The End of an Era

President Luther was indeed prophetic when, at the time of his resignation, he suggested that there would be changes at Trinity College. Although perhaps few could agree as to what form these changes would take, everyone expected change. And many demanded change. In view of three decades of pressure for an enlarged student body, it must have come as a surprise to some that there should have been, at that time, suggestions that the College now be decreased in size rather than expanded.

While the Trustees Committee was still seeking a permanent successor to Dr. Luther, Philip Curtiss '06 of Norfolk, Connecticut, proposed that the change of administration might advantageously be the occasion of reversing the traditional policy regarding college admissions at Trinity. The pressures, he said, had been upon Luther to build up the student body, and Luther had followed orders. The results, he observed, had been far from happy. And Curtiss' solution to the problem was shockingly simple: admit only the most highly-qualified students, fail those who cannot maintain the highest standards and, if necessary, let the size of the College drop to one student, one Professor, and one classroom. By offering quality education, he said, let Trinity gain the reputation of the foremost college in the country!

A short while later, after the selection of the new President had been made, Curtiss' suggestion was endorsed by another Alumnus, Charles W. Bowman '87 of Brownsville, Pennsylvania, who optimistically enjoined: "We have a new President; let's make a fresh start, and not repeat the mistakes of 1904."

These were, of course, bold statements, but they represented merely the extremes of a generally widespread feeling among the Alumni that the College would have to return to a policy quite the opposite of that which had been followed during the Luther administration as well as during the latter years of that of George Williamson Smith. And not only would the academic standards of the College have to be raised generally, but there would also have to be, as the pronouncements of the College Senate and the Committee on the State of the College made clear, a policy of admission which would make Trinity College as socially prestigious as it had been in the 1880's and 1890's. And perhaps there should even be a return to a closer tie with the Church. It was this philosophy which guided the search for a new president and which, incidentally, made the quest such a difficult one.

The Committee entrusted with the nomination of a candidate for the Presidency of the College was headed by the Honorable William E. Curtis '75 of New York City. Of those who had been considered by the committee, Remsen B. Ogilby seemed to have the requisite qualifications. Ogilby was a clergyman of the Episcopal Church, he had considerable experience in educational administration, he was an individual of strong character, he had the enthusiastic recommendation of the Right Reverend Charles H. Brent, Bishop of the Philippines, and he had the social background which had been so notably lacking in President Luther. And there was, indeed, much in Ogilby's record which commended him to the position.

At the time of his appointment, Ogilby was thirty-nine years old. He had been graduated from Harvard in 1902 and the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in
1907. After graduation from college, he had taught for two years at Groton School, and from 1909 until America’s entrance into the First World War, he had served as Headmaster of Baguio School in the Philippines. During the war, he served as a chaplain in the United States Army. After the Armistice was signed, he accepted a position at St. Paul’s School in Concord, New Hampshire, and it was from St. Paul’s that he was called to the Presidency of Trinity College.4

The Trustees had full confidence that the new President would lead the College into a new period of prosperity. Despite the understanding between Ogilby and the Trustees that the President would not have to raise money,5 by the time the Christmas Term opened in September, 1920, plans were already under way to provide new facilities – chapel, gymnasium, science building, and possibly a nine-hole golf course.6

Ogilby was inaugurated on November 17, 1920. Delegates were present from forty-one colleges, universities, seminaries, and secondary schools. There were statements in several of the addresses which might have been taken as indication of what might be expected from the new administration. The Right Reverend Chauncey B. Brewster, Bishop of Connecticut, spoke for the Board of Trustees. The Bishop emphasized the liberal religious provisions of the College Charter as well as the Episcopalian heritage. And he also made much of the Christian spirit in which the College had been founded and the traditional relation of Trinity to the Episcopal Church.7 Professor McCook, speaking for the Trinity Faculty, welcomed the new President as a fellow Priest of the Church.8 And the President himself made much of Trinity as a Church College. “Trinity men,” he said, “know that our college is still a church college and, please God, it always will be.” But then he went on to ask, “What do we mean by a church college?” Trinity, he pointed out, is no longer under either general or diocesan ecclesiastical authority. The Faculty is no longer predominantly Episcopalian. The student body is only 43.5% Episcopalian, while Roman Catholics count for 18%, Congregationalists for 16.5% and eleven other religious bodies constitute 22%. Yet

Ogilby was still content to call Trinity a “Church College.” Trinity, he said, admits all students without regard to their particular religious affiliation, but once admitted to the College, Trinity puts “before them without apology or compromise the conception of Christianity which our Church holds dear. . . . Along such lines as these Trinity is a church college.”9 Apparently, the Episcopalian, or at least the Christian, “heritage” was to receive more emphasis than in the immediate past.

President Ogilby had kind words for former President Luther’s idea of “training for leadership and service.” He made no apology for the college man going into business, and even suggested that this trend would increase, but he also made clear that he conceived of Trinity’s mission as being that of providing a broad, liberal education strongly based in the Humanities, rather than in vocational or professional preparation. His most unusual remarks, however, were those regarding the “social” aspect of higher education. He summarily dismissed the old idea of higher education
for the wealthy only, and he was equally harsh regarding the idea of "supporting an aristocracy of birth by an aristocracy of wealth." Trinity, he said, must be open to all comers, and scholarships must be provided for those who could not come otherwise. And to make his point, he informed his hearers that in his own undergraduate days, Harvard had provided him with a scholarship to the extent of 40 per cent of his expenses and that he had earned the remaining 60 per cent himself. The aristocratic element at Trinity was to be one of intellect, rather than one of wealth or birth.

