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American college and university students in the 1960's are dramatically demonstrating their belief that the period of in loco parentis is over. Current student rhetoric maintains that officials lack the authority to regulate the activities of students except in matters clearly "educational." Requiring students to live in dormitories, to observe specified hours, to refrain from acts of civil disobedience, to invite only "approved" speakers to campus, to publish only "responsible" items in student newspapers and magazines, and to respect established channels of communication merely begin the list of practices currently being challenged by aroused students.

Students are not alone in their assertions. Members of the educational establishment, administrators as well as professors, are also increasingly taking the position that the college student is a mature adult, guaranteed the civil liberties due every citizen, and liable to no restraints save those common to all members of civil society. At a recent conference on the legal aspects of student-institutional relationships, Princeton's William M. Beaney, a professor of political science, reflected the current mood when he recommended that "universities should establish an internal order that takes into account the legitimate claims of students, one that makes provision for internal justice and that recognizes the rights and obligations of
students should be defined after long and searching deliberation, and not dismissed simply because the law, at present, provides no compulsion to act differently. . . ." Maintaining that students can no longer be considered as innocent wards of a beneficent, all-wise and all-powerful agent, Beaney states:

Rules pertaining to academic and noncurricular matters must be reasonably related to institutional objectives and, to the fullest extent possible, must provide meaningful standards to guide students in their academic and other activities, and should be enforced through clearly stated and fairly administered procedures.¹

At the same conference Robert B. McKay, Dean of the New York University Law School, contended that "orderly and peaceful demonstrations on campus should not be forbidden unless they interfere with legitimate university functions" and that since students enjoy all the constitutional rights of other citizens, "it is difficult to see how the university can restrict student off-campus activities involving the lawful exercise of First Amendment apparent rights."² William Van Alstyne of the Duke University Law School asserted that vague speaker-ban rules were objectionable and that orderly meetings by students to express grievances against the college itself are a protected form of expression. Van Alstyne added that college officials do not have the right to mute criticism by forbidding critical comment in the campus newspaper.³

Professor Beaney stated moreover that "the unpopularity or irrationality of student expression provides no justification for suppression or


²Ibid.

³Ibid.
penalty. In short, the emerging view holds that the student is not to be treated as an immature youth in need of protection or restraint by the university, no matter how well-meaning its policies might be.

Even a cursory reading of American educational history reveals quite plainly that such was not always the case. Traditionally, administrators have held the view that the institution must impose restrictions on students for their own good as well as for the sake of maintaining an orderly functioning organization. Until recently, at least, the majority of parents who sent their sons and daughters off to college generally expected that officials would enforce regulations and maintain standards basic to good conduct. And students, for all their complaints and infractions of the rules, generally accepted the right of the college to stand in place of the parent. In the present decade, however, none of these traditional assumptions remains unchallenged. Demonstrations by students as well as position statements by such organizations as the American Association of University Professors are announcing that contemporary trends cannot be reconciled with traditional policies.

The confusion that now exists is directly related to conflicting views of the status of the student in the university structure. Is he to be seen as a novice in need of guidance and supervision by superiors, or is he to be considered a scholar among scholars, mature and capable of governing his own affairs? Is he to be considered merely a recipient

---

4 Ibid.

of knowledge or a participant in the educative process? Is the university responsible for the character of its students, or is character formation an individual matter beyond the legitimate concerns of the university? How the student is seen at once determines and is determined by the way in which the authorities define the nature and purpose of the university. The wedding of collegiate traditions and university aspirations has resulted in the current paradoxical situation wherein students are treated in some respects as if they were completely responsible for their actions while in other matters they are accorded the status of youngsters incapable of governing their lives. An examination of the philosophies of the builders of the university system in the United States in the late nineteenth century might uncover at least some of the roots of the present dilemma.

The writer intends to advance the thesis that a commitment toward Lernfreiheit—the freedom to learn—was an integral part of the philosophies of the leading champions of the university movement, and that the justification for liberating undergraduate students was founded upon the premise that students, if given more responsibility for their own actions, would conduct themselves as gentlemen and scholars. Although in theory the pioneering university presidents tended to disavow the responsibility of the university for the character of students, confusion as to how far student freedom should be extended resulted from a reluctance to act fully on their pronouncements.

Of immediate concern then are two related issues, student freedom and the university's obligation for student character. In the first
instance, it will be seen that the shift from *in loco parentis* toward Lernfreiheit has been evolutionary in nature. Although little was written on "student academic freedom" before the twentieth century was into its third and fourth decades and although the volume of rhetoric on this issue has reached a high point only in the 1960's, the crucial shift giving rise to current views occurred at an earlier period. A tendency toward allowing more freedom to students was underway even before the Civil War period, but it was not until the last third of the nineteenth century that the old order was seriously challenged.

At the very time when university leaders were encouraging student initiative and paving the way for increased student freedom, they hesitated in varying degrees to reject fully the legacy of concern for student manners and morals. The relaxing of sectarian bonds, the challenge of the "new science," the appeal of the German ideal of research and scholarship, the increasing demands for "practical" education, and the growing attraction of and necessity for higher education which resulted in increased enrollments, all served to weaken, but did not eliminate completely, traditional efforts to protect and shape the character of students. But, accepting new challenges and announcing for itself new aims forced the university into a relationship with the student unlike that which was characteristic of the "old-time college."

6 Yet, in spite of the increased attention to this topic, a reasoned theory of student academic freedom is still lacking. See Christopher John Lucas, "American Conceptions of Academic Freedom in the Twentieth Century" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School, Ohio State University, 1967).
To support the above thesis, the status and role of the student in the university as revealed in the actions and views of four early university presidents will be analyzed. The four selected for study are those who were seen by themselves, by their contemporaries, and have since been judged by historians of education as the most outstanding developers of the American university ideal: Daniel Coit Gilman of Johns Hopkins, Andrew Dickson White of Cornell, Charles William Eliot of Harvard, and James Burrill Angell of Michigan. Other presidents in time refined and altered the concept of the American university, but these four stand as the pioneers of the university movement in the United States. Theirs was a conscious effort to break with the past. During their administrations, their institutions unmistakably left the fold of colleges and emerged as the dominant pacesetters among institutions that would call themselves universities. Each of these presidents developed a philosophy of the nature of a university, and each set in motion his ideals at his own institution. Gilman, White, Eliot, and Angell are worthy of study too in that each presided over a different type of university: Gilman governed a privately endowed institution dedicated from its beginning to the highest standards of university scholarship; White presided over a privately endowed land-grant university; Eliot was president of the foremost private liberal arts college which was acquiring university status; and Angell guided the affairs of a midwestern state university. Thus, each had an unique contribution to make to the university system. The nature of the institutions over which they presided coupled with philosophic and personality differences caused these four to differ in some important
particulars as to the nature and purpose of "the university," but the commonality of their break with the traditional collegiate system cemented them in a common cause. Further, Gilman was a close personal friend of both Eliot and White, and each of the four was acquainted with the others. All had spent time in Europe and were well acquainted with European educational ideals. Advice and ideas were exchanged in personal meetings and in letters; the official publications of each president were carefully studied by his colleagues. Each realized that the successes and failures of one university administration held vital lessons for the others.

Thus, the primary concern of this dissertation is a presentation and comparison of the views of these four presidents as to the role of the university with respect to the formation of student character and their opinions and actions pertaining to student freedom. To this end, their writings, both formal and informal, will serve as the main source of data with special attention being given to their published speeches and articles.

The original concept of Lernfreiheit stemmed from the German universities and referred to the absence of direct governance by university officials over the affairs of students. Students were free to shift from one university to another and were generally at liberty to determine the choice and sequence of courses taken. Their place of residence and their private lives were of no concern to the university. A similar policy existed in French and Italian universities from the beginnings of the university movement. The practice of regulating student activities has traditionally enjoyed limited application when
when viewed in the context of western educational history. As Henry Steele Commager has pointed out:

... Academic freedom was born, some seven centuries ago, as student freedom, with the insistence by students in Italian and French universities on the right to have a decisive voice in choosing professors, arranging for courses of lectures, controlling their housekeeping affairs, and securing certain political rights in their communities. The notion that the university should act in loco parentis to its students is a relatively new and limited one; to this day it is confined pretty much to English-speaking countries, and unknown elsewhere.7

In the American context, therefore, academic freedom has traditionally been reserved for professors while a policy of in loco parentis has been followed where students were concerned. Highly significant is the fact that the authors of the important A.A.U.P. "Report on Academic Freedom" of 1915 felt that "it need scarcely be pointed out that the freedom which is the subject of this report is that of the teacher."8 The authors noted that "'academic freedom' has traditionally had two applications--to the freedom of the teacher and to that of the student, to Lehrfreiheit and Lernfreiheit."9 In the domestication of the concept in America, however, Lernfreiheit was largely ignored.10

9Ibid.
10It is not surprising then that investigations into academic freedom in the United States have been essentially concerned with professorial freedom. The work by Howard K. Beale, A History of Freedom of Teaching in American Schools (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941) has been supplanted by Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger's The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955). Several doctoral
A swelling tide of literature, endless conferences on campuses across the nation, and increased emphasis on student personnel programs all attest to the mounting concern of educators with the college student in recent years. Indeed, the student is now spoken of as if he were just discovered, a new arrival in the academic community. As one college administrator recently observed, if current trends continue, the college student may well become the "most researched, analyzed, probed, charted, dissected, scrutinized, and catalogued species of our time, not even excluding the astronauts." But recent activity has not yet compensated for the long tradition of neglect of the college student. However, there are a few studies which offer insight into student life and activities as well as some investigations dissertations explore the academic freedom issue, but here too emphasis is on Lehrfreiheit rather than on Lernfreiheit. Among others see Robert Benjamin Sutton, "European and American Backgrounds of the American Concept of Academic Freedom, 1500-1944" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School, University of Missouri, 1950) and Stanley Rolnick, "The Development of the Idea of Academic Freedom and Tenure in the United States, 1870-1920" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School, University of Wisconsin, 1952).


dealing with the evolution of student personnel services, a concern tangential to this study.

Certain limitations must be observed in a study of this sort. No attempt has been made to present comprehensive biographical studies of the presidents under consideration. Where pertinent, however, an attempt has been made to enter biographical information which sheds light on the views and actions of each president. Further, it is clearly beyond the scope of this dissertation to present full historical coverage of their universities or even detailed treatment of their administrations. The criterion used for inclusion or exclusion of information is basically the relevance of data to the questions presented above. Those who are concerned with biography or institutional history may take cognizance of the notations made in the text.

In order to appreciate the significance of the views and actions of these four presidents regarding student freedom and the development of student character, it is necessary to place them within the context of the history of American higher education. The chapter which follows presents an admittedly brief but essential analysis of the aims and methods of student control in American colleges prior to the university

period, which, according to Veysey,\textsuperscript{14} falls before 1865. The analysis is made easier by the existence of many individual college histories which have been amplified by several enlightening studies of the antebellum college.\textsuperscript{15}

The emergence of the American university has been treated as a significant movement in several informative general histories of American higher education\textsuperscript{16} and several scholars have directed their attention to specific aspects of university development.\textsuperscript{17} The most useful single source on the rise of the American university is Veysey's recent work.\textsuperscript{18} It is not our purpose here to compete with or duplicate these contributions to American university history, but rather to focus attention on an aspect of the university movement largely neglected or overshadowed in existing studies: the altered relationship between the student and the university and the administrative redefinition of the role of the student in the new structure. Therefore,

\textsuperscript{14}See Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965).

\textsuperscript{15}To cite only a few of the most helpful, see Donald G. Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932); George P. Schmidt, The Old Time College President (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930); and Albea Godbold, The Church College of the Old South (Durham: Duke University Press, 1944).


\textsuperscript{18}Veysey, op. cit.
rather than devoting a chapter or chapters to the social and educational currents of the period, it seems the wiser course to recognize such forces as they were reflected in the views and actions of the presidents under consideration and as they were indicated by the directions in which these presidents pointed their universities. Consequently, the status of the student in the new institution has been treated as an integral part of, not separate from, the emerging shape and nature of four American universities.

Even though attitudes toward the degree of freedom students should exercise are interwoven with social and institutional expectations as to the amount of freedom accorded professors, no study has yet concentrated on the history of student discipline or "student academic freedom." It is hoped that this dissertation, while not undertaking that aim, will nonetheless illuminate one aspect of that theme. The way in which Gilman, White, Eliot, and Angell saw the relationship between the university and the student determined their attitudes toward discipline, student freedom, and the degree to which the university should accept responsibility for student character. Significant social as well as educational changes have occurred since these men laid the groundwork for the American university ideal, but the contemporary situation can only be understood in the light of its formative influences.
CHAPTER II

THE "OLD-TIME COLLEGE" IN LOCO PARENTIS
IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Piety, Manners and Morals as an Educational Aim

The contemporary American university--or multiversity, as one of its former presidents\(^1\) recently dubbed it--seems to bear little resemblance either to its medieval parents or to its siblings across the Atlantic. Few European universities can boast (or bemoan) the large and heterogeneous populations served by an increasing number of gigantic American state universities. And, although change is clearly underway, European cathedrals of scholarship have not, as yet, dared to undertake the continuously growing tasks of their American counterparts. The American university, in its commitment to instruction in the arts and sciences, to applied and theoretical research, to professional and vocational training, and to service to the government as well as to private enterprise, seems an awkward member of the fraternity of universities in the Western world. Indeed, the typical European scholar might well share the sentiments of the perturbed former president of the University of Chicago who compared the American university to a cannibal who tries to swallow every conceivable task which comes.

\(^{1}\)Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge: Havard University Press, 1963)
its way.\(^2\) No doubt envying the more sedate life of Oxford and Cambridge dons, another critic of the modern university has complained that, like the medieval guild, the American university attempts to do everything for the "town."\(^3\) And, as some with scorn and others with praise might well add, the American university apparently tries to do everything for the student as well. Health centers, dormitories, cafeterias, counseling services, provisions for entertainment, and a host of other services all seem oddly out of character when one compares the American system of higher education with the traditional form of the continental European university.

Yet, for all its diversity, its insatiable appetite, its commitment to numerous and often conflicting purposes, the American university is nonetheless the legitimate child of immigrant parents. The little "Schoole or Colledge" conceived in the minds of a few Puritan settlers in 1636 was long undernourished and frail, but it was unmistakably the progeny of Oxford and Cambridge. In terms of curriculum, collegial pattern, regulations, religious atmosphere and in general aim, Harvard represented an attempt to bring a bit of England to the New World. When in time Harvard was joined by other struggling institutions of higher learning, they too bore the stamp of the English tradition. The nine colonial colleges were already adjusting to new demands by the time of the Revolution, and have ever since grown more independent of their


\(^3\) Jacques Barzun, "The University as the Beloved Republic," ibid., p. 25.
parent institutions, but, for all the transitions and alterations, American colleges and universities are at bottom transplanted institutions.

And well should they be. Of the many motives urging Europeans to forsake their homelands for the untamed forests of the New world, the desire for a different approach to education was noticeably absent. The Puritans of Massachusetts no less than the Anglicans in Jamestown had no notion of abandoning their educational traditions. "None of the early settlers in English America," writes Bailyn, "not even those who hoped to create in the New World a utopian improvement on the Old, contemplated changes in this configuration of educational processes, this cluster of assumptions, traditions and institutions."^ The founders of Harvard were determined to establish a New Cambridge as well as a New England, pioneer prejudices and frontier values notwithstanding.^

Motivated by a strong sense of mission, the Puritans wasted little time in providing for the enlightenment of their numbers. The author of New England's First Fruits justified the haste with which the Massachusetts settlers set about to found a seminary of learning in the wilderness:

After God had carried us safe to New England, and we had builded our houses, provided necessaries for our liveli-hood, rear'd convenient places for Gods worship, and setled the Civill Government:

---


One of the next things we longed for, and looked after was to advance Learning and perpetuate it to Posterity; dreading to leave an illiterate Ministry to the Churches, when our present Ministers shall lie in the Dust.⁶

Preparation of an educated clergy was indeed to be a vital concern not only of Harvard but of the other colonial and later denominational colleges which followed her lead. But there were yet other assumptions and traditions worthy of preservation. The curriculum of the college was forged by the Renaissance as well as the Reformation, and was to serve secular interests as well as theological. Neither Harvard nor any of the other eight colonial colleges ever served merely as theological seminaries. That the early colleges were not theological schools or even given exclusively to the education of ministers is clearly shown by Schmidt:

... At no time did all or nearly all of the graduates enter the ministry. ... At Harvard, 52 per cent of the graduates and 40 per cent of all students in the seventeenth century became ministers, probably a smaller proportion than at Oxford and Cambridge in the same years. Of four hundred and seventy-eight students who graduated from Princeton during the incumbency of President Witherspoon, 1769 to 1794, the percentage was less than 25. A later compilation, made in 1850, showed that about 25 per cent of the graduates of Harvard, Yale, and Dartmouth up to that time had become ministers. Secular interests ... had never been entirely absent....⁷

It is then to a large degree true that the seventeenth and eighteenth century colleges were "religious schools," but theological seminaries they were not.⁸

⁶New Englands First Fruits (London, 1643) as found in ibid., pp. 420-446; the quotation above is on p. 432.


If the early colleges in America can be said to have had any single purpose that outweighed all others, then it would have to be their intention, through the curriculum and the total environment, to develop the character of their students. Disciplining the mind was also of great concern, but piety overshadowed intellect. From the first there was evidenced sincere concern for the manners and morals of students; whether one was destined to serve in church or secular callings, it was essential that the highest character be maintained. And, paralleling concern for character in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century colleges was concern for correct religious beliefs. Where one existed, the other was to be found also; the lack of one also indicated a lack in the other. For a time, orthodoxy and sound character were one, but long after orthodoxy faded as a raison d'être of the college, the concern for gentlemanly character remained. Henry Dunster would in time have his own religious beliefs questioned, but the first president of Harvard nonetheless understood the broad

President, p. 22, states: "It seems then that the colonial college, at least in its later stages, was intended not so much to train men to be ministers as to train ministers—and others—to be men." Cf. Donald G. Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932), p. 59 ff., who places more stress on the idea that most "colonial colleges were primarily designed as institutions for the education of ministers."

Dunster, president from 1640-1654, committed the then unpardonable sin of refusing to have one of his children baptised, an act which led the Overseers to conclude that he was too dangerous a man to be in charge of impressionable boys. See Samuel Eliot Morison, Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century, I (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936), pp. 305-314, and Jeremiah Chaplin, Life of Henry Dunster (Boston: James R. Osgood and Co., 1872), Chapters IX-XIII.
principles to which the college was committed when he instructed newly appointed teaching fellows to:

... Take care to advance in all learning, divine and humane, each and every student who is or will be entrusted to your tutelage, according to their several abilities; and especially to take care that their conduct and manners be honorable and without blame.10

In a later day, a commitment to secular learning and character development might imply a lack of concern for orthodox belief, but toleration was hardly a trait desired or possessed by Harvard's founders. Seeing themselves as God's chosen few, the Puritans could not conceive of allowing opposing views to flourish, as many Quakers and Baptists soon learned. As Hofstadter and Metzger have observed:

It was ... implicitly understood that the teaching in the college would be committed to the doctrinal orthodoxy of the New England Congregational Way; and if no formal tests or oaths of conformity were imposed, it was not because conformity was not expected but because the community was at the beginning so homogeneous in religious conviction that such requirements were felt to be superfluous.11

Yet, Harvard found, as did Yale and numerous other colleges in later periods, that adherence to narrow sectarian views was to be impossible in the New World. Threatened by internal dissension as succeeding generations displayed less and less zeal for the beliefs of their fathers, and plagued by mounting pressures from the Crown and from new inhabitants demanding toleration, the dream of the Holy Commonwealth had dissipated by the opening years of the eighteenth century. By 1700, Harvard was moving from stern Calvinism to a mild Unitarianism. Recognizing a new balance of power as competing religious groups gained


an ever stronger position in Massachusetts, even the most pious inheritors of the Puritan tradition, Increase and Cotton Mather, found it convenient to praise the virtue of religious toleration by the 1690's.12

As the Harvard climate became more receptive to liberalism, the concern of the Corporation moved more toward insuring gentlemanly conduct than upon insisting on religious orthodoxy. Perhaps one indication of the changing attitude is exemplified by President John Leverett's references to the "Sons of Harvard" rather than the former Biblical designation favored by his predecessors, "Sons of the Prophets."13

The changes occurring by the early eighteenth century were by no means applauded by the more devout. While Cotton Mather might find it expedient to acknowledge a spirit of toleration, he became most aroused when he learned that Harvard students in the 1720's were privately reading "plays, novels, empty and vicious pieces of poetry, and even Ovid's Epistles," which, he warned, "have a vile tendency to corrupt good manners."14 Mather's charges sparked an investigation by the Overseers, only one of a long series of heresy-hunts to plague American higher education, but the verdict rendered in this episode probably brought its

12 Ibid., p. 97. The authors in Chapter II present an informing analysis of the shift from orthodoxy to liberalism at Harvard. See also Perry Miller, The New England Mind: from Colony to Province (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

13 Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard, p. 60. Leverett was president of Harvard from 1708-1724; with his inauguration may be said to have ended the period of strict religious orthodoxy at Harvard.

instigator little comfort. The investigators reported that indeed some unassigned reading had been engaged in by the students. Even worse, a few students had fallen into other immoralities, "particularly stealing, swearing, idleness, picking of locks, and too frequent use of strong drink." But the Overseers, for all their concern, were beginning to understand the hazards inherent in the collegiate way; such immoralities, they confessed, still continued in the College in spite of the "faithful endeavors of the rulers of the House of suppress them." 15

Thus, concern for student manners and morals continued at Harvard, as elsewhere, well into the twentieth century, and students continually managed to give their substitute parents plenty to be concerned about. Even though after the seventeenth century the overseers, presidents, and faculty members at Harvard were forced to refrain from (or at least tone down) their attempts at encouraging sectarian religious beliefs, the aim of producing men of sound character continued on. The ideal of the Christian gentleman was to be a central feature of the collegiate way.

Harvard was not alone in its concern for cultivating the standards of gentlemanliness as well as scholarship. After several abortive attempts, the colony of Anglicans to the south finally received a charter for a college in 1693. Obviously unimpressed with the Virginians' claim that such an institution would be useful in saving souls, the attorney general for the Crown is reported to have bellowed: "Souls!  

15 Ibid., p. 316-321.
Damn your souls! Raise tobacco."\(^{16}\) The determined Virginians undertook both causes, proving themselves not only capable of raising and curing tobacco, but of caring for souls as well. The charter which brought the College of William and Mary into existence pledged the institution to the educating of clergymen and provided as well that all the youth in attendance be "piously educated in good letters and manners."\(^{17}\)

The founders of Yale College were if anything even more committed to sound Puritanism and decent morality than the Massachusetts divines had proven to be, but even here the broad purposes of the college were clear at the outset. Fear that a growing spirit of toleration at Harvard was in fact a drifting away from the first principles of Calvinism, a group of New England worthies persuaded Elihu Yale that he could render no better service to mankind--nor indeed, as Cotton Mather counseled, could erect no better monument to his own memory--than to provide for the founding of a new college, one of course, bearing its benefactor's name.\(^{18}\) The 1701 charter of the collegiate school which pre-dated Yale's none-too-generous endowment acknowledged not only a desire to uphold and propagate the "Christian Protestant Religion by


\(^{17}\) Ibid., p. 5.

a succession of Learned and Orthodox men," but noted further that the school would have as an end the instruction in the arts and sciences of youth "who through the blessing of Almighty God may be fitted for Publick employment in Church & Civil State."19

In like manner did the subsequent colleges which began to dot the eastern seaboard commit themselves to broad secular as well as religious aims. Princeton was a child of the Great Awakening, but its founders saw fit to direct their energies to the education of layman as well as to candidates for the ministry. "Though our great intention was to erect a seminary for educating ministers of the Gospel," they declared, "yet we hope it will be a means of raising up men that will be useful in other learned professions--ornaments of the State as well as the Church."20 Neighboring Queen's College (now Rutgers) displayed a similar attitude. In advertising the founding of King's College (Columbia) in 1754, its first president, Samuel Johnson, linked the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ with virtuous habits and useful knowledge which should render students "creditable to their Families and Friends, Ornaments to their Country and useful to the public Weal in their Generations." And, while there was to be "no Intention to impose on the Schollars the peculiar Tenets of any particular Sect of Christians," there would be concern for the "great Principles of Christianity and Morality in which true Christians of each Denomination

19Dexter, pp. 20-23.

are generally agreed.\textsuperscript{21} At the College of Philadelphia the religious motive was largely absent. True to the spirit of its founder, Benjamin Franklin's college was concerned with what was "most useful" and "most ornamental."\textsuperscript{22}

Thus, although "education in colonial America was the child of religion,"\textsuperscript{23} the colleges accommodated a significant majority who were neither preparing for the ministry nor necessarily orthodox in their beliefs. College officials would assure parents that their sons' morals would be cared for, but there would be no direct policy of enforcing religious conformity on the students. The Baptists of Rhode Island who founded the institution which became Brown University clearly expressed this willingness to practice religious toleration by providing that: "Into this Liberal and Catholic Institution shall never be admitted any Religious Tests," but "Youths of all Religious Denominations shall and may be freely admitted to the Equal Advantages, Emoluments and Honors of the College or University."\textsuperscript{24} Perhaps one factor encouraging not only Brown but all the colonial colleges to adhere to a policy of toleration regarding student persuasions was the gradual growth of competition among colleges for students. In the nineteenth

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} The advertisement is in Louis Franklin Snow, \textit{The College Curriculum in the United States} (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1907), pp. 56-57.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Schmidt, \textit{The Liberal Arts College}, p. 25. Elsie Clews Parsons, \textit{Educational Legislation and Administration of the Colonial Governments} (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1899), contains the charters of the colonial colleges.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Wertenbaker, p. 3.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Walter C. Bronson, \textit{The History of Brown University: 1764-1914} (Providence: Brown University, 1914), p. 29.
\end{itemize}
century this pressure was most definitely a factor; not a few colleges died from lack of students.\textsuperscript{25}

The toleration granted to students is of no small significance. While attempts to convert wayward students into the particular sects sponsoring colleges doubtless continued in a not always subtle fashion in a great many colleges until the twentieth century, the very fact that they were officially allowed freedom of conscience in religious matters marks an early phase in the gradual growth of academic freedom in the United States. Hofstadter and Metzger noted in their careful study of the development of academic freedom that "freedom of thought as a consciously formulated goal appeared first as religious freedom for students."\textsuperscript{26} Long before there was consideration of freedom for teachers, the existence of religious freedom or toleration for undergraduates was commonly pointed to as an outstanding asset by college officials.

**Faculty as Moral Exemplars**

If the colonial colleges adopted a policy of moderate toleration for students, they were not so lenient regarding professors, presidents, and tutors. Following the resignation of Harvard's Dunster for his unorthodox views, the new president, Charles Chauncy, was compelled to keep to himself his doctrinal deviations before he could assume office in 1654. At Yale, new appointees had to assent to the Westminster Confession and the ecclesiastical discipline of the Connecticut Congregational churches as laid down in the Saybrook Platform of 1708. Even where allegiance to a particular sect was not openly a prerequisite

\textsuperscript{25}See Tewksbury, esp. pp. 23-28.

\textsuperscript{26}Hofstadter and Metzger, p. 152.
for employment, teachers were carefully chosen on the basis of their views and character. Potential tutors and professors were frequently quizzed as to their religious views, not only before appointments were made, but even afterward, especially if the trustees had reason to suspect a shift in their convictions. In 1735 the Overseers of the Harvard corporation found it necessary to dismiss a French instructor who they determined had been affected by some of the same tendencies toward "enthusiasm" that were associated with the Awakening. Indicative of the power assumed by the trustees and of their determination to keep students from being contaminated was their assertion of the right to examine into the principles of all those that are Employed in the instruction of Students of the College upon any Just Suspicion of their holding dangerous tenents altho no Express Charge be Layed against them ... and that no person chosen into such an office shall be accepted or Continued who refuseth when desired to give Satisfaction to this board as to their principles in religion.27

Exactly what views might be determined "dangerous" varied with the times. Morison notes that the accepted meaning of "orthodoxy" came to be whatever was in accord with the "general sentiments of the country."28 Thus, what views one should conform to might change, but unchanging was the notion that the board of control had the authority and the responsibility to insist upon "qualified" professors. And, if boards of control in time mellowed somewhat with respect to the religious beliefs of their professors, they often made up for that tolerance in


28 Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard, p. 188.
other ways. Obnoxious personality traits and dissenting political views could end a career as easily as could religious heresy. Standing unchallenged in loco parentis, boards of control assumed a protective posture that long served to militate against both student and professorial freedom alike.

The Responsibility and Response of the Collegiate Way

The desire to protect the character and influence the religious views of students, a commitment common to all colleges at least until late in the nineteenth century, necessitated more precautions than merely selecting professors of sound habits and beliefs. In fact, to explain the theory and practice of in loco parentis is to describe the essential character of the "old-time college." Almost everything the college did, its every activity, was directly related to its central concern: the protection and guidance of the young boys in its care. Like any good parent, the college took its responsibility seriously. On the one hand, the college had a responsibility to the intellect; for more than two centuries following Harvard's founding the traditional classical curriculum was relatively unquestioned as the proper vehicle

29See, for example, William M. Meigs, Life of Josiah Meigs (Philadelphia: J. P. Murphy, Printer, 1887) or Dumas Malone, The Public Life of Thomas Cooper (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1926).

30For discussion of the relationship between boards of control and academic freedom, see Hofstadter and Metzger, chapter III and passim. See also Robert Benjamin Sutton, "European and American Backgrounds of the American Concept of Academic Freedom, 1500-1914," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School, University of Missouri, 1950), esp. chapters V and VI.
for cultivating and disciplining the mind. On the other, piety, manners, morals--in a word, character--had to be advanced. For this more than the classical curriculum was needed. Provision for spiritual growth and the inculcation of proper habits of conduct were tasks calling for unrelenting efforts on every front. The protective measures utilized only began in the classroom; they permeated the whole of the college environment. In class and out, the student in the ante-bellum college was ever under the all-encompassing influence of the college, alma mater, in loco parentis. Elements of control which often began as expedients lengthened into traditions, traditions which were to be challenged frequently in the nineteenth century but never completely broken. Even when the university appeared offering a new rationale for American higher education, the inherited notion of in loco parentis remained, although new forms of control tended to blur its earlier and more clearly recognizable character.

Location and Residential Pattern.--To many who would have the college stand in place of the parents, it was essential that the college be located in a favorable environment. When one considers the scarcity of significant cities in seventeenth-century America, it is not at all surprising that the early colleges were established in lightly populated areas. Not until the founding of the College of Philadelphia and King's College in New York in the 1750's could colleges be said to exist in an urban atmosphere. But, what is surprising is that King's and Philadelphia became the exception rather than the rule. Long after

cities had become firmly planted across the country, college builders still showed a preference for rural and small-town settings. The idea that the most favorable location for a college was one close to nature became a familiar theme of those who felt keenly the college's responsibility as a molder of character and protector of morals.

Part of the explanation as to why this pattern developed is to be found in a preference for the residential way of life as exemplified in the collegial arrangements of the British universities. Admirers of the British system held that more than books, professors, students, and classrooms was needed to establish the proper college environment. The ideal collegiate atmosphere could result only from communal living; thus, adherence to the residential scheme of things was all but essential. "The collegiate way," writes Rudolph, "is respectful of quiet rural settings, dependent on dormitories, committed to dining halls, permeated by paternalism."32 Under conditions such as these, the advancement of learning could proceed serenely. When in 1770 it was proposed to locate the College of Rhode Island in Providence, a town already boasting four hundred houses, disciples of the collegiate way objected—although this time in vain—that "a Considerable Degree of Retirement is very Requisite in order to acquire any Great Proficiency in literary pursuits."33

Important as it was, proficiency in literary pursuits was not the chief concern of the most ardent followers of the collegiate way.


33Bronson, p. 47.
After all, students in Bologna, Paris, Vienna, and numerous other European universities had managed to pursue learning in urban centers for centuries. But to the carriers of the English tradition in the New World, of more immediate concern than fostering the intellect was protecting the morals of students. If, for no other reason, this consideration alone made the rural or small-town residential college seem necessary.

Not all trustees had the freedom of those of the University of Georgia who in the summer of 1801 set out "into the forests to the northwest and did not stop until they had almost entered Indian country."\(^34\) Satisfied that they had left behind the evils of city life, they named a hilltop Athens and began clearing the ground for the University. In like manner, the charter which gave birth to the University of North Carolina in 1789 prohibited the locating of the University "within five miles of the seat of government, or any of the places holding the courts of law or equity."\(^35\) Chapel Hill was found to meet these requirements satisfactorily, a place "covered with a primeval growth of forest trees, with only one or two settlements and a few acres of clearing."\(^36\) Kenyon, in addition to its claim as the healthiest spot in Ohio, had the additional recommendation of being only six miles from a stage line and only twenty-five from the National Road—a convenient spot, but not contaminated. Not as convenient, but doubtless

\(^{34}\) E. Merton Coulter, College Life in the Old South (New York: Macmillan Co., 1928), p. 9.


\(^{36}\) Ibid., p. 35.
"safer" was Beloit College, located in a frontier village five hundred miles from a railroad, fifty miