were raising students as well as educating them. The Penn Student Handbook from 1960 stated that “the University’s responsibility for you at Pennsylvania begins where your parents’ ends.” In order to keep track of its female students, the University devised a system comprised of three types of permission where at the beginning of each semester the girls and their parents decided on what type of permission she would be granted. The strictest level of permission was mandatory for all freshmen, and it stipulated that students must have specific permission to visit any place. The next level of permission allowed students to visit places overnight “at her discretion except hotels or other public places or other university or college campuses.” The loosest type of permission was known as “blanket permission”, and it allowed female

---

<sup>46</sup>Dr. Catherine Stimpson in “Making Waves,” *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, January/February 1999

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

students freedom to visit anyone as long as they signed out with the name, number, and address of where they were going. By the time a woman was a senior she had some say in her social activities outside the dorm, however “men [were not allowed] to be entertained above the first floor” of the women’s dorms, and men were only allowed to be in the dorms between 11am and 11pm Monday through Thursday, and until 12am Friday and Saturday.<sup>49</sup>

Under this system Penn had the responsibility to be involved in all aspects of a student’s life. Sometimes referred to as the “collegiate way”, the philosophy of *in loco parentis* allowed institutions to take a paternalistic attitude towards their students in order to maintain responsibility for a student’s moral, social and intellectual life.<sup>50</sup> Today, this type of hands on control by a university seems unfair and overbearing, but it was normal at that time. Until Penn women learned how to voice displeasure with the University’s rules and regulations, this hands-on philosophy by the administration was common practice.

Hill Hall was completed and opened in September of 1962, increasing the number of beds for Penn Women by 665. Prior to the building of Hill Hall, all female resident students lived in Sargent Hall at 33<sup>rd</sup> and Chestnut Streets, but Sargent Hall could effectively house only 150 women. Because of this housing shortage, the majority of women at Penn commuted from home until 1962. The opening of Hill Hall increased the female presence on campus by allowing many day students to become “boarders”, and it also afforded the University more slots for a diverse female population. An article in a 1973 edition of *The Pennsylvania Gazette* supports this idea; “Fact: five years ago the

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Penn student handbook 1960 p. 35

University had on-campus living spaces for only 3500 students. Now there are 7500 spaces. As a result, Penn has gone from being a day-school to a full fledged residential school.”<sup>51</sup> There were large benefits in becoming a primarily residential school. Specifically the University could now accept more diverse applicants from different geographic areas. The increase in the 24-hour female population of Penn made the arguments for social freedoms more acute because the number of people affected by them increased—basically women became less of a rarity on campus. However, the increased, constant female population on campus also presented an unexpected problem for Penn. While planning for this new population, the administration had overlooked the fact that security measures would have to increase in order to protect their new residents. At the height of Penn’s physical plant expansion in the early 1960’s the University never foresaw increased security as an outcome of development, but with a larger and more diverse student body, the University had an increased obligation to ensure safety in its own community.

By the mid-1960’s, with the female student body on the rise, a decade of improvements for Penn coeds began. Between 1964 and 1974 women at Penn campaigned for, and successfully achieved, integration with the rest of the University. During these years the University ceased to monitor women’s social lives, and female students were allowed to join the formerly all-male DP, the WSGA and the SGA merged, the Women for Equal Opportunity at the University of Pennsylvania (WEOUP) was founded, a Women’s Studies program was established, and a Women’s Center was formed. Finally, the College of Women merged with the rest of the University. By the

---

<sup>50</sup> *The Almanac* Vol. 19 # 7, 10 October 72

<sup>51</sup> “Save the Quad,” *The Pennsylvania Gazette* October, 1973 Vol. 72 #3

end of these transformations, “women had exchanged the security of the College for Women for and the opportunity and chance to develop a more meaningful place for themselves on campus.”<sup>52</sup>

“I at 20 am two years older than men who are drafted and one year younger than people who vote and yet I am treated no better than a child... The University must get it into its red-bricked head that we are living in the era of the bomb, the tear gas gun, and the Pill.”<sup>53</sup>

The first edition of the 1966-67 *Daily Pennsylvanian* referred to the previous school year as “dynamic and controversial.” The 1965-66 school year was editorialized as the year of the butterfly, and the DP reported that “The Penn campus crackled with excitement and controversy” in the form of pickets, educational reforms, and protest.<sup>54</sup> During that year the campus was plagued by student riots, and after a special appeal to the Dean, women were allowed to wear slacks to the library. If the editors of the DP thought that this was revolutionary, then the events that transpired in following year must have shocked them.

On July 1, 1966 Dr. Alice Emerson assumed the role of Dean of Women. Dean Emerson—a successful woman in a position of leadership with a family—was a role model for Penn women. The beginning of Dr. Emerson’s tenure as Dean of Women marked the beginning of the push by female students for increased responsibility and control of their lives on campus. An article in the August 15, 1966 *Daily Pennsylvanian* entitled “Hopes for a Co-ed Government Hinge on Referendum” brings the issue of the female student voice into the forefront of campus news at the start of the semester. The

---

<sup>52</sup> Sarah Federman, “Preliminary Explanation”, 11.

<sup>53</sup> Letter to the Editor, *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 13 September 1967.

<sup>54</sup> “News of 65-66 year in review,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 15 August 1966.

article states that while a provisional combined government was in effect during the previous semester, the proposed merger of the Women's Student Government (WSGA) and the Men's Student Government (SGA) was postponed, however the author felt that "the Co-ed Constitution [would] certainly be adopted." On November 6, 1966 the proposal to unite the WSGA and the SGA passed with a majority vote from the male student population and 2/3 vote from the female population. With the merging of the two governments, the distinction between women's and men's issues blurred into one category of student's issues. Arguments about parietals, apartments, dress code, and other social regulations were debated University wide and not just within the College of Women.

The November 8, 1966 headline in the DP reads "Berger Elected USPG Head". Barbara Berger was the first female student body president in the Ivy League and her presidency heightened the visibility of females on campus. Upon her acceptance, Berger stated that her election was "an endorsement of the principle of co-ed student government".<sup>55</sup> The principle of a co-ed student government was a first step in the eventual fusion of the College and the College of Women.

The fall of 1966 marked an increased visibility of women on campus. Berger was in the DP on a daily basis, which was a constant reminder that women had the capability to lead, and in the December 9, 1966 edition of the paper she was given the "man of the year" award. Her presidency also signified the constant debate over social regulations on campus. Visiting hours for Men's dorms, curfews, telephone sign-out, and off campus living for men and women were intensely debated issues, and in February 1967 a faculty

---

<sup>55</sup> "New USPG President Berger Promises Reorientation of Student Government," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 9 November 1966

body was designated to investigate merging the College and the College of Women.<sup>56</sup> The 1966-67 school year initiated the conversation about the role of the University in making and enforcing social regulations for the University of Pennsylvania students.

In the fall of 1966 women were allowed in men's dorm rooms until 9:00 P.M. on Fridays and 11:00 P.M. on Saturday nights. Students initiated a bill to change the "archaic visiting hours" in the men's dorms, however Dean Craft, the Dean of Men, felt that "dorms being a little more than bedrooms, were not an appropriate place to entertain a date."<sup>57</sup> <sup>58</sup> In order for a social resolution to pass it needed approval from both the UPSG and the Committee on Residence Operations (CRO) which was made up of faculty members. The students countered Craft's argument by stating that "whatever serious things can happen by extending the visiting hours till 2A.M. Can certainly occur by 11P.M. Extending the University's hours will simply make the situation more bearable."<sup>59</sup> At the December 1966 CRO meeting the proposal to extend visiting hours was turned down, and Dean Craft stated that "students should attempt to work within the system."<sup>60</sup> Finally, in January 1967, the CRO approved the extension of visiting hours on weekends. The campaign for extended visiting rights was only one of many struggles in which students campaigned for loosened regulations from the University. In other words, students were attempting to redefine the role the University would play in their social lives.

Simultaneous to the petition to increase visiting hours in the men's dorms, women had campaigned for and successfully achieved privileges to a new telephone sign-out

---

<sup>56</sup> "Faculty Body will Examine Fusing C, CW," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 9 February 1967

<sup>57</sup> "A Pristine Chapel?," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 20 October 1966

<sup>58</sup> "Extension sought of Visiting Hours in Men's Dormitories," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 20 October 1966

<sup>59</sup> "A Pristine Chapel?," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 20 October 1966

system in addition to extended visiting hours for men in the female dorms. Under the old system, women had to fill out a card with the name, number, address of where they were going and time they planned on returning. A specific number of “late leaves” were allowed per semester, and women were forced to speculate before they went out if they planned to use up one of those late leaves that night. Under the telephone sign-out system women could call back to the dorm anytime before midnight and have a friend fill out a late leave card for her. The telephone sign-out system was heralded as “a major forward step in the liberalizing of social regulations” by *the Daily Pennsylvanian*.<sup>61</sup> Not only was this system positive because it allowed women more freedom to come and go as they pleased, but it also created a system of dual responsibility—the girl who filled out the late leave card was just as responsible as the girl calling in to sign-out for the night. The hope was that this system would foster a sense of trust between students themselves as well as between the administration and students. While the University still adhered to the policy of *in loco parentis*, women were taking steps to reclaim social freedom and things were slowly changing.

By second semester, women were demanding the right to live in off campus apartments as juniors, a privilege already afforded to sophomore men. *The Daily Pennsylvanian* editorialized that the 1966-67 school year “started with a new Dean of Women and ended with a new acting Dean of Men,” and during that time the University saw significant changes in female social regulations.<sup>62</sup> Pushed by students during the

---

<sup>60</sup> Arkow, Phil “Committee on Residences Turns Down Extension of Dorm Hours,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 6 December 1966

<sup>61</sup> “Co-ed Residents discuss phone sign-out system,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 7 October 1966

<sup>62</sup> “The News of the Year,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 25 August 1967

1966-67 school year, the University was forced to reevaluate how it would relate to and deal with students.

In October of 1967, the CRO approved the proposal, which had already passed in the UPSG, allowing junior women to live in apartments off campus. One College of Women junior in reaction to the apartment vote said, "I just want to be able to come and go as I please, and not have to worry about being 'campused.'" <sup>63</sup> Prior to this vote by the CRO a junior in the College of Women, Ms. Diamonstein, initiated a case with the Joint Student Judiciary that challenged the University's right to dictate social regulations. This woman's parents had requested that she live off campus, and while the University would not allow it, they stated that they were not operating under the "old" policy of *in loco parentis*; with the apartment ruling Ms. Diamonstein withdrew her suit. The new policy of parental permission and a person to fill your spot in the dorms allowed junior and senior women to have their own apartment with one caveat. Two letters, both from the Office of the Dean of Women and both presumably mailed home to parents, gave a scary edge to the idea of complete freedom that living off campus would allow. The first letter is not dated but signed by the Assistant Dean of Women and details the perceived danger of women living alone in West Philadelphia. It said, "The University of Pennsylvania cannot take responsibility for the non-academic welfare of students who are living off campus... your daughter must assume the responsibility and risks which are part of an independent life in a large city." <sup>64</sup> With this letter the University officially washed its hands of responsibility for the safety and security of students who chose to live off campus. This letter shows the University loosening its grip on the private lives of

---

<sup>63</sup> "Coeds and Dean Emerson happy with Apartment Meeting," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 17 November 1967



students, but it is doubtful that many parents would allow their child to live in what the University deemed a risky neighborhood when they could live under the watchful eye of the school.

The second letter signed by Dean Emerson and dated October 4, 1968 is a list of “helpful suggestions” for the safety and security of all women students living off campus. Such suggestions include: not talking to telephone solicitors, registering only your first initial and last name in the phone book and on your mailbox or doorbell, not opening your door to any strangers even if they claim to be or have some authority, and finally the Dean suggested that all women buy a police whistle to carry in their pocket. The above suggestions might be standard today, but at that time people were more naïve. At that point, most 19-21 year old women had never experienced living on their own so such things as keeping your door locked at all times had not yet become second nature. These letters suggest that the University was attempting to prepare students for their new responsibilities as *in loco parentis* ended by giving personal freedom on the condition that Penn women accept their personal responsibilities.

By the spring of 1968 students had moved past extending visiting hours and began to push for co-ed dorms. Birth control and abortion were discussed openly on campus, and the University declared that Heyday would be co-ed for the first time in the history of the University, where as in the past there had been two separate ceremonies on the same day. A DP article entitled “Off With Skirts” speaks out against the regulation that forced girls to wear skirts to class, to the dining hall, and to the library. “The antebellum outlook on females adopted by the University portrays a double standard feeling of *in loco parentis*, a doctrine that the University has been urged to abandon in the

---

<sup>64</sup> The University of Pennsylvania Archives and Records Center Box 250, FF 14.

face of demands made on it by modern education.”<sup>65</sup> On the other side of the slacks debate, a male student wrote in a letter to the editor that women should not be allowed to wear slacks. By wearing skirts he felt that females took pride in their appearance and that Penn women had a reputation of being among the best-dressed college co-eds. Despite the regulations, women began to wear slacks, and as a College for Women freshman said, “no one has a right to impose fashion standards on anyone else.” The slacks debate is just another example of women asserting themselves and speaking out in order to achieve a right already sanctioned for their male peers.

While the slacks debate raged within the pages of *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, birth control and abortion were being openly discussed on campus, and there were numerous panels on sexual topics. One entitled “Medical, Moral and Legal Implications of Abortion” was a debate between lawyers and clergy, and another panel focused on “Facts and Misconceptions of the Pill.” What is ironic is that while sex and sexual topics were openly discussed, University Student Health Services refused to prescribe birth control pills. Girls that came in requesting the Pill were turned away or referred to a private doctor who would prescribe birth control for the regular fee.

By the fall of 1968 the improvements in social conditions at Penn were vast, as “The University [was] changing its philosophy with regard to its role in the affairs of students. The doctrine of *in loco parentis* if not dead [was] dying”<sup>66</sup> The final step in students gaining the freedom to exercise their own social choices was the bill proposed and passed by the UPSG in April of 1968. The bill asked the University Council (a joint

---

<sup>65</sup> “Off With Skirts,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 25 January 1968

<sup>66</sup> “Social Rules Aren’ t What they Used to be,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 18 September 1968

student and faculty body) for the power to control and enforce social regulations.<sup>67</sup> The bill was brought before the University Council in the fall of 1968, and once passed it ended *de jure in loco parentis* by allowing the student government full responsibility for social regulations.

The relationship that evolved between the administration and the student body between the years of 1965 and 1968 was consistent with colleges around the nation. Lewis Mayhew, the President of the American Association for Higher Education, stated that “Colleges are not churches, clinics, or parents. Whether or not a student burns a draft card, participates in a civil rights march, engages in premarital or extramarital sexual activity, becomes pregnant, attends church, sleeps all day, [or] drinks all night, is not really a concern of an educational institution.” After years of disagreement, the University grudgingly gave the control of social regulations to the students. Finally women were allowed to make their own choices about where they wanted to live, who they wanted to entertain there, when they wanted to come home, and what they wanted to wear. With choice, women became more assertive and gained the confidence to stand up for themselves. Women were no longer seen as decoration, instead their opinions and ideas added to the University community, as women wrote for the DP, participated in student government, and in athletics. Finally, in 1970, Women for Equal Opportunity at the University of Pennsylvania (WEOUP) was founded. WEOUP was a women’s organization for students, faculty, and staff that served as a forum for women at the University to voice concerns and create opportunities for themselves at Penn.

This improved state was something to be celebrated, however it also forced the University to reassess how to relate to female students. During this readjustment the

---

<sup>67</sup> “Officials Question UPSG control over social roles” *The Daily Pennsylvanian* 24 April 1968

University was forced to determine how to protect female students while not infringing on their rights. This dilemma caused problems with the surrounding community as the rate of violent crimes, such as assault and rape, skyrocketed in the late 1960' s and early 1970' s.

### Chapter 3

## MISPERCEPTIONS OF RACE AND CRIME

*The University in an attempt to cover up the blatant ineptitude of its security force [and] in order to detract public attention from scandal are using the arrest of Bill Bradley after all he was not only a non student, he was a black non student. And blacks are nobodies at Penn.*<sup>68</sup>

Richard Rogers

“Blacks as Nobodies”

*The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 2 December 1971

In October 1971, an African American male unaffiliated with the University was arrested and unjustly branded as guilty of a rape committed in a Penn parking garage. The case of William Bradley accurately illustrates the explosive issues surrounding the perception of race and crime on and around Penn’s campus at this time. In the academic year 1966-67, even as women students began to realize personal freedoms equal to their male peers, crime and race converged on the University of Pennsylvania campus to create a new segregation, one based on race and membership in the University community. Those who “didn’t belong” were made to feel unwelcome and in some cases were used as scapegoats, as evidenced by the arrest of Bill Bradley. This new form of segregation was visible in the relationship between the University and the community, as well as between African American Penn students and the rest of the University. In reaction to the unjust arrest of Bill Bradley, African American student authors, like the author of the DP article quoted above, spoke out angrily against the University, not so much for failing to control crime, but for what was perceived as gross mistreatment of all African Americans.

---

<sup>68</sup> Rogers, Richard “Blacks as Nobodies,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 2 December 1971

William Bradley was arrested based on his skin color and background, and his became the face of the “West Philadelphia youth”. His arrest shows the fear and misunderstanding that existed. Whites became increasingly skeptical and suspicious of African Americans especially those not affiliated with the University, and in turn, blacks were skeptical and suspicious of the continuously expanding, predominantly white institution in their neighborhood. As West Philadelphia became increasingly African American, and the crime rate at Penn and its surrounding neighborhoods soared, people became afraid. Fear and anger led to tense and clashing relations between the two entities. This chapter will seek to document and interpret the conflicting voices of the West Philadelphia community, and the white and black University communities in light of increased crime and hostility.

The area of Philadelphia which included the University campus and its surrounding neighborhood community underwent substantial racial change between 1950 and 1970.<sup>69</sup> United States population and housing data taken in 1950, 1960 and 1970 show that this area of Philadelphia lost nearly one-third of its population during these decades, while the proportion of its residents who were African American nearly doubled. In 1950 the population of the University area was 61,970 people, 21% of whom were African American.<sup>70</sup> By 1960 the population of the same area was 51,213 people, 32.7%

---

<sup>69</sup> Philadelphia City Planning Commission, “Population Characteristics, 1960 and 1970 Census tracts,” (Philadelphia) 1973

<sup>70</sup> The University of Pennsylvania is in the area designated ward 45 by The United States Census Bureau. The ward is subsequently divided into tracts and then blocks. To calculate the population data for the community surrounding Penn I used the following tracts; 24F, 24G, 27A, 27B, 27C, 46A, and 46H. The physical boundaries of this are as follows: beginning at the intersection of Market Street and the Schuylkill River West to 31<sup>st</sup> Street, North on 31<sup>st</sup> Street to Spring Garden, West on Spring Garden to 40<sup>th</sup> Street, North on 40<sup>th</sup> Street to Haverford Ave to 46<sup>th</sup> Street, South on 46<sup>th</sup> Street to Market Street, West on Market Street to 50<sup>th</sup> Street, South on 50<sup>th</sup> Street to Baltimore Ave, East on Baltimore Ave to 41<sup>st</sup> Street, South on 41<sup>st</sup> street to Woodland Ave, South West on Woodland Ave to Grays Ferry, and East on Grays Ferry to the Schuylkill River, and North, along the Western bank of the River, to the place of beginning. See Appendix “C”

of whom were African Americans.<sup>71</sup> By 1970 the population had fallen to 42,950 people, but 40% was now African American.<sup>72</sup> Philadelphia as a whole experienced a steady rising percentage of African American population—between 1960 and 1970 the African American proportion of the City’s population increased from 26.7% to 34.4%--but the University area was notably more African American than the rest of the City.<sup>73</sup>

The simultaneous occurrence of these two trends and substantial increases in African American population, even as West Philadelphia emptied out, must be examined. Though racial discrimination was widely practiced in the North prior to World War II, barriers to equal access in education and employment fell rapidly after Truman’s integration of the Armed Services in 1948. The University expansion in the 1950’s and early 1960’s caused many white families living near Penn to move away. This movement overlapped with the American trend of suburbanization, sometimes referred to as “white flight”, which motivated many families to move to suburbs of Philadelphia. The last wave of African American migration from the South coincided with this change and accounted for much of the population increase of that racial group in Philadelphia. As this took place, however, the old 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century industries were leaving Philadelphia rapidly. The Pennsylvania Railroad, America’s greatest corporation in the first half of the century, was an apt representative for Philadelphia as its business declined soon after the introduction of the Interstate highway system in the mid 1950’s.

When W.E.B. DuBois was at Penn in 1897, Philadelphia was only 4% African American and Plessy vs. Ferguson was only one year old. Because of the doctrine of

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> In 1970 the tract numbers change, but the physical boundaries remain the same. The new tract numbers are: 76, 79, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92.

“separate but equal” created by Plessy and strict Jim Crow legislation enacted in the aftermath of the end of reconstruction in 1877, African Americans began to migrate to Northern cities. While migration to the North began in the late 1800’s, the numbers of African Americans moving north increased substantially between World Wars I and II. As this group moved North, African American families who were members of an earlier generation in the northern cities were leading the NAACP, the Harlem Renaissance, and other cultural advancements. The last group to come north had been living under Jim Crow for a half a century and had been denied an education and the opportunity for monetary success. Just as DuBois predicted, these African Americans took northern cities by surprise, introducing anger and violence within their own communities. The University of Pennsylvania, the older established African American communities in Philadelphia, and the new African American residents of West Philadelphia were caught in the middle of this phenomenon:

As in the ghetto riots of the sixties when Blacks burned and pillaged their own communities, the gang members had been venting their rage on each other. But there was nothing to be gained from that, they realized so gradually they turned their anger outward, seeking satisfaction—and profit—in the White world.<sup>74</sup>

As the population of West Philadelphia quickly changed between 1950 and 1970, crime rates, particularly violent crime, exploded. Sources such as *the Daily Pennsylvanian*, *the Philadelphia Inquirer*, *the Evening Bulletin*, and internal University correspondence acknowledge and discuss the problem of increased crime on and near campus.<sup>75</sup> One

---

<sup>73</sup> City Planning Commission of Philadelphia “Population Characteristics 1960 and 1970 Philadelphia Census Tracts” 1973

<sup>74</sup> Lukas, Anthony *Common Ground* (Vintage Books: New York, 1986), 414

<sup>75</sup> The following citations are examples of crime articles from the above publications. “Assaults and Robberies on the Rise” *The Daily Pennsylvanian* 22 November 1966, “Coed, 22, Raped in West Phila.”



difficulty in presenting this thesis is that there is considerable evidence that the University suppressed the reporting of campus crime in an attempt to maintain a clean image and continue to attract prospective students and faculty. In an internal memo to President Martin Meyerson dated April 5, 1973 Robert Coryell wrote, “We considered refusing to provide the requested data but concluded that such an action would not decrease the possibility of *The Bulletin* pursuing an unfavorable editorial line.”<sup>76</sup> Donald Shultis, Director of Safety and Security at that time, contended that Penn was a city university and that its “crime statistics cannot be totally unrelated to those of Philadelphia...crime in the big city is real and its nationwide increase in rate and amount is awesome.”<sup>77</sup>

Writing in *the Almanac* in January 1972, Shultis used the Department of Justice’s Uniform Crime Reports to calm security fears. Across the United States between 1960 and 1970 the population increased by 13% and felony rose by 176% which produced a crime rate 144% higher than the previous one; “In 1969, 17,400 index crimes were counted in Philadelphia. The first six months of 1970 produced over 21,000 such crimes.”<sup>78</sup> Similarly, violent crime was up 156%. Armed with these statistics, Shultis attempted to persuade the University community, as well as frightened parents and upset alumni, that crime on campus was simply a reflection of crime in Philadelphia and in the nation as a whole. He argued that people living at Penn were just as likely to fall victim to crime in West Philadelphia as they were at home. However, the overwhelming evidence points in the opposite direction. By 1973, *The Christian Science Monitor* was echoing many other voices in American life when it said, “Crime [has] replaced militancy as the

---

*The Evening Bulletin*, 1 December 1972, “Rape Arrest Fails to Calm Penn Coeds,” *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 16 November 1971

<sup>76</sup> UARC UPF 8.5, News Bureau, Box 250 FF 13. This memo was written regarding to a request for information made by a *Bulletin* reporter doing a story on rape at Penn and security in April 1973.

number one problem on U.S. campuses according to college security directors.”<sup>79</sup> Rising crime required universities such as Penn to move towards the professionalization of their security forces. At Penn, however, the move towards a more professional security force became problematic because it adversely affected the University’s relationship with the surrounding community.

Crime reporting in *The Daily Pennsylvanian* best reflected this change at Penn. Beginning as early as the fall of 1969, the bulk of the articles in *the DP* were no longer about protests surrounding Vietnam. Students at Penn were visibly concerned for their safety. Student writers became increasingly alarmed and angry when the University would not publicize when and where crimes occurred; many times DP reporters found out about instances of rape or assault only after they were reported in *The Inquirer* or the *Bulletin*. There were also instances where crimes were reported to the Penn police, but not to the Philadelphia Police. An article entitled “Coed is Raped at Penn but Police Aren’t Told” discussed the rape of a 19-year-old woman in College Hall. The University did not report this rape to the Philadelphia police, choosing instead to handle it internally, therefore causing the University Community to wonder how many rapes had gone unreported and question how to “solve crimes we don’t know about.”<sup>80</sup> Penn students argued against these practices on the grounds that without knowledge of crime the University Community could not effectively protect themselves.

In contrast with Donald Shultis’ 1971 explanation of crime in West Philadelphia, the *DP* published an article as early as 1968 examining a University of Pennsylvania

---

<sup>77</sup> Shultis, Donald, “Safety, Security and the University,” *The Almanac*, 11 January 1972

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> Nutch, David, “Crime Emerges and No. 1 Campus Problem,” *The Christian Science Monitor* 20 March 1973

Student Government (UPSG) bill to increase the number of campus guards. The article states that there had been 108 rapes in the 18<sup>th</sup> Philadelphia Police Precinct from January 1 to September 30, 1968, and many of them had occurred on Penn's campus.<sup>81</sup> One student was quoted saying that "a number of co-eds have complained about being bothered, assaulted, or frightened, and stories about rape and assault circulate." A later article in the *Penn Women's News* states that the General Crime Statistics for 1972 show a decrease in all major crimes except rape which was up 17% in cities and 2% in suburbs.<sup>82</sup> This article states that there were 872 rape cases reported in Philadelphia in 1972, but according to the FBI, the rape report ratio was only one out of every ten to twelve rapes. The total number of rapes in Philadelphia for the year could be as high as 10,000. According to this article, West Philadelphia had the highest overall crime rate as well as the highest rate of rape in Philadelphia. There is little evidence in the form of hard statistics that the rate of crime increased on and around Penn's campus from 1968 to 1973, but newspaper articles and the apparent tone of fear that existed within the Penn community make it clear that crime, especially violent crime, rose during this time. Penn's leading criminologist Martin Wolfgang published his scholarly view:

Since the statistics indicate that blacks attack, rob, and assault others more often than whites most people, white or black tend to anticipate and fear attacks by blacks.<sup>83</sup>

Wolfgang reinforced the general view of crime at Penn that African Americans were responsible for committing the majority of violent crimes, and this perception is repeated

---

<sup>80</sup> Schwartz, Berl "Co-ed is Raped But Police Aren't Told," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 17 December 1969

<sup>81</sup> Salaman, Alban and David Kaye, "Philadelphia Police Say Area Crime Rate Not Up Abnormally," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 30 September 1968. The 18<sup>th</sup> precinct accounted for all of West Philadelphia bounded by the Schuylkill River, the Airport and City Line Avenue.

<sup>82</sup> *Penn Women's News*, 4 April 1973, UARC UPF 8.5, News Bureau, Box 250 FF13.

<sup>83</sup> Wolfgang, Marvin E and Bernard Cohen. *Crime and Race Conceptions and Misconceptions*, (New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1970) 43

often in the newspapers of those years. When discussing a suspect in a rape or assault case, the phrase “West Philadelphia youth” became a euphemism for African American youth. Often articles stated that the suspect was a “Negro youth,” and in a few cases a photograph of the suspect was published alongside the article. The idea that African Americans committed the majority of crimes at and around Penn became unquestioned, and the Uniform Crime Reports “revealed that generally and proportionally, Black Americans [were] arrested between three and four times more frequently than whites.”<sup>84</sup>

As illustrated in the above pages, the community surrounding the University of Pennsylvania underwent a drastic change simultaneous to, but not because of, the University’s physical plant expansion. The new community voice that emerged out of this transformation was a voice filled with rage and anger at the white man’s “establishment” which, in this community, was the University:

Black men have stood so long in such peculiar jeopardy in America that a black norm has developed—a suspiciousness of one’s environment which is necessary for survival. Black people to a degree that approaches paranoia must be ever alert to danger from their white fellow citizens. It is a cultural phenomenon particular to Black Americans.<sup>85</sup>

Suspicious of a power system, which it did not understand, this developing community voice unleashed extraordinary charges against Penn and the City. Roots of skepticism and animosity felt by the community towards the University can be linked to the culture of the South under Jim Crow laws. This system violated the national rhetoric that “all men are created equal,” demonstrating instead that “equality” was limited to whites only. African Americans were continually demeaned by Whites and forced to live in lesser conditions,

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid. 30-31

<sup>85</sup> Grier and Cobbs, *Black Rage* (Basic Books Inc. New York, 1968), 206

with lesser jobs, and lesser opportunities for education. For obvious reasons this system conditioned an extreme distrust of White people by African Americans. The fear and anger that existed on the side of the African American members of the West Philadelphia Community was also present within Penn's African American Community as African American students sought to create an experience separate from the rest of the University.

W.E.B. DuBois House opened in the fall of 1972. The purpose of the project was to "maximize the academic, cultural, and social benefits that students interested in black studies and Black culture receive from the University."<sup>86</sup> In favor of DuBois, Assistant Professor Barney Hollins from Morgan State University stated that "Black students come to the University with different needs."<sup>87</sup> The opening of DuBois was a visible result of African Americans on campus attempting to differentiate themselves and their experience from the rest of the University population.

Support for DuBois House and the idea that African American students were different, and therefore should not be treated like White students, was expressed by one student in an opinion piece in the *DP*. The piece accuses society of "being oblivious to the roots of black alienation and frustration."<sup>88</sup> The author, an African American student, charges that "the University has done little to examine critically the fundamental sources of black protest, treating its black students exactly like their white counterparts."<sup>89</sup> The tone of this article is one of anger as the author expresses African American disenchantment with the University of Pennsylvania. While tensions were growing within the University community, African Americans at Penn found a shared loyalty and interest

---

<sup>86</sup> Candor, Tom, "W.E.B. DuBois College House: Programs, Problems," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 20 February 1973

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Gibson, Scott "The University and the Black," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 6 March 1972

in the African Americans in the surrounding community. During DuBois House's maiden year, a "black paper [was formed] to unite the University Community."<sup>90</sup> The stated purpose of the paper was to "bridge the gap between the intellectual blacks and the grass roots blacks."<sup>91</sup>

The William Bradley incident served to fuse the two African American communities even more resolutely. Bradley, a West Philadelphia teenager, was accused of raping a Penn commuter on October 8, 1971 in a Penn parking garage at 32<sup>nd</sup> and Chestnut Streets. In response, African Americans at Penn stated that "we the black family want to make public...that under the guise of crime prevention blacks have been constantly and systematically harassed by both University security and Philadelphia Police."<sup>92</sup> African Americans at Penn also pledged to help Bradley secure and pay for the "best possible legal defense."<sup>93</sup> A second article in the DP regarding Bradley's arrest discussed the basis of the American judicial system and the idea that a person is innocent until proven guilty. The author states that it is "insulting and humiliating to realize that these stipulations are seldom met when the defendant is black...The Dred Scott decision was accompanied by the words that blacks 'had no rights which a white man was bound to respect.' Time has passed. Taney is dead but the racist spirit incorporated in his words still strip our people of the illusions of justice a few of us still cherish."<sup>94</sup> The author communicated a strong dislike for the University, and accused Penn of oppressing African American students and student groups. Finally, the end of the article threatens that the

---

<sup>89</sup> Ibid.

<sup>90</sup> Silverman, Ed "University Students form Black Paper to Unite W. Phila. Community," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 18 February 1972

<sup>91</sup> Ibid.

<sup>92</sup> Hicks, Gary "The Arrest of William Bradley," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 17 November 1971

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.

<sup>94</sup> Rogers, Richard "Blacks as 'Nobodies,'" *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 2 December 1971

University needs to realize that “we [African Americans] are very proud people and that it is time for us to directly deal with our oppressors.”<sup>95</sup> The rage articulated by the “intellectual blacks” in the student body was a contained version of the violent rage which existed throughout much of the West Philadelphia community.

Beginning with the creation of the Institute of Urban Studies in the early 1950’s and the West Philadelphia Corporation in 1959, the University of Pennsylvania began its involvement in community affairs.<sup>96</sup> From these beginnings Penn began creating programs to reach further out to the surrounding community. “The [West Philadelphia] Corporation [has] worked since 1959 to attract new resources to University City and to reverse the decay that threatened the area after World War II.”<sup>97</sup> President Gaylord Hamwell, writing in 1966, said, “The interaction of the University of Pennsylvania with those people who are not clearly a part of its own structure has grown vastly in both intimacy and complexity in a generation.” He described, as an example, a Human Resources program established in 1964 to coordinate University resources dealing with community problems.<sup>98</sup> Out of this program, the Community Involvement Council (CIC) was formed. As a student run organization, the goal of the CIC was “to work, in any way we can, to eliminate unjust imbalance, which we perceive in the community.”<sup>99</sup> Once established, the CIC became a clearinghouse for volunteer opportunities throughout the West Philadelphia community, setting up tutoring programs, staffing hospital emergency rooms, and acting as the liaison between numerous campus and community groups.

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Beck, Lawrence and Stephen Kerstetter, “Residents Suspicious of University,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 27 January 1967.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

<sup>98</sup> Hamwell, Gaylord, “An Era in Which Today’s Problems do not Come in Yesterday’s Categories.” *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, December 1966

Through these committees, the University developed projects and collaborative efforts to build one community with West Philadelphia. Penn's overtures into the community led one person to remark in the December 1966 *Pennsylvania Gazette* that "the University of Pennsylvania [has become] involved with mankind." One wonders, however, if Penn was engaging the community on its own conditions.<sup>100</sup> President Harnwell began a program to recruit black high school students, and in 1968 the Woman's Affairs Council of the University of Pennsylvania Student Government organized a symposium entitled "The Role of the University in the Urban Community". "Black militants" from the community were invited, but the African Americans chose instead to boycott the event, and it seemed that volunteers from the University were "hated wherever they tried to help in the ghetto."<sup>101</sup> It became readily apparent that "the University [was] one of the most despised 'establishments' in the area."<sup>102</sup>

Students, faculty, and friends of Penn became increasingly interested in helping West Philadelphia in some way. Another of the University efforts in the community was the creation of a new administrative position in the fall of 1969. Francis M. Betts III was the first to fill the new post of Assistant President for External Affairs. In an interview with the *Pennsylvania Gazette* where he defined his job as liaison between the University and the community, Betts said, "I try to help people on and off campus to see that they have a mutual interest in solving problems which affect us all."<sup>103</sup> Betts appointment was a

---

<sup>99</sup> Beck, Lawrence and Stephen Kerstetter, "Residents Suspicious of University," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 27 January 1967

<sup>100</sup> Harnwell, Gaylord, "An Era in Which Today's Problems do not Come in Yesterday's Categories," *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, December 1966

<sup>101</sup> Arkow, Phil, "Subtle Hatred of the University's Guts displayed by the Community," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 14 October 1968

<sup>102</sup> Ibid.

<sup>103</sup> "Pennsylvania Struggles to Identify Its Role in the Urban Community," *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, April 1970, 20-24



positive overture by the University in relating to the community, but it only took Frank Betts six months in the position to realize that the bad relationship between the two communities needed more than a quick fix. He stated, “I am getting the message that lies beyond rhetoric and is often obscured by it. Instead of just reaching out to hyperbole, I’m coming to understand—and I think the University is also—community need and fear and resentment.”<sup>104</sup> What Betts figured out, and what many overlook, both then and today, is that the existence alone of a powerful white institution in a community of unaffiliated and relatively powerless African Americans is enough to cause fear and resentment.

The community held the University back in its attempts to aid the neighborhood. African Americans were afraid of the “establishment”, and to them “the University was just another part of the ‘establishment’...blacks [did not] distinguish between the University, the Redevelopment Authority and the West Philadelphia Corporation. They [did not] even distinguish between students and faculty members.”<sup>105</sup> Many times the neighborhood assumed that those who offered to help were only offering for their own selfish reasons. Skepticism, fear, and anger characterized the evolving voice of the community towards the University in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s, and are best described in the following excerpt:

They [the community] believe the lies that the University is tearing down their houses out of hatred, that the University is getting government funds for research on riot control, that campus guards are armed specifically to shoot neighborhood people.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Ibid.

<sup>105</sup> Ted Hershberg quoted by Phil Arkow in “Subtle Hatred of the University’s Guts Displayed by Neighbors,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 14 October 1968

<sup>106</sup> Ibid.

The community truly believed that the University was out to get them, and in reaction to their fear the West Philadelphia Community sought justice by destruction. A quote from one of Penn's neighbors illustrates this desire for destruction; "One local resident said he couldn't wait until 'you build that (University City) Science Center' 'Why' Hershberg asked. 'Because we're going to burn it down' was the reply."<sup>107</sup>

The community surrounding the University was scared of Penn because to them the University represented the authority that throughout American history had been oppressing African Americans. Intense fear, distrust, and resentment pervaded West Philadelphia. Not only would African American community residents not accept help from the University, but also they believed steadfastly that the University was out to get them. Fear led to anger—and anger to resentment—which then led to rage and often manifested itself in violence. William Grier and Price Cobbs propose their theory of "Black Rage" in their book of that same title. This theory is one interpretation that helps to make sense of West Philadelphia's negative feelings towards the University of Pennsylvania:

The message is simple—that despite the passage of five civil rights bills since 1957, despite the erosion of legal supports for segregated institutions, despite greater acceptance of Negroes into our major institutions, both public and private, it is still no easy thing to be black in America. As the authors put it, this is to say that for the average Negro 'so much time has passed and so little has changed.' The civilization that tolerated slavery dropped its slaveholding cloak but the inner feelings remained...the practices of slavery stopped over a hundred years ago, but the minds of our citizens have never been freed.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> United States Senator Fred R. Harris in "Foreword" to *Black Rage* May 1968, vii-viii

The notion described above—that African Americans brought the feelings of hatred, fear, and marginalization from the South—sheds light on the relationship between Penn and West Philadelphia. However, African American historical experience does not fully explain the feelings of anger and fear that existed on the part of the West Philadelphia community. African American feelings towards the University gained substance with various acts of commission by Penn such as the William Bradley case, and other University initiatives such as the guaranteed mortgage program for faculty and staff. The unjust arrest of William Bradley for the rape of a White woman served as proof to the African American community that the University was against them. The guaranteed mortgage program, initiated in 1965, (from the University's point of view) aided in the creation of a residential community in West Philadelphia, which, was seen by many West Philadelphians as a way for the University to establish a White buffer zone between themselves and West Philadelphia.

In searching for solutions to the problems confronting the University and the community, the authors of *Black Rage* make a compelling case. They argue convincingly that in order to understand African Americans fully, one must understand the history of African Americans in America. According to them, “most [African Americans] harbor wounds of yesterday...The black man today is at one end of a psychological continuum which reaches back in time to his enslaved ancestors.”<sup>109</sup> Following this argument even after slavery officially ended, African Americans were continually oppressed by Jim Crow legislation in the South. As African Americans moved North from the Deep South they were not able to forget or forgive the way they, or their ancestors, were treated. Instead, they were skeptical of institutional intent, and in the case of Penn and West Philadelphia,

afraid of the implications of living in such close proximity to something they had been conditioned for so long to distrust:

Consider too what would be proper conduct if one were an oppressed member of a helpless minority held in effective bondage by a majority which not only has numbers in its favor but is a majority of intellectual supermen as well. If a person had such a view, he would develop an extremely suspicious way of life. He would adopt a frightened, comered, panicky, paranoid way of thinking.<sup>110</sup>

Grier and Cobbs continue further, providing a sympathetic explanation of African American adaptation to oppression, one which suggests the origin of some aspects of rage and violence:

The mother is generally perceived as having been sharply contradictory...The Black man remembers that his mother underwent frequent and rapid shifts of mood. He remembers the cruelty...She must intuitively cut off and blunt his masculine assertiveness and aggression lest these put the boy's life in jeopardy.<sup>111</sup>

The psychological outcome seems clear they say, there are “no more psychological tricks blacks can play upon themselves to make it possible to exist in dreadful circumstances...Only a welling tide risen out of all those terrible years of grief, now a tidal wave of fury and rage, and all black, black as night.”<sup>112</sup>

A more recent best seller *Common Ground*, a book by Anthony Lukas, explores the tension, anger, and fear between neighborhood communities and classes in Boston during the late 1960's and 1970's. Lukas's thesis also centers on rage, but unlike Grier and Cobb's account, which focuses solely on black rage, *Common Ground* is the story of everyone's rage:

---

<sup>109</sup> Grier and Cobbs *Black Rage*, 24

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 192

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*

Of this I can be sure, that Boston and America are both diverse. That very diversity—if there is not deep, honest conversation and dialogue on all sides—can lead to misunderstanding. Misunderstanding can lead to hostility and hostility to destruction.<sup>113</sup>

Two fairly homogeneous communities in close proximity to one another, the University of Pennsylvania and West Philadelphia, are diverse socioeconomically and racially. Lukas would argue that these differences create the basis for serious misunderstanding, even violence, regardless of race. In a situation where groups with different traditions and values coexist side by side, the same action or event is interpreted differently in each community. Misinterpretation is a problem in the relationship between Penn and West Philadelphia as it only adds to preexisting feelings of rage. Throughout Lukas' argument, rage lies just below the surface, ready to rise and explode under the right concatenation of adverse events:

An equally important motive [for crime] was racial—and class hostility—some young Blacks hated Whites, convinced that they had enslaved, exploited, and misused Black people so long that the gang was justified in taking whatever it could in return...gentrification had laid bare the chasm between the White middle class and the Black working/welfare class. Such indignities prompted some young Blacks to lash out at Whites in violent street crimes. For others, it provided a rhetorical justification, a rationalization for crimes they would have committed anyway.<sup>114</sup>

The differences between the University and West Philadelphia communities were obvious, and Lukas's thesis states that these differences were enough to initiate the volatile situation that existed.

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., 213

<sup>113</sup> Lukas, Anthony. *Common Ground*, 362

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., 422

The idea of rage is integral to understanding the feelings of the West Philadelphia community. As African American anger emerged in the aftermath of civil rights legislation, American cities became the battleground for a problem that was 350 years in the making. The relationship between the University of Pennsylvania and the African American community of Philadelphia deteriorated in the conflict that enveloped the nation. The rage of the African American community manifested itself not only against the University, but also against white America everywhere. The University responded defensively, protecting its own interests, and only further alienating the West Philadelphia community.

## Chapter 4

### A COP ON EVERY CORNER?

*“More security? —I don’t think anything could cut it out (recent crime on campus) except a total police state around here.”<sup>115</sup>*

*The Daily Pennsylvanian*

October 14, 1971

Understanding the sentiment of the University community surrounding the issues of crime on campus is critical in evaluating the University’s response to combat crime on campus. Chronicling crimes committed on campus or against members of the University community, as well as the University’s reaction to crime from 1966 to 1973, will support the theory that in response to increased crime Penn created a security state on campus. Penn’s requirement for increased security directly followed the successful campaign by female students for increased personal freedoms. This chronicle is important because no substantive crime report or statistics exist, and this paper attempts to piece together the reality of crime on campus. The University intended only to protect those working or studying at Penn, but in the process of protecting members of the University community, Penn ostracized the surrounding West Philadelphia community.

The first issue of *The Daily Pennsylvanian* for the 1966-1967 school year, published September 8, 1966, related the story of a murder that occurred on campus over the summer. On August 22, 1966 Roslyn Reibenstien was found “stabbed to death in an apartment at 3804 Locust Street.”<sup>116</sup> Reibenstien was only at Penn for the summer, but her roommate was a Penn student. The murder occurred shortly after University of Pennsylvania women won the right to live in off-campus apartments, and in the wake of

---

<sup>115</sup> U. Coeds not surprised by Crime,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 14 October 1971

the murder the University announced that it would begin inspecting all apartments occupied by Penn women. The murder caused the University to take back some of the autonomy granted to women at Penn, however it also washed its hands of any responsibility for the murder because the victim was not a Penn student and the attack did not take place on University property.

In November 1966 there was a series of articles in *the Daily Pennsylvanian* relating to campus crime. One article declared that a “rising tide of crime and violence [had] struck the University.”<sup>117</sup> Two incidents were reported in the same night, the first, a gunfight that had occurred on Sansom Street between 36<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Streets, and in the second incident a Penn senior was held at gunpoint. The article suggested that the two attacks were related, but because “the Philadelphia Police often pick[ed] up suspects within the University area” it was difficult for campus police to keep the Penn community alert to the possibility of crime.<sup>118</sup> In addition, “the shooting incident [became] just one more exciting episode in an action-packed series of burglaries, beatings, and miscellaneous acts of lawlessness that kept University area residents jumpy all semester.”<sup>119</sup> In response to the increase in crime during the fall semester, the University hired additional guards from a private detective agency. In cities in the 1960’ s, it was common for community groups and institutions to call for more central police protection and the University followed this pattern. The additional guards brought the total Penn security force to ten campus guards and three Philadelphia Police officers

---

<sup>116</sup> Wilen, Dennis, “Reibenstien Murder Sparks Inspection of Apartments,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 8 September 1966

<sup>117</sup> “Assaults and Robberies on the Rise,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 22 November 1966

<sup>118</sup> “Gun Fight Sr. Escapes Injury,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 15 November 1966

<sup>119</sup> “Gun Fight on 36<sup>th</sup> Street,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 15 November 1966



with access to one car and one scooter to ensure the safety of 18,000 students and 4,000 faculty members.<sup>120</sup>

Between the spring of 1967 and the fall of 1968 there was only one report of violent crime in *The Daily Pennsylvanian*. On February 6, 1968 a female student was raped in her dorm room at 38<sup>th</sup> and Chestnut Streets at 7pm. The woman had left her door ajar when she went across the hall, and she was assaulted and robbed of fifteen dollars upon returning to her room; she described her attacker as “a 16 or 17 year old Negro.”<sup>121</sup> While this was the only incident to be publicized, President Harnwell “[announced] steps to increase campus safety” in September 1968.<sup>122</sup> Harnwell’s decision came after a bill was put before the UPSG requesting a “reevaluation of the function and size of campus cops, inspection of outdoor lighting, self-defense classes, and the creation of a community relations board.”<sup>123</sup> This call for increased security and crime awareness by the student body would not have come unwarranted even though there is not much evidence for its necessity. From this, one concludes that there must have been many instances of crime that went untold on Penn’s campus.

Beginning in the fall of 1968, reported crime in *The Daily Pennsylvanian* exploded. In reaction to a string of homicides and assaults near Penn, a West Philadelphia woman said, “I’ve lived here 23 years...I remember when you used to be able to watch the children play games in the street until long after dark. Now you’d have to be a god damn fool to be on the streets after 6pm.”<sup>124</sup> The same article stated that

---

<sup>120</sup> “Assaults and Robberies on the Rise,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 22 November 1966

<sup>121</sup> Storm, William J. “Intruder Rapes Penn Coed in Campus Dorm,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 9 February 1968

<sup>122</sup> “Local Campus Guards Increased”, *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 16 September 1968

<sup>123</sup> News Bureau Letter introducing Ruth UARC, Box 250, FF 11

<sup>124</sup> “Madden, Stuart, “Residence Scared as Violence Mounts in U. Area,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 4 November 1968

people were afraid to go outside, and that “robberies and beatings [were] so common in the area [that they] scarcely [gained] attention.”

On December 14<sup>th</sup>, 1968 just before the University’s holiday vacation William Carson, a history graduate student, was murdered at 46<sup>th</sup> and Larchwood Avenue. In a letter to the parents of the slain graduate student President Harnwell wrote, “I cannot tell you how deeply distressed all of the University community is at the cruel crime committed in our own neighborhood that took the life of your son.”<sup>125</sup> While Harnwell was “deeply distressed,” teachers, friends, and colleagues of William Carson were outraged. In two letters to Dr. David Goddard, University Provost, the History Department faculty and graduate students spoke out angrily against the murder of William Carson:

As members of the Department of History at the University of Pennsylvania, and at the occasion of the tragic death of one of our friends and students, we feel that it is our responsibility to do all that we can to change University City conditions so that such incidents no longer take place.

We of the History Department feel that it is the responsibility of the University trustees and administration, both as individuals and as men entrusted with the continued growth and well being of the University, to concern themselves with the quality of life in the community around them. But even more immediately and concretely, the University does have the minimal responsibility of safeguarding the lives and well-being of its students when the well-being is threatened by their very attendance at the University.

Thus far the University’s only gesture towards the University City Community has been the relatively passive one of supplying mortgage support to faculty members. This clearly is inadequate. Though perhaps of only marginal significance in terms of the ultimate needs of Philadelphians, the trustees and administration must

---

<sup>125</sup> Gaylord Harnwell Letter, 16 December 1968 UPF 8.5, News Bureau, Box 250 FF 14

immediately exert their influence to secure more adequate lighting in University City.

If the Philadelphia officials are not responsive, then we strongly urge the University to investigate the possibility of employing its own police in close cooperation with the Philadelphia Police Department to patrol the are.

The alternatives seem clear. If present conditions continue, faculty members will leave the vicinity and in some cases the University as well. Students will avoid attending an institution in the vicinity of which such conditions exist. And local residents (including students and faculty) may well ultimately have to organize for their own protection. None of these contingencies are consistent with either the immediate practical interests of the University or its general responsibility to the community which supports it.<sup>126</sup>

*The above letter was signed by Professors Charles Rosenberg, Edward Peters, Theodore Hershberg, Alan Charles Kors, Michael Zuckerman, John L. Shover, Werner Gundersheimer, Wallace E. Davies, Martin Wolfe, Alfred J. Rieber, James C. Davis, F. Hilary Conroy, Richard S. Dunn, Richard R. Beeman, Alexander Rissanovsky, Perry Viles, Jack Reece, Otakar Odlozilik, Vincent J. Walsh Jr., and Holden Furber, and fourteen history graduate students.*

Outraged by the violent crime that took the life of William Carson and the overall situation of crime in West Philadelphia, the History Department accused, threatened, and then made suggestions to the University for improving the crime situation. The Department wrote that the safety of Penn students and faculty on campus, as well as in West Philadelphia, was under the University's jurisdiction. And if the University Trustees and administration did not concern themselves with the surrounding community, Penn as an institution would suffer because students and faculty scared for their lives would leave West Philadelphia and the University. Tackling the problem, the authors realized, would be difficult, but they did suggest that the University should begin by

---

<sup>126</sup> UARC 8.5 News Bureau, Box 250, FF 14.

using its political power to lobby the City for improved lighting and increased police patrols.

The death of William Carson was not highly publicized, and the story did not make the pages of *The Daily Pennsylvanian* until February 1969, but two days after the above letter was written the University created a position to “coordinate institutional, community and City governmental agency resources needed to combat violence in the campus area of University City.”<sup>127</sup> On December 18, 1968, just four days after the murder of William Carson, President Hamwell appointed Henry Ruth, an Associate Professor of law, to the new position. Hamwell described Ruth’s appointment as “one of a number of steps which [has] been undertaken in the interest of providing additional security measures for members of the University Community who live and work in the campus area.”<sup>128</sup>

But even after Ruth’s appointment, the University responded slowly with measures to increase security. Along with Ruth’s appointment, the University set up meetings with Philadelphia Police and extended the routes and hours of the campus bus service. The letter from the History Department, and Ruth’s resulting appointment as crime coordinator, proves that as early as 1969 the University was aware of the dangerous nature of crime in the area surrounding the University. Unfortunately, the realization that crime existed did not solve the problem, and over the next couple of years the University would be forced to evaluate its role in protecting Penn students and faculty. Was Penn responsible for student and faculty safety when they were off campus but in the University City neighborhood? After a long fight to end the relationship of *in*

---

<sup>127</sup> UARC UPF 8.5, News Bureau, Box 250 FF 14.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*

*loco parentis* between the University and female students, could the administration reinstate curfews and other measures to ensure students safety? Was it fair to increase patrols in the neighborhood so that there was a cop on every corner and neighbors felt as if they were in the middle of a war zone? As crime in West Philadelphia continued to rise, these questions and others faced the University.

In the first two months of 1969 two women were assaulted and one was raped. In January, a student nurse was attacked in the lobby of her apartment building on 44<sup>th</sup> street, and in early February a student was assaulted at 3943 Locust Street and a second student was raped in Cheston Hall dorm at 38<sup>th</sup> and Chestnut streets.<sup>129</sup> In response to that rape, the residents of Cheston Hall “insisted on constructive improvements immediately to ensure against further tragedies.”<sup>130</sup> Some students requested that bars and locks be placed on all dorm windows—an interesting request when only three years earlier the same students fought for the right to be “unlocked” from the dorms.

Another University student was raped in June 1969, and by the beginning of the fall 1969 semester, the University had begun to implement new security measures. Emergency, or blue light, phones with direct links to the campus guardhouse were installed, and “with the advent of optional self-regulated curfew for upper-class women and the accompanying security problems” night clerks were hired to guard the entranceways of women’s dorms.<sup>131</sup> Only 18 months after women won the right to have their dorms opened the University was forced by students for their safety to place guards in female dorms. Security was increased on campus, but still a female student was raped in December in an administrative building on campus. This rape went unreported, and it

---

<sup>129</sup> “Student Nurse Attacked in Lobby,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 23 January 1969

<sup>130</sup> “Two Coeds Sexually Assaulted,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 10 February 1969

was only after the *Philadelphia Inquirer* reported the story that the Penn community was informed leaving people to question how many other crimes went unreported by the University.

Unfortunately, the new year and the new semester ushered in gross criminal displays. Francis George, a senior in the College was stabbed to death in early February 1970; George was killed while walking to his car in Powelton Village at 1:30 AM. Later that month, a female student was “molested in a campus rest room by five teenage boys.”<sup>132</sup> In February 1970, in response to this rampant crime activity, the campus security force was altered when the University hired Donald Shultis as Penn’s Director of Security and Safety. Hiring Shultis was the first of many acts by Penn to professionalize its security force. Prior to Penn, Shultis served as Director of Security for the United States Air Force. He was brought to the University of Pennsylvania “to do something about problems about which something should be done. Like an alarming increase in robberies and burglaries. Like a patina of fear that overlies the campus at night...”<sup>133</sup> The end of a campus security system run by the Buildings and Grounds Department brought a prediction from the *Gazette* in its November 1971 edition that described the change in security personnel as the end to crime at Penn. The *Gazette*’s optimism proved far from true. While Shultis and his men made improvements in campus security, they were also irresponsible by not reporting all of the crime that actually occurred at Penn.

---

<sup>131</sup> “Safety Measures put into Effect in the Women’s Dorm,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 9 September 1969

<sup>132</sup> Montgomery, Charles “5 Youths seized in Burglary, Molesting of Penn Coed,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 24 February 1970

<sup>133</sup> Mandel, William K. “In Base With the Fuzz,” *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, November 1971

In November 1970 a headline in *The Daily Pennsylvanian* read, “Superblock Security Deemed Ineffective Following Incidents.”<sup>134</sup> This article indicated that crime was prevalent in Superblock dorms, but there was no public record or accountability for this crime. The article stated that the largest problem in the dorms was that non-residents had free access to the buildings. The administration needed to devise a system where only residents were allowed to wander through the dorms and visitors would be signed into the building. In the spring of that school year a stricter policy was realized, but not before other University students became victims of violent crime. “Robberies, vandalism and assault of female residents have necessitated Superblock security policy...students [were] required to produce their matric card to enter, non-students [had to be] sponsored.”<sup>135</sup> Security in campus dorms was tightened early in the spring of 1971, but in March Superblock residents were victimized again.

The Quad increased security regulations in September 1971 making them consistent with those in Superblock. After armed robberies, a grand larceny, and “many non-students milling around” the Quad was in need of visitor control; a month later two rapes and one assault were reported on campus. A female student was assaulted and raped in a Penn parking garage at 32<sup>nd</sup> and Walnut Streets, and only 24 hours after that attack a rape in High Rise North and an assault in Low Rise North occurred totaling three rapes within a 48 hour period. The female student attacked in Low Rise North claimed that “[she] woke up and this black guy was on the bed ripping the sheets off [her].”<sup>136</sup> The man was armed and stabbed the student in the leg. The University’s response to this

---

<sup>134</sup> “Superblock Security Deemed Ineffective Following Incidents,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 25 November 1970

<sup>135</sup> Ibid.

<sup>136</sup> Silver, Michael “Two Coeds Assaulted in Local Crimes,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 12 October 1971

attack was frustrating. Director of Safety Shultis stated that “when his men first heard of the incident [in Low Rise North] they thought it might have been a dream.”<sup>137</sup> It is interesting that Shultis thought two women could have the exact same dream, especially since the director of High Rise South confirmed that “the same thing happened last week to another girl.”<sup>138</sup> Accusations that “Shultis [had] in his two years made a conscious and deliberate attempt to foster the impression that little or no crime exists on the University campus” prevailed.<sup>139</sup>

Covering up campus crime was dangerous to the University community because students and faculty were given a false sense of security. If the earlier assault had been publicized it may have been possible for the later assaults to have been prevented. Three hours after the student in Low Rise North was beaten, a female student was raped in High Rise North. The aftermath of the October crimes proved that the new rules in Superblock had done little to increase security there, instead they “only succeeded with infusing each [dorm] with the atmosphere of a prison.”<sup>140</sup>

Similar to previous years, the first edition of *The Daily Pennsylvanian* in the fall of 1972 declared that the University had “renew[ed] [its] crime fight”<sup>141</sup> The article discussed University plans to use “sophisticated electronic crime prevention equipment and greater student cooperation” in order limit the climbing crime rate in West Philadelphia.<sup>142</sup> Over 700 crimes were reported on campus during the year ending June 30, 1972, and of those crimes one homicide, seven rapes, and 500 plus robberies,

---

<sup>137</sup> Ibid.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid.

<sup>139</sup> “Campus Security,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 14 October 1971

<sup>140</sup> “Superblock Security,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 28 October 1971

<sup>141</sup> Kahn, James “Campus Security Unit Renews Crime Fight,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 7 September 1972

<sup>142</sup> Ibid.



burglaries and larcenies were reported. A common feature on campus today, the computerized card swiper was introduced in the fall of 1972, and the machine was tested in one of the medical lab doorways. Volunteers from the Crew and Football teams, dubbed the “mod squad,” aided the campus police in patrolling the University. Finally, in order to gain entry to Penn dorms after 10PM, desk clerks were required to check students’ mailbox keys. Even with the University implemented security, a group of Penn women “organized a patrol to deter assaults on women.”<sup>143</sup> This group was organized in response to rape statistics that rose in comparison to other crime statistics.

Events of the fall of 1972 again shadow earlier years, as after an attempted rape at 40<sup>th</sup> and Pine Streets an article in a December *Daily Pennsylvanian* disclosed that possibly ten rapes had occurred since the beginning of the semester.<sup>144</sup> Even with increased security students were not safe. The 1972-73 academic year proved to be one of the most treacherous in terms of reported rape and assault. A female student on her way home from class was forced into a car and then dragged into some bushes and raped near 43<sup>rd</sup> and Locust Streets in December 1972. In January, a University employee was raped on the second floor of Houston Hall. It was becoming increasingly difficult to ensure the security of Penn academic and administrative buildings, as they were open to the public. Even after the rape in Houston Hall some felt that “you can’t confront and embarrass every non-University juvenile who comes onto campus.”<sup>145</sup> On the other hand, some felt that it seemed “more reasonable to embarrass a few non-members of the

---

<sup>143</sup> Daniszweski, John “Women Attempt to Form a Campus Rape Patrol,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 30 November 1972

<sup>144</sup> Berger, Mitchell “Police Disclose Possibility of Ten Rapes in University Area,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 12 December 1972

<sup>145</sup> “U Employee Raped by Teen,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 22 January 1973

University community than to facilitate rape.”<sup>146</sup> One proposal was to issue activity permits to all those without a Penn ID that had business in Penn buildings. This idea never took hold however, and the University Community responded only with some increased awareness that rape existed on campus and people needed to be careful.

During one week in March five Penn women reported being victims of rape. Two student nurses “were raped six times each and robbed by a gang of youths in an alley near 33<sup>rd</sup> and Chestnut Streets.”<sup>147</sup> A 19-year-old woman was forced off the subway and raped at the 34<sup>th</sup> and Market Street stop, and that same day two women were robbed and raped at the 37<sup>th</sup> and Spruce Street subway stop. Outrage, fear, and disgust fueled reaction to the rapes on campus and the administration’s refusal to make the attacks public. In an internal memo, University officials showed their displeasure with the publicity generated from the attacks stating, “Gaddis is mad at Shultis and also said that the PR people aren’t doing their job because stories are appearing on the radio relating to rapes at the University of Pennsylvania.”<sup>148</sup> *The Daily Pennsylvanian* and the Penn community at large only found out about the attacks after accounts were given on the radio or printed in the Philadelphia papers. Some students were afraid to be alone at night and some felt inconvenienced at finding a group to walk with, as other students remained unaware of the attacks.

In the wake of the brutal March, attacks and in order to make the University community safer by both finding a way to successfully increase security and to educate the community about crimes that had occurred and ways to prevent them in the future,

---

<sup>146</sup> “Activity Permits Could Prevent Rapes on Campus,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 24 January 1973

<sup>147</sup> Gaffney, John “Two Student Nurses Raped by Gang of Six,” *The Bulletin*, 22 March 1973

<sup>148</sup> UARC UPF 8.5 News Bureau, Box 250, FF 13.

women began to discuss the possibility of taking action against the University.<sup>149</sup> There had been eight rapes on Penn's campus between September 1971 and May 1972, and women at Penn faulted Shultis "for inefficient and inadequate security precautions" and decided to take matters into their own hands.<sup>150</sup> Penn women were frustrated. They had fought hard for freedom from *in loco parentis* and equal opportunity at the University but the freedom "was worthless if women's activities were curtailed by the threat of rape."<sup>151</sup> In protest to increased rape in the University area, women planned a rally and sit-in and planned to remain until the University accepted their demands.

The protest began on April 3, 1973 with a rally. In a speech, College for Women sophomore Tory Henley accurately captured the mood of women on campus:

I am here today because I decided a couple of days ago that I had to do something; I could no longer stand by and let others do it for me. I am alarmed about the crime situation at Penn. I am extremely worried about my safety as a female member of the Penn community and I am outraged by what I consider negligence on the part of the University.<sup>152</sup>

Some of the women's demands included: installation of sodium lights, increased campus bus service, more alarms, installation of more blue light phones, a improved escort service, rape services in the form of medical, legal and psychological services for rape victims, free self-defense classes, and the creation of a women's center.<sup>153</sup> The women's requests were almost identical to those made of the University years earlier after the

---

<sup>149</sup> Ginsburg, Peter "Panel Discusses Methods of Defense Against Rape," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 29 March 1973

<sup>150</sup> Ibid.

<sup>151</sup> Murphy, Maralin "Women Plan College Hall Protest; Meeting, sit-in set for Tuesday," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 2 April 1973

<sup>152</sup> "Responsibility to Ourselves" Speech by Tory Henly printed in *The Daily Pennsylvanian* 5 April 1973

<sup>153</sup> UARC UPF 8.5 News Bureau, Box 250 FF 13

murder of William Carson. The protest went on for four days as a team of negotiators made up of administration and students discussed the women's demands.

President Meyerson issued the following statement in response to the protest:

...the concern of all of us at the University of Pennsylvania for the safety and security of the members of the University Community has been heightened by the recent assaults of women in the vicinity of campus. I have appointed Alice Emerson, Dean of Students to coordinate University efforts to help prevent and deal with such outrages and to develop effective measures for the aftercare of victims.<sup>154</sup>

The University responded positively to the protest, commending the women for the manner in which they conducted themselves. After four days of negotiations, an agreement was reached and the protest ended. The negotiating team had agreed on the majority of measures proposed by the women. First, a committee of seven students and four faculty members was formed to "implement and maintain measures to improve security for women."<sup>155</sup> University bus service was expanded, and more blue light phones and outdoor lighting were installed. Security in residence halls was increased and a female security specialist was appointed. The Women's Center was established as well as self-defense classes and victim services. The protest was seen as a success by all involved. It served as a catalyst for the University and students in defining their post *in loco parentis* relationship.

The rape protest concluded a long period of violent crime on Penn's campus with the implementation of safety provisions that had been suggested as early as 1968 in the aftermath of William Carson's death. The protest had publicized the problem of crime, particularly violent crime, against women on campus. The public outcry allowed the

---

<sup>154</sup> UARC UPF 8.5 News Bureau, Box 250 FF 13

<sup>155</sup> "Plan to Improve Security for Women at Penn.," *The Almanac* April 1973

University to alter its relationship with students for a second time in order to provide for their safety. The administration moved towards a strong stance on security as student fears coincided with the trend of professional security forces on college campuses around the nation.

Today the top campus security forces—those at Wayne State University in Detroit, the University of Utah, and the University of Pennsylvania to name a few—are more professional than, it is said, police forces in a number of small communities across the United States.<sup>156</sup>

As early as 1969 the University administration began thinking about ending the era of “campus cops” whose self-described role in combating campus security issues was the following:<sup>157</sup>

We are not a police organization, nor are we a detective bureau. Our job is, primarily, to protect the buildings and grounds of the University. We also try to protect the student—mostly from himself.<sup>158</sup>

The new position of Director of Safety and Security created in October 1969, and filled by Donald Shultis in February of 1971, required that the new director have “extensive specialized training in law enforcement and crime detection, and at least ten years of relevant professional experience preferably including service in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.”<sup>159</sup> Shultis did not have FBI experience, but he did have both a BA and an MA as well as a long military career culminating in the position of Director of Security for the United States Air Force. During Shultis’s tenure, Penn was focused on the continual betterment of its security office:

---

<sup>156</sup> Nutch, David “Crime Emerges as No. 1 Campus Problem,” *Christian Science Monitor*, 20 March 1973

<sup>157</sup> UARC Martin Meyerson Papers Box 311 FF 8. A job description existed for a “Director of safety and Security” as early as 1969, however, Donald Shultis was the first person hired under that title in 1970

<sup>158</sup> Savitz, Edward “Captain Barcus Defines Duty of Campus Guards to University,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 9 February 1961

<sup>159</sup> UARC Martin Meyerson Papers Box 311 FF 8

We would like to report that our faculty, students and staff are absolutely safe and secure at Penn, that no one will be hurt or be a victim of crime. But we can't say that. The people working toward that end, we would like to say are, are of the highest professional level of qualification. We can't say that either. But we are evolving in that direction through selection and training.<sup>160</sup>

If Shultis's appointment marked the beginning of professional security for Penn, then his successor David Johnston is proof that Penn finally achieved its goal of professionalization of security at the University.

David Johnston came to Penn in 1977 from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst where he served as their Director of Public Safety. Penn's Vice President for Operational Services Fred Shabel said of Johnston, "He is truly a professional in the field of public safety and I welcome him to Penn."<sup>161</sup> As reflected by his qualifications, Johnston was a true expert in the field of law enforcement having received his BA in Police Administration and Public Safety, and then his MA in Criminal Justice. Johnston also served a police officer in New York, California, and Michigan. By 1977 the University had effectively cultivated a professional security force, however the higher caliber of security did not come without some cost to the University's relationship with West Philadelphia. With an effective security state, Penn reinforced the skepticism and fear held by the surrounding community towards the University.

Measures taken to secure the University community in the wake of exploding crime meant that suspicion and fear followed most non Penn people or those who appeared to be unaffiliated with the University, around campus. In a letter to the editor of *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, one student wrote:

---

<sup>160</sup> Safety and Security annual report 1971-72 UARC Martin Meyerson Papers Box 311 FF 18

<sup>161</sup> UARC UPF 8.5 Biographical Files, Box 71 FF 1

I would like to express my disgust at the so-called tighter security measures initiated by campus security. Twice, following incidents which occurred on campus involving robbery and rape (of mostly white students) my fiancé has been picked up by the security force because he was walking in the quad after dark and he doesn't have a U of P ID. If you are going to tighten security do it for everybody (or would the University suggest that sisters escort their men around campus after dark)?<sup>162</sup>

What effect did increased security measures have on the community? Some argued that the University could not “give up or run scared [or] demand a cop on every corner. [They] must continue to live freely and openly and hope that some answers will be found quickly...,” but instead the University should continue its previous commitment by searching to “find solutions to the agonizing problems of the cities.”<sup>163</sup> As violent crimes increased the University struggled to find a way to protect itself. Evidence suggests that the necessary precautions and increased security measures pushed the community surrounding Penn further away.

What if an African American man walked through campus with out a U of P ID? Penn is in his neighborhood, but he was regarded with fear and suspicion. The policy requiring a Matric card (today a Penn card) to enter buildings reinforced the idea that anyone without a membership card was not welcome at Penn. Life under Jim Crow laws in the South was not a distant memory for many West Philadelphians, and increased security measures by the predominantly White University must have felt a lot like a return to segregation.

---

<sup>162</sup> Deborah Shelton Letter to the Editor, *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 10 April 1973

<sup>163</sup> Riley, John and Jeff Rothbard, “Campus Security,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 10 February 1969

## CONCLUSIONS

*What White Americans have never fully understood—and what the Negro can never forget—is that White society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, White institutions maintain it, White society condones it.*<sup>164</sup>

Kerner Commission Report 1968  
quoted by Anthony Lukas in *Common Ground*

This paper set out to question the existing conventional wisdom regarding the relationship between the University of Pennsylvania and West Philadelphia, but the theory that displacement due to Penn's physical plant expansion in the 1950's and 1960's was the root cause of the conflict appeared far too simplistic an explanation for such a complex problem. Displacement serves as a tangible and easy concept to grasp, and for this reason it has been blamed by University and City publications, students, faculty, and others affiliated with the University for the existing negative relationship between Penn and the community

Searching for information to absolve partially displacement of its negative stigma brought to light many other conflicts and issues between Penn and West Philadelphia that partly contributed to the relationship that previously was blamed solely on displacement. The physical plant expansion of the 1950's and 1960's allowed the University to increase its enrollment as new dorms were created. Penn's capacity to house female students increased exponentially, and as Hill Hall opened in 1962 the University was forced to confront how it would relate to these new students. In the early years of Hill House, there was not resentment from females over the inequities they suffered in comparison to their male peers. However, by 1966 women at Penn became frustrated with the University policy of *in loco parentis* and demanded that Penn move



towards defining a new role that would allow women greater personal freedoms. In response to the female student's demands, the University liberalized its social policies, and women were given increased responsibilities. They could have men in their dorm rooms, curfews ended, the dress code was abolished, women were allowed to spend the night out without informing dorm mothers of their plans, and upper class women were allowed to move off campus into private apartments. The reforms enacted in response to *in loco parentis* caused many students both female and male to move away from the University's protective cover, and while others decided to live in the newly erected Superblock many students chose to live in off campus apartments. Ironically, just as students were moving further into the West Philadelphia community the crime rate there was exploding and Penn students became easy targets for criminal attacks. Increased crime against members of the University community forced Penn to evaluate its responsibility for protecting students and faculty. In light of the recent changes in social policy, protecting students from crime might also usurp some of the freedom gained by the end of *in loco parentis*. The eventual University response to rising crime on and around campus was to increase security. The professionalization of security at Penn coincided with similar moments around the country. The hiring of Donald Shelties as Director of Safety and Security for Penn in 1971 marked the creation of a security state at the University. Surrounded by a skeptical and angry community, the security state at Penn reinforced the differences between the two communities and increased resentment, anger, and fear felt by both the West Philadelphia community and the University.

Colleges and universities serve as quintessential examples of stable institutions in American society, and, conflict between urban institutions and the

---

<sup>164</sup> Lukas, Anthony J. *Common Ground* (New York) 8

communities that surround them are common. Tension between the two sides has developed from a mutual misunderstanding, and in many cases, White universities impose their own value system on the surrounding community. In response the communities skirting urban universities, most of which tend to be majority African American, feel dominated and pushed around by the university:

Along with isolation, comes increased crime and resultant barricade mentality on campus since Blacks begin to view the University with hostility, envy and frustration.<sup>165</sup>

Ken Klinck, coordinator of the Community Involvement Council states clearly the animosity that is visible between the University and West Philadelphia communities.

The existing problems between Penn and West Philadelphia are complicated, and that is why the simple explanation of displacement is not entirely accurate. In fact, displacement, the end of *in loco parentis*, changing racial and socioeconomic demographics and increased crime together created the mutual fear and anger that has existed between Penn and the community. The confluence of the above events provides evidence to conclude that an alternate explanation for Penn's negative relationship is convincing.

Currently, the University is in the midst of a second wave of development and expansion. With the legacy of the initial development cycle casting a negative spin on Penn's current expansion it is important to reevaluate the common knowledge. This paper has shown that expansion and development do not deserve total of the blame for the bad relationship between Penn and West Philadelphia. Instead, the problem comes from misunderstanding, fear and confusion on the part of the University community and the West Philadelphia community. By questioning the common knowledge people will

see that blame should be placed on both sides and that there are no quick fixes or clear-cut answers to solve the problems that still exist between Penn and West Philadelphia. However, by reopening the debate over the legacy of Penn's first wave of expansion and development it might be possible to improve community relations at present. In terms of solutions arguably the best one was proposed in a *Daily Pennsylvanian* editorial in 1969, "We must understand our neighbors, not segregate ourselves from them."<sup>166</sup>

---

<sup>165</sup> Ken Kilmnk quoted the *Daily Pennsylvanian* 1973 UARC UPF 8.5, Box 250 FF8

<sup>166</sup> Riley, John and Jeff Rothbard "Campus Security," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, 10 February 1969

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

### **PRIMARY SOURCES**

Federman, Sarah. "A Preliminary Exploration into the Rise of the Women's Movement at the University of Pennsylvania 1964-1974." Independent Study, University of Pennsylvania 1998.

Theodore Hershberg University of Pennsylvania Professor, interviewed by author, 12 November 1998, Philadelphia.

### **The Department of Records**

Microfilm deed records of the properties that make up Penn and the surrounding area.

### **The University Archives and Record Center**

*The Almanac* 1960-1973. The University Archives and Records Center, (hereafter UARC) The University of Pennsylvania North Arcade, Franklin Field Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

*The Bennett News* 1924, 1964

*The Daily Pennsylvanian* 1965-1973

*The Pennsylvania Gazette* 1960-1973.

UPA 4 Martin Meyerson Papers Box 311 FF 4, 8, 11, 18

UPF 8.5 Biographical Files, Box 71 FF 1 (David L Johnston 1977-83)

UPF 8.5 Biographical File, Box 417 FF 18 (Donald Shultis)

UPF 8.5 News Bureau Collection, Box 66 FF8, (CIC)

UPF 8.5 News Bureau Box 250 FF 13 (Safety and Security, Rape on Campus), 14 (Safety and Security, Ruth Report)

### **The Temple Urban Archives**

Evening Bulletin Clippings Collection (hereafter referred to as EBCC) Penn U "Eminent Domain" FF. Urban Archives, Paley Library Temple University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

At Temple University Urban Archives the following file folders were used:

"Misc. 68"

"Penn U Birth Control Center"

"Penn U Building Construction 1957"

“Penn U Co-eds 1951-62”  
“Penn U Co-eds 1963-69”  
“Penn U Co-eds 1969-73”  
“Penn U Security Set-up”  
“Pennsylvania Building Construction Program”  
“Pennsylvania University Building Construction Program 1959-63”  
“Pennsylvania University Building Construction Program 1965”  
“Pennsylvania University College of Liberal Arts for Women”  
“Pennsylvania University Crime”  
“Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority”  
“Sansom Street”  
“U-City”

## **SECONDARY SOURCES:**

Bissinger, Buzz. *A Prayer for the City*. New York: Random House, Inc, 1997.

Cheyney, Edward Potts. *History of the University of Pennsylvania 1740-1940*. Philadelphia: University Press, 1940.

Grier, William H. and Price M. Cobbs. *Black Rage*. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Halberstam, David. *The Fifties*. New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1993.

Jacobs, Jane. *The Life and Death of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.

Lukas, J. Anthony. *Common Ground: A Turbulent Decade in the Lives of Three American Families*. New York: Vintage Books, 1986.

Petshek, Kirk R. *The Challenge of Urban Reform Policies & Programs in Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1973.

Philadelphia Pennsylvania, *Journal of the City Council of Philadelphia* January 1957-June 1966 (Dunlap Printing Company 1957).

Philadelphia City Planning Commission, Compiler. *Population Characteristics, 1960 and 1970*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1972.

Philadelphia City Planning Commission, Compiler. *Population and Housing Trends 1970 Census*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1971.

Redevelopment Authority of the City of Philadelphia, Compiler. *Survey and Planning Application University City – Unit No. 4* (January, 1962).

Redevelopment Authority of the City of Philadelphia, Compiler. *Survey and Planning Application University City –Unit No. 5* (January, 1962).

Sugrue, Tom. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Post War Detroit*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

United States Census of Housing. *Block Statistics, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 1950*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1952.

United States Census of Housing, *Block Statistics, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 1960*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

United States Census of Housing and Population, *Block Statistics, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 1970*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Wolfgang, Marvin E. and Bernard Cohen. *Crime and Race Conceptions and Misconceptions*. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1970.

## CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

The research for this thesis was conducted primarily at the University Archives and Records Center at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia.

### PRIMARY SOURCES

Federman, Sarah. "A Preliminary Exploration into the Rise of the Women's Movement at the University of Pennsylvania 1964-1974." Independent Study, University of Pennsylvania 1998.

This paper was a good resource in chronicling the struggle of women at Penn to free themselves from *in loco parentis*.

Theodore Hershberg University of Pennsylvania Professor, interviewed by author, 12 November 1998, Philadelphia.

### The Department of Records

Microfilm deed records of the properties that make up Penn and the surrounding area.

The deed records served as important exploratory research. Discovering who lived on each block, in each dwelling helped put the issue of displacement into perspective.

### The University Archives and Record Center

*The Almanac* 1960-1973. The University Archives and Records Center, (hereafter UARC) The University of Pennsylvania North Arcade, Franklin Field Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The Almanac was a good source as it conveyed the Penn faculty perspective throughout the time period pertaining to this paper. It was also used to reconstruct sentiment towards various hot button issues of the time such as displacement, crime and women's issues.

*The Bennett News* 1924, 1964

This source was helpful in determining the different female voices at Penn in 1924 and then in 1964.

*The Daily Pennsylvanian* 1965-1973

The Daily Pennsylvanian was a gold mine of research. It recreated the issues and debates that occurred at Penn. from 1965-1973. It provided a plethora of different opinions and facts that had not been compiled anywhere else.

*The Pennsylvania Gazette* 1960-1973.

As the Alumni magazine, this source provided a view of how the University wanted to be perceived.

UPA 4 Martin Meyerson Papers Box 311 FF 4, 8, 11, 18

UPF 8.5 Biographical Files, Box 71 FF 1 (David L Johnston 1977-83)

UPF 8.5 Biographical File, Box 417 FF 18 (Donald Shultis)

UPF 8.5 News Bureau Collection, Box 66 FF8 (CIC).

UPF 8.5 News Bureau Box 250 FF 13 (Safety and Security. Rape on Campus), 14 (Safety and Security, Ruth Report)

### **The Temple Urban Archives**

Evening Bulletin Clippings Collection (hereafter referred to as EBCC) Penn U “Eminent Domain” FF. Urban Archives, Paley Library Temple University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

At Temple University Urban Archives the following file folders were used:

“Misc. 68”

“Penn U Birth Control Center”

“Penn U Building Construction 1957”

“Penn U Co-eds 1951-62”

“Penn U Co-eds 1963-69”

“Penn U Co-eds 1969-73”

“Penn U Security Set-up”

“Pennsylvania Building Construction Program”

“Pennsylvania University Building Construction Program 1959-63”

“Pennsylvania University Building Construction Program 1965”

“Pennsylvania University College of Liberal Arts for Women”

“Pennsylvania University Crime”

“Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority”

“Sansom Street”

“U-City”

The clippings file was invaluable as it gave the non-Penn point of view of events happening on campus. This file was the source of many great quotes.

### **SECONDARY SOURCES:**

Bissinger, Buzz. *A Prayer for the City*. New York: Random House, Inc, 1997.

This book was helpful in framing the questions asked in this paper. While shadowing Mayor Rendell during his first term in office Bissinger addresses many urban social and political issues important to this paper.



Cheyney, Edward Potts. *History of the University of Pennsylvania 1740-1940*. Philadelphia: University Press, 1940.

This source was used to learn about the School of Education and the creation of the College of Women.

Grier, William H. and Price M. Cobbs. *Black Rage*. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

The arguments in this book were invaluable to the interpretation of the rising crime rates in West Philadelphia. Grier and Cobbs provide a unique look into the African American psyche and their theory of Black anger and suspicion at White institutions helped make sense of the relationship between Penn and West Philadelphia as the demographics of both were changing.

Halberstam, David. *The Fifties*. New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1993.

This book served as background research.

Jacobs, Jane. *The Life and Death of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.

Lukas, J. Anthony. *Common Ground: A Turbulent Decade in the Lives of Three American Families*. New York: Vintage Books, 1986.

Common Ground was another example of an explanation for tensions that exist in cities between different socioeconomic groups and classes. Lukas focuses his account on Boston in the late 1960's and early 1970's, following the lives of three families from three classes and two races.

Petshek, Kirk R. *The Challenge of Urban Reform Policies & Programs in Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1973.

Philadelphia Pennsylvania, *Journal of the City Council of Philadelphia* January 1957-June 1966 (Dunlap Printing Company 1957).

Philadelphia City Planning Commission, Compiler. *Population Characteristics, 1960 and 1970*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1972.

Philadelphia City Planning Commission, Compiler. *Population and Housing Trends 1970 Census*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1971.

Redevelopment Authority of the City of Philadelphia, Compiler. *Survey and Planning Application University City – Unit No. 4* (January, 1962).

Redevelopment Authority of the City of Philadelphia, Compiler. *Survey and Planning Application University City – Unit No. 5* (January, 1962).

Sugrue, Tom. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Post War Detroit*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

This book served as one example of how urban issues are written about historically.

United States Census of Housing. *Block Statistics, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 1950*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1952.

United States Census of Housing, *Block Statistics, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 1960*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

United States Census of Housing and Population, *Block Statistics, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 1970*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Wolfgang, Marvin E. and Bernard Cohen. *Crime and Race Conceptions and Misconceptions*. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1970.

This book provided information on the race of criminals. It is one of the only sources available that discusses the likelihood of various races to commit crimes.