And then Ogilby turned to the size of the College—a question which had perplexed the Trinity community for almost half a century, but to which the happy solution had yet to be found. Trinity could, he said, greatly increase the size of the student body without appreciably enlarging either Faculty or physical facilities. But this would be neither beneficial to the institution nor to the advantage of the individual student. Trinity, as a small college, has a definite task to perform. She can enrich the social nature of the graduate of the small high school, and she has a particular obligation to the boys from boarding schools who are accustomed to the routine of daily chapel, small classes, and close relationships to their teachers.

Finally, Ogilby turned to the ideals which he thought should be set for Trinity College. Trinity's aim is "to produce leaders rather than specialists, ... and to intensify the cultivation of such qualities as will make for leadership rather than for expert technical knowledge along a single line." And thus the new President outlined what was to be his philosophy and program for the College whose leadership he had just assumed.

Immediately following his formal installation, Ogilby visited several of the larger local alumni associations—Boston, Hartford, New York, and Buffalo—and everywhere he went, Alumni pledged their support to the new President and his administration. In early April, 1921, the College began the long-awaited drive to raise $1,500,000—actually as a "Centennial Fund" in anticipation of the coming hundredth anniversary of the College's founding in 1823, and again Ogilby received the full support of the Alumni.

In the spirit of the fund-raising campaign was indicated the change in spirit which had come to Trinity with President Ogilby. The principal speaker at the banquet (held at the Hartford Club) which got the campaign under way, was Joseph Buffington '75, who had once been among those who had felt that Trinity's future was dependent upon a large student body. Buffington's speech was devoted largely to the idea and ideal of the "small college," and it was in Buffington's remarks that the slogan, later to be much used at Trinity, "The Personal College," was first used. For weal or for woe, the pressures for a larger college had ended—for the time, at least. As the campaign went on, President Ogilby pointed out what he recognized as the advantages of a small college, and whenever he met with alumni groups he made clear that the $1,500,000 was being raised to improve the quality of the instruction, and not to enlarge the College. Along this same line, even the student body was becoming reconciled to the plans to keep Trinity among those colleges of lower enrollment. An editorial in The Tripod, entitled "Forlorn Hopes," pointed out the folly of Trinity's competing in athletics with such large institutions as Princeton, Holy Cross, and Yale, and urged that Trinity's athletic schedule be rearranged so as to include only colleges of comparable size.

Ogilby conscientiously stood by his plans to raise educational standards and willingly he ac-
cepted the idea of the "Personal College." The "personal" element, indeed, began at the top, for from his office in Williams Memorial, President Ogilby directed the day-to-day affairs of Trinity College in a more "personal" fashion than the institution had ever seen. Ogilby was usually to be found in his office at the head of the "Long Walk," puffing on his pipe, walking about the office lost in thought. On frequent occasions he would open the casement window to hail a passing Professor or student and engage in a few minutes of conversation. Students soon came to know President Ogilby as a friend. A student in trouble with the Hartford police would soon find "Prexy" ready with bail money. A student in Hartford Hospital soon found "Prexy" at his bedside with earnest solicitation as to his well-being. Students in financial difficulties always found him willing to help. And students who were having academic difficulties found him a most comforting adviser. Ogilby was easy to know and easy to love, and so Trinity truly became "The Personal College." 18

But there were other ways in which Trinity became "personal." A system of Faculty Advisers was set up, and each student was assigned to an Adviser who was to help him in the selection of courses and in other academic matters. 19 In 1925, the first College Dean was appointed, Edward L. Troxell, who had come to the College in 1919 as Assistant Professor of Geology. Here the "personal" element was again evidenced, for the Dean took over the disciplinary function which had previously been exercised by a Faculty Committee. And the Dean's duties were especially onerous during the early years of Prohibition. 20

Like his predecessor, Dr. Luther, Ogilby was fond of sports and rarely was an athletic event scheduled—whether football, baseball, or track—at which he was not present. Ogilby believed that sports helped develop leaders, leaders of men, but he gave little concern to whether Trinity lost or won or whether Trinity's athletic budget was large or small. To him, the important thing was whether or not "our boys like their games." 21

In the matter of the religious life of the College, too, Ogilby had definite ideas. Although he was proud to boast that Trinity had no legal ties to the Episcopal Church, he rejoiced that the Episcopal "heritage" had been strengthened from the time of his assuming the Presidency. And although he always took pride in the liberal spirit which he felt made members of other Christian communions, and particularly Roman Catholics, welcome, there was something of a reaction to the Latitudinarian spirit which had prevailed during the Luther administration.

Ogilby insisted that as Trinity was a Church College, and even as he loosely defined "Church College," that the Ecclesiastical calendar be observed. Once early in his administration, Ogilby was walking to Chapel, puffing on his ever-present corn-cob pipe, when he was met by Francis Bunnell Creamer '23, business manager of the Jesters. Creamer, a pre-theological student, asked the President for permission to hold a performance of Cyril Maud's play, The Monkey's Paw, "two weeks from Thursday." As Creamer later reported, Ogilby's "red hair stood on end, his pipe bellowed white-hot smoke and he took from his pocket a calendar. Two weeks from Thursday? Do you know what day that is?" 'No sir,' replied Creamer. 'It is Maundy Thursday, and if you are contemplating Holy Orders, I would advise you to keep a closer tab on your Church Calendar.' And, it may be added, the presentation of The Monkey's Paw was deferred until after Easter! 22

Remsen Ogilby was a High Churchman, but a High Churchman who was more concerned with the externals than the theological basis of High Churchmanship, and one who was most interested in "the quaint and picturesque elements of Catholicism." He delighted, for instance, in wearing ecclesiastical vestments, but he seldom wore a clerical collar. And, later in life, he always opened the sailing season at his summer home at Weekapaug, Rhode Island, by blessing the sailboats as they passed in review before him. 23 Hence, it was hardly unexpected that the worship of the Trinity Chapel should have taken a more
Nor did Ogilby hesitate to state his position—even when it was an unpopular one—in politics. Even before his inauguration as President of Trinity College, he had become involved in the political affairs of the city of Hartford and the state of Connecticut. The *Hartford Courant* had been carrying paid advertisements in support of the re-election of Frank E. Brandegee to the United States Senate. Ogilby was a strong proponent of the League of Nations and Brandegee's opposition to the League, as well as his lack of sympathy for the Women's Suffrage Movement, was particularly displeasing to Trinity's President. The *Hartford Times* had refused to carry the advertisements, but the strongly Republican *Courant* did not see anything wrong with either the senator's stand or the revenue which the advertisements provided.25

In what could be described as anything little short of a fit of anger, Ogilby stormed into the office of Emile Henry Gauvreau, managing editor of the *Courant*, and demanded that the paper apologize to its readers for carrying advertising of this sort. When Gauvreau insisted that the advertisement, and any others like it would not be apologized for, Ogilby declared that he would never again read the *Courant*. Gauvreau politely asked his visitor to sit down, picked up the telephone, called the circulation department and said, “This is Gauvreau. You have a subscription in the name of Ogilby. Trinity College. Cancel it! And send Dr. Ogilby a check for the full amount he has paid.” The managing editor then walked to the door and ushered President Ogilby out with a polite “Good day.”26

But this was not the end of the affair so far as Ogilby was concerned. At a regular Sunday chapel service he preached a sermon in which he both castigated the *Courant* and expressed the hope that Brandegee would be defeated at the polls.27 Ogilby’s attack on the senator was, however, of little avail, for two weeks and two days after the much-talked-about chapel sermon, Brandegee won re-election as part of the Republican landslide which swept Warren G. Harding to the Presidency of the United States.28

During his first year at Trinity, President Ogilby once more used the pulpit to denounce a politician with whom he disagreed. George Harvey, President Harding’s Ambassador to the Court of St. James and one of the most articulate opponents of America’s joining the League of Nations,29 was described in Ogilby’s first Baccalaureate Sermon (preached in Christ Church Cathedral on June 14, 1921) as one whom future historians would not hold in high regard.30

In strictly academic matters, Ogilby was pledged to two objectives: 1) to maintain the size of the College at about 250 students,31 and 2) to develop such a program of studies as carefully selected young men might find most useful in preparing for positions of leadership.32 There was, of course, no particular problem in holding the student body at the desired level, but considerable difficulty was encountered when the Admissions Committee sought to impose a higher standard of selectivity. So long as the College was engaged in raising the “Centennial Fund,” it was thought best to leave the matter alone, especially as it was hoped that the city of Hartford would contribute a considerable amount of money towards the “Fund.” During the early Ogilby years there was, therefore, little change in the makeup of the undergraduate body. The number of “townies” remained at almost one hundred—all day students,33 few of whom belonged to fraternities or otherwise participated in student life.34

Standards of academic performance remained low, and the freshmen classes seemed to show little improvement. In 1920–1921, the President reported that during the past academic year, 12% of the student body were required to withdraw because of low grades.35 The following year (1921–1922) there were similar figures, and the President noted that the poor performance might be accounted for, in part, by the fact that so few of the entering students came from families in
which there was any tradition of higher education. And as evidence of this, Ogilby reported that of the 117 freshmen who entered Trinity in the fall of 1921, only 17 were the sons of college men.36

Particularly distressing at this time was the fact that so many of the scholarship holders were among those whose work was of an inferior standard. This indifference to serious academic work brought forth new rules for scholarship men. By vote of the Trustees, upperclassmen on scholarship would have to earn grades of at least four C's and one D; Freshmen would be allowed three C's and two D's; and in neither case would failures be permitted.37

The Faculty soon noted another discouraging trend. The number of transfer students was increasing, and young men were coming to Trinity in increasing numbers (17 in the fall of 1922) after they had failed elsewhere. The Faculty urged that the rules of admitting transfer students be made more rigid.38

There were those who hoped that the Centennial Celebration would mark a turning point in the life of the College, and in a way it did. The drive for the Centennial Fund did much to unite the Alumni. Bishop Brewster and the other New England Bishops pledged their support39 and President Ogilby, acting in conjunction with the heads of four other Episcopalian Colleges,40 was able to induce the Presiding Bishop and the General Council of the Episcopal Church to make a grant of $10,000 per year for a period of three years.41 The President also scored an unexpected victory when he was able to, once and for all, lay the old ghost of "sectarianism" and to receive a grant of $125,000 from the General Education Board.42 This, it will be noted, was at the very time the College had received its first and only appropriation from the Episcopal Church.

The Centennial Fund was raised with difficulty. The goal had been lowered by one-third, and despite the valiant efforts of Johnny McCook and J. H. Kelso Davis, the $1,000,000 mark was reached only by the end of the Centennial Celebration in June, 1923,43 but friends and Alumni had once more made a strong commitment to the College.

Centennials always fascinate the historically minded, and Trinity's Centennial was the occasion of historical sketches in the Ivy, the Tripod, and the Hartford newspapers. Unfortunately, there was no full-scale history undertaken at that time,44 but Professor McCook's address at
Founders’ and Benefactors’ Day, given on March 8, 1922, was one of the most delightful sketches of Trinity and her sons yet to appear.45

As a series of new buildings was one of the purposes for which the Centennial fund was being raised, it was quite natural that attention should have turned once more to campus architecture. Great must have been the rejoicing of those admirers of the Burges Plan when The Tripod, in a special Sub-Freshmen Week-End, Pictorial Issue of April 21, 1923, carried an architect’s sketch of a proposed modification of the three quadrangles. The bird’s-eye view, which had been prepared by Samuel B. P. Trowbridge ’83 of New York City, showed an open quad­rangle with the “Long Walk” forming the west side, an open north quadrangle with Williams Memorial and a splendid Gothic Chapel facing the south side, and a south quadrangle with dormitories and a Gothic Library occupying the same position in the south quadrangle as the Chapel to the north.

Ogilby was particularly partial to the Gothic style, and it will be remembered that he had begun his Inaugural Address with words of high praise for the buildings of the “Walk.”46 In June, 1925, the Trustees agreed upon the advisability of employing an architect to prepare a general plan for future buildings47 and, most significantly, it was then decided that the Burges Plan would be followed insofar as was practical in view of the needs of the College. Trowbridge was engaged as the architect, and he at once proceeded to prepare a new plan somewhat in modification of the one he submitted in 1923. Trowbridge, unfortunately, died before the revised plan was finished, but the work was completed by his architectural firm, Trowbridge and Livingston, with the assistance of Howard T. Greenley ’94.48 And it was this plan which was to be followed with reasonable care in the planning of the particular units which were erected during the 1930’s and 1940’s.

The Centennial Celebration itself was a grand affair. It began on Sunday, May 13, 1923 (“Charter Day” in the Trinity Calendar), with a religious service at which the Reverend Dr. S. S. Drury Hon. ’10 of St. Paul’s School preached a sermon and the Trinity Choir sang a “Centennial Hymn” with words and music by Professor Shepard.49 Class Day (Friday, June 8) was unusually elabo­rate, and the occasion was graced by the presence of a Japanese beauty, Princess Hime, the daughter of Count Koen Otani, head of the Shinsu sect of the Buddhist faith in Japan.50 Alumni Day (Saturday, June 9) featured a Cent­ennial Midway in which the fraternities operated booths and sideshows to the enjoyment of all.51 Sunday, June 10, was observed as “Memo­rial Day” with an Open-Air Service at 11:00 with an address by Major-General J. G. Harbord, Chief of Staff, A.E.F. Before the service, various martial units paraded from the State Capitol to the campus. And at 3:00 P.M., at a special service in Alumni Hall, there was presented to the College a portrait of Professor McCook who had retired after forty years on the College Faculty. At 8:00 P.M. the Baccalaureate Sermon was preached in Christ Church Cathedral by the Rev. Dr. Karl Reiland ’98, Rector of St. George’s Church, New York City. Commencement was held on campus, Monday, June 11, at 10:00 A.M. In the afternoon, Trustees, Faculty and Alumni paraded to the State Capitol Building where Bishop Brewster dedicated a tablet marking the site of the old campus.52

With the celebration past, President Ogilby looked for Trinity’s settling down into a pleasant academic routine. He had no spectacular plans to propose, and it was only a modest—perhaps too modest—goal which he set for the College. New buildings were needed, particularly a chemistry laboratory and a chapel, but these had long been a recognized need. Additional instructors would be engaged, but this was to relieve several overworked Professors; Political Science should be detached from History, Sociology from Economics, and Psychology from Philosophy.53

Trinity settled into a routine, but not, perhaps, such as President Ogilby had anticipated. Old problems persisted and new ones arose. There was criticism of the President that he was trying to run the College in the fashion of a “prep school,” and Ogilby was the first to admit that such failures as he had made could be attributed
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to his "sticking too closely to preparatory school methods of handling the youth."54

The requirement that all boarding students attend daily chapel smacked, the students felt, of "prep school" regulations. And the fact that "townies" were not required to attend except on Wednesday led to a general demand for the abolition of compulsory chapel. The Tripod polled the student body and found that while eleven students favored compulsory chapel, 186 were opposed to it. Not only did the matter of compulsory chapel widen (if that was even possible) the rift between boarders and "townies," it led to a growing feeling of antagonism between the under-
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ulty, the College joined the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association of America,57 and to provide instruction for members of the Hartford Community, the College began a program of extension studies which was to develop into Trinity's present graduate and summer studies organization.

Trinity had made, as we have seen, repeated efforts to develop advanced graduate study and to offer courses for non-matriculated students, but none of these had been particularly successful. The excellent graduate work in the sciences which had flourished at the beginning of the century petered out as those who had instituted the program were replaced by Professors who had little interest either in research or in teaching highly specialized courses.58 An arrangement entered into in 1919 with the Hillyer Institute whereby Trinity Faculty would teach courses at the Hartford YMCA (with those who had completed three years equivalent in institute courses being eligible for senior matriculation)59 never fully went into effect. But in response to the demand for some sort of Trinity instruction to be offered the Hartford community, in 1925 the College, in cooperation with the Hartford school system, began to offer several courses each year to teachers in the Hartford schools. The Extension program was carried on in classrooms of Hartford Public High School, and courses were given on both graduate and undergraduate level. It was not until the end of World War II that the program came to be centered completely on the campus.60

The undergraduates may have felt that the College was being run as a "prep school," but they seemed to have had a good time. Athletics were strongly supported, the Glee Club flourished, and the Jesters were giving well-received performances. Interest groups, such as the Political Science Club, added much to the intellectual life for those who availed themselves of them. And there were more and more special lectures by both Faculty and outside authorities on an almost infinite variety of topics.

The student body remained about the same as it had been since the war, and from year to year the number of undergraduates varied from 255 in 192361 to 284 in 1925.62 This was more or less in keeping with Ogilby's commitment to the "small college," but it was not entirely in keeping with the wishes of most Alumni, who (despite the suggestions at the beginning of Ogilby's administration that the College concentrate on quality rather than quantity) still could think of Trinity's potential greatness only in terms of student numbers.

Students, especially Hartford students, were easily attracted to Trinity as Freshmen, but the undergraduates seemed less adequately prepared for college work than ever before. The College refused to admit graduates of high school commercial courses,63 but even many of those who had been graduated from the preparatory courses found the going difficult. In the fall of 1924, thirty-five per cent of the Freshman Class failed, and this record prompted the Faculty to approve a tutoring program whereby the better students would give special help to the weaker ones. The Tripod, incidentally, was quite frank in announcing that the program had been adopted "to hold athletes."64

Quite naturally, there were those who thought that Trinity was making no "progress." The Hartford Alumni Association became particularly critical of President Ogilby. First, they appointed a Committee to Create Interest in the College -- and particularly in the preparatory schools in the Hartford area. The committee was especially entrusted by the local association with recruiting athletes and to point out to promising high school players that, while the College would not give athletic scholarships, the Hartford businessmen could be counted upon to provide part-time employment.65 And later the Hartford Alumni inaugurated a "Bigger Trinity" plan whereby the alumni groups of the larger cities would be coordinated for purposes of providing the publicity which the Hartford men thought was so seriously lacking.66

This was, of course, a reversal of the commitment to the "small college" idea which Ogilby had so readily made the official policy of the institution. But the sharpest criticism of the Ogilby
administration came from certain Alumni who felt that the idea of a smaller college was commendable enough, provided the students themselves were of the sort who had traditionally found their way into the Trinity fraternities.

The alumni members of Delta Psi were particularly concerned about the future of the fraternity system at Trinity and of Epsilon Chapter in particular. Following World War I, Delta Psi had fallen upon evil times. The chapter was short of funds, the chapter house had fallen into disrepair, and there were few initiations. In fact, between 1917 and 1926, Delta Psi had initiated an average of but five men each year, and of these forty-eight men, only fourteen were graduated. Most of the initiates remained at Trinity for only a year or two. In 1927, only one man was initiated and he was not an undergraduate, but a member of the Faculty.67 There was talk of Epsilon Chapter giving up its “Charter” in the fraternity and there were even fears that the national fraternity would ask Epsilon to surrender the charter.68

By 1926, it became clear that the other Trinity fraternities were in the same straits,69 but it was the Delta Psi men who were able to work out a plan of action which would save their chapter, the fraternity system at Trinity and, as they may have felt with some justice, the College itself. On April 20, 1927, the Trustees of the chapter met at the St. Anthony Club in New York City. A revolving fund was set up to help defray the college expenses of eligible Delta Psi prospects and thus enable them to remain in college.70 Colonel W. E. A. Bulkeley ’90 agreed to raise money for the rehabilitation of the chapter house, and the Alumni members began an earnest program of student recruiting.71 But most important of all, a committee consisting of Henry L. G. Meyer ’03, Robert B. O’Connor ’16, Robert Thorne ’85, and William H. Eaton ’99, undertook a thorough study of the chapter, the fraternity system, and the College. The committee invited all Epsilon men to a dinner held in Hartford on May 11, 1928, and at this meeting an elaborate program of action was outlined and a second committee was appointed to ascertain the “underlying causes” of the College’s failure to revive. The committee consisted of Martin W. Clement, W. H. Eaton, R. B. O’Connor, W. E. A. Bulkeley, and C. B. F. Brill.72

On June 17, 1928, the committee reported to Epsilon Chapter, and the findings gave little encouragement. It was noted that “the morale of the student body [was] low,” and that there was a “consequent lack of spirit and therefore [an] absence of the pleasures, enjoyment and friendships which alone engender the desire to continue in college in men of the character Delta Psi wanted.” The committee, furthermore, reported that there was “a widespread belief that the college placed more emphasis upon rigid conformity with scholastic requirements than on a well-rounded development of its students.” And, most alarming to the friends of the fraternity system, the committee concluded that “the number of qualified men entering Trinity [was] too small to maintain the senior fraternities.”73

So far, the movement had been entirely one of Delta Psi,74 but the other fraternities were soon drawn in. Psi Upsilon and Alpha Delta Phi immediately expressed sympathy with the program which had been instituted by the Delta Psi Committee. Soon all the Trinity fraternities were united in the Inter-Fraternity Committee, and a direct approach was made to the Corporation through President Ogilby.75

The Inter-Fraternity Committee started its work by meeting with the President of the College at the Hotel Griswold in Groton, Connecticut, on August 28, 1928, to place before him proposals for the reform of the College along lines acceptable to the fraternity Alumni.76 And in presenting the proposals to Ogilby, the committee delineated what might even be described as an ultimatum: the College had too long been a local institution, and the institution would have to regain its national reputation. The College would, furthermore, have to be restored in such a fashion as would suit the fraternity Alumni and in such a fashion as would permit fraternity life to thrive.77

The committee discussed every phase of college life with the President - the college personnel, the kind of students the committee wanted, the size of the College, and the curriculum. Ogilby was much perturbed that the Alumni would criticize
the Trinity curriculum. That, he felt, was a faculty matter, and not one of concern to the Alumni. Nevertheless, he challenged the committee to make a recommendation on curricular change. On the matter of the size of the College, Ogilby acceded to the committee's principles, and at the close of the meeting the President remarked, "This is the first time in my Trinity experience that I felt Alumni breathing down my neck, and it's a good feeling." With Ogilby's assurance of cooperation in revamping the College, the Inter-Fraternity Committee appointed a sub-committee which was to prepare a detailed report and to make recommendations to the President, the Trustees, and the Board of Fellows. The committee met regularly during the winter of 1928-1929, and the members gave unstintingly of their time. Other colleges were visited, and headmasters were interviewed. In the spring of 1929, a comprehensive report was presented to the college authorities. The report was signed by Charles E. Tuke '02 and James A. Wales '01 for Alpha Chi Rho; by Richardson Wright '10 and Blinn F. Yates '11 for Alpha Delta Phi; by William George Wherry '04 and Leonard J. Dibble '09 for Delta Kappa Epsilon; by Arthur V. R. Tilton '21 and Richard E. Peck '01 for Delta Phi; by Hill Burgwin '06 and A. Northey Jones '17 for Psi Upsilon; and by Martin W. Clement '01, Robert B. O'Connor '16, William H. Eaton '99, and C. B. F. Brill '19 for Delta Psi. What had begun as a measure of desperation undertaken by Delta Psi ended in a report and recommendation signed by some of the College's most loyal and respected Alumni, six of whom subsequently became College Trustees, three of whom became College Fellows, and all of whom evidenced their genuine concern for Trinity College by helping to implement the recommendations they had made.

The content of the report was hardly revolutionary, judged by later standards of alumni recommendations at least, and it merely set forth most of the principles already agreed to by President Ogilby at Groton. What was of utmost significance was the fact that the Trinity Alumni had demanded a share in forming the policy of the institution. As the geographic imbalance of the student body had initially prompted the conferences which had brought forth the report, it was hardly surprising that something was said regarding the large number of "townies" at Trinity. Hartford students, the report suggested, should not exceed twenty per cent of the total enrollment, and even these should be selected with the utmost care. Hartford students should be admitted "not on the basis of what Trinity College can do for these day students, but what can these day students do for Trinity." Even the boarding students should be more carefully screened, and special efforts should be made to work with the headmasters in recruiting freshmen from the preparatory schools. There should be a "better rounded" athletic program and improvement in the athletic facilities. There should be improved relations between college administration and Alumni. Instructional facilities should be expanded - new laboratories, more classrooms, and additional Faculty. And to bring Trinity in line with the other New England colleges for men, the curriculum should be modernized along the lines of: 1) less emphasis on the Classics, and 2) new courses in Fine Arts, the Humanities, and the Social Sciences.

Changes were to come, and they were to come quickly. Even before the Inter-Fraternity Committee Report had been submitted, President Ogilby had already announced new policies and developments which were to fulfill the promises he had made at Groton. In his Report to the Trustees of December 1, 1928, Ogilby made clear that there would be a radical change in the makeup of the undergraduate body. Trinity would hereafter, he said, resist the pressure of numbers from Hartford applicants to the Freshman Class. Day students (who were perhaps more interested, he felt, in a practical, vocational education) would be admitted only in such numbers as not to deter the College's intellectual or social tone. Boarding students, too, would be more carefully chosen. Trinity would make much of her Episcopalian heritage. A new chapel, this thanks to the generosity of Trustee William Gwinn Mather '77 of Cleveland, Ohio, and a new gymnasium would
be erected immediately. Each of these promises was carried into effect.

Five hundred students was set as the ideal size of the College – one small enough to make possible the close faculty-student relationships so much stressed by the defenders of the small-college ideal, and yet one large enough to provide a sufficient reservoir upon which the fraternities and the athletic teams could draw. Besides, an enrollment of 500 would place Trinity roughly in the same category, so far as size was concerned, with Wesleyan, Williams, and Amherst. As to the number of Hartford students, 125 was set as a "quota." There was a rather rapid increase in the number of students toward the goal of five hundred. In 1929-1930, there were 312 students enrolled, and the following year the number had risen to 351. In 1931-1932, the enrollment shot up to 426, and in 1932-1933 it stood at 439. Slight gains in the next two academic years took the enrollment to 453 and 485, and in the fall of 1936 the goal of 500 students was passed when the enrollment reached 516, a figure which included 7 graduates, 12 non-matriculated students, and 2 specials.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of this phenomenal growth of the College was the fact that it occurred during the years of the Great Depression, a time when many of the smaller American institutions were hard pressed to find students able to pay the tuition fees. But almost equally noteworthy was the fact that the growth had brought back to Trinity a national clientele, a sharp reduction in both the number and proportion of local students, and a closer spiritual tie with the Church whose members had brought the institution into being.

Alumni, and particularly the fraternity Alumni who had been on the Inter-Fraternity Committee, personally canvassed the preparatory schools in the New York and Philadelphia areas, and among the increasing number of undergraduates there was soon to be found a proportionately larger number of men from the better preparatory schools. And although Ogilby insisted that there was no such thing as a "Trinity-type" of student, the fraternity Alumni were immensely pleased with the sort of young man who was being attracted to the College.

There was, as had been hoped for, an enrichment of the social life of the College. Despite the economic depression, the fraternities entered a period of prosperity, and athletic teams and other undergraduate activities found a new vitality.

These developments, however, should not suggest that Trinity had taken on the atmosphere of a "country club." There was, rather, a steady improvement in the undergraduates' academic performance. Despite their greatly increased numbers, students were coming to Trinity much better prepared than formerly, and there were fewer dropouts and fewer dismissals for low grades. The all-college average rose steadily even in the face of higher standards having been set by the Faculty for classroom work. Holders of Trinity degrees were bringing credit to themselves and their Alma Mater by success in the leading graduate schools, and there was every reason to believe that the quality of a Trinity education was the highest it had been in the institution's history.

Despite the fact that the country was in the midst of its greatest financial depression, Trinity enjoyed an economic prosperity which was a new element to be injected into the College's history. Year after year ended with a surplus rather than a deficit, and this, fortunately, without the "cutting of corners" which enabled the less fortunate institutions to make ends meet. During these depression years, the salary of the Professors was doubled, the endowment greatly increased, and almost countless improvements were made on the college grounds. But the most "visible" improvement in the College was the series of splendid buildings which was erected during these years.

Cook Dormitory and the beautiful Hamlin Dining Hall were completed in 1931. The same year also saw the completion of the Trowbridge Memorial, a most modern swimming pool and squash courts, dedicated to the memory of the campus architect, S. P. B. Trowbridge.

1932 saw the completion of the Trinity Chapel, a magnificent, English Gothic, limestone struc-
ture, designed by Frohman, Robb and Little, the architects of the Washington Cathedral, and presented to the College by William Gwinn Mather '77, the Cleveland industrialist and philanthropist. The Chapel was President Ogilby's "Great Project," and from the time of the ground breaking in December, 1928, through the cornerstone laying on June 15, 1930, to its consecration on June 18, 1932, it was his chief concern.101 And the actual building brought out all that was Medieval and Catholic in President Ogilby's High-Church soul. The workmen were encouraged to live together on the job-site and, as the building took shape, Ogilby conducted a daily service for them in the Crypt. Although few of the masons, carpenters, or bricklayers were Episcopalians, Ogilby was able to inspire them to a love for the building. The workmen were encouraged to try their hand at stone-carving, and the five prize-winning works were incorporated into the fabric of the building along with tile, brick, and stones from such diverse places as Trinity College, Cambridge, Mount Sinai, and the Great Wall of China. The workmen came to share much of Ogilby's love for the Chapel, and throughout the years they made gifts to the Church. Each year they return to a meeting of the "Chapel Builders' Alumni Association" at which time they hold a memorial service in the Crypt Chapel for their deceased fellows and then enjoy a banquet held by the College in Hamlin Hall. Lewis Wallace, master mason during the Chapel's construction, became so attached to the building that he stayed on at the College, serving as Chapel Verger from 1933 until 1943, and then as Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds. Earl Sanborn, the creator of the magnificent stained-glass windows, asked that his ashes be buried under a slab in the Crypt floor.102

The Chapel's consecration, Saturday, June 18, 1932, was one of great solemnity. At Mather's request, the consecrating Bishop was the Right Reverend Chauncey B. Brewster. Others present and participating in the service were the Bishop Coadjutor of Connecticut, the Presiding Bishop, and the Bishops of North Carolina, Delaware, South Dakota, and North Dakota. Five separate
processions formed in the old Chapel and proceeded to the new structure, where five Bishops consecrated different parts of the Chapel simultaneously, and then these processions later joined for the consecration of the whole. The workingmen were present, all in the work clothes of their several crafts.103

Among the many memorials in the Chapel was the Plumb Carillon of thirty bells, presented to the College by John F. Plumb '91 and his wife in memory of their son John '26 who had died in his senior year.104 Ogilby learned to play the carillon, taught his students and colleagues to play, and in 1934 he brought together at Trinity the twenty-two performers on the instrument who formed the Guild of Carillonneurs in North America.105

Trinity's Chapel was truly one of the most noble examples of English perpendicular Gothic to be found in America, and it was doubtless the finest collegiate chapel in the country. But there were those who felt that President Ogilby's "Great Project" had taken precedence over more pressing needs. The facilities for teaching Chemistry were particularly inadequate. The Chemistry Department was crowded into the basement of Jarvis Physics Laboratory, and Professor Vernon Krieble, head of the Department of Chemistry, made his point by converting an abandoned coal bin into an auxiliary laboratory. Professor Krieble felt that construction of a Chemistry Building should have taken precedence over a new Chapel, for as Krieble put it to President Ogilby, "God can be worshiped anywhere, even out of doors; Chemistry can be taught only in a laboratory, and only in a well-equipped one."106

Ogilby's response to this argument was that
money for the Chapel had been made available by the generosity of an Alumnus and that a Chemistry Building would be erected as soon as funds were provided. Professor Krieble believed that the money could be raised by soliciting the chemical industry, and in his quest for funds he turned to Martin W. Clement '01. In 1934 the two of them raised the necessary amount. Construction was begun in the fall of 1934, and in 1936 it was completed as the termination of the south end of the quadrangle according to the Burges Plan as modified by Trowbridge and Greenley. The new structure was a model of its type, and for many years it was visited by faculty and trustees of other colleges who were laying plans for a similar facility. It was the hope of the chief (anonymous) donor that the laboratory should be named for Martin W. Clement, but it was not until Clement's retirement from the Board of Trustees in 1963 that the Chemistry Building's principal fund-raiser gave his consent. In the fall of that year, the building was appropriately designated the Martin W. Clement Chemistry Laboratory, and the auditorium was named, with equal justice, for Vernon K. Krieble.

Architecturally, the erection of the Chemistry Building considerably to the east of Hamlin and Cook Halls left a "blank" in the southern end of the Great Quadrangle. The student body had been growing steadily, and the dormitories, as well as the fraternity houses, were being crowded to capacity. As the commitment was to an almost wholly residential college, it was hoped that a series of dormitory units could be constructed between the Chemistry Building and Cook Hall and thus close the gap in the southern walk.

Although the financial situation of the country caused the Trustees to proceed with caution, when the student body reached 567 in the fall of 1939, the Board decided that the proposed dormitory could be put off no longer. Under the leadership of College Provost Harold Jacquith '12 and Trustees Charles F. Weed '94 and Allen Northey Jones '17, a campaign was launched to raise the $125,000 needed to complete the unit. The results were most gratifying, for $131,549 was soon subscribed by 1,067 individuals. As had been the case in the Chapel, there were numerous memorials. A beautiful arch was given by the grandmother of William Nickerson Bancroft '37, and several of the rooms were dedicated as memorials to the alumni fathers of the donors. The oak paneling and the fireplace in the commons room (now Goodwin Lounge) was taken from the former New York home of James L. and Jose-
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phine S. Goodwin and presented by Mrs. Walter Clark of Hartford in memory of her father, George S. Gilman '47. In naming the buildings, the Trustees chose to honor two former Trustees, James J. Goodwin and P. Henry Woodward, both of whom had sons who faithfully carried on the family tradition of benefaction and service to the College.114

While Goodwin and Woodward Halls were under construction, plans were announced for still another dormitory. Delta Psi Fraternity had long recognized the inadequacy of facilities in its old chapter house which had been erected in 1878. Delta Psi men entered into an arrangement with the College whereby Delta Psi would raise the money for construction and the College would purchase the site, provided the College would lease the dining facilities to the fraternity and permit a limited number of rooms to be occupied by Delta Psi men. Martin W. Clement again raised the money, this time receiving the $150,000 from an anonymous donor. The College purchased the lot on the northeast corner of Vernon and Summit Streets, and two Delta Psi men, Robert B. O'Connor '16 and C. B. F. Brill '19, prepared the plans. The lovely brick building, designed to accommodate twenty-six students and

two Faculty members, was completed in 1941 and subsequently named Ogilby Hall.115

While these physical improvements were being made, there were many developments which gen-
erally reflected a strengthening of the College. Despite the tremendous expenditures for buildings and equipment, and despite the fact that the nation’s economy had made little progress toward recovery, each fiscal year ended with a slight surplus. There were gifts and bequests that raised the College’s total assets from $4,641,490 in 1928–1929 to $7,346,604 in 1937–1938. During this same period, the annual budget had steadily increased from $218,318 to $353,970. And as the student body increased from 276 to 537, the Faculty had an almost proportional growth from 39 to 59.\textsuperscript{116} There were generous sabbatical leaves,\textsuperscript{117} and, except for several rather infantile faculty feuds, a general spirit of faculty loyalty prevailed. To bring about better understanding between Trustees and Faculty, a Trustees-Faculty Dinner was held in Hamlin Hall each year,\textsuperscript{118} and in April, 1940, the Trinity Faculty even entertained at dinner the Faculty of Wesleyan University.\textsuperscript{119}

The decade of the 1930’s was, doubtless, one of the College’s most prosperous and progressive periods. From the institution with such a provincial orientation as to deserve the name of the "Hartford Local," Trinity had regained her national clientele and, at the same time, something of a national reputation. The scholarly works of Professor Thomas Hume Bissonnette in Biology, Odell Shepard in English, and James A. Notopoulos in Classics were widely recognized as being of superior quality. And no little honor came to Trinity when Professor Shepard was awarded a Pulitzer Prize for his biography of Bronson Alcott. Standards of undergraduate academic performance continued to rise, and many a Trinity Alumnus proceeded to distinguished work in the graduate and professional schools of the major universities.\textsuperscript{120} Undergraduate social life was much improved, and the athletic teams enjoyed a series of most successful seasons.\textsuperscript{121} All-in-all, it was one of those “comfortable” periods which an institution briefly experiences in the course of its history and, in many ways, the Ogilby years may be compared with the Presidency of Abner Jackson, of which so much has been made in this volume. But the decade of the 1930’s was, too, the end of an era—perhaps an “Indian Summer” of the “old Trinity”—for events were soon to occur which would disrupt the pleasant tenor of Trinity life, break some of the institution’s most hallowed traditions, and set the College along a path which would remove it from the “small college” pattern which, by choice or necessity, it had traditionally followed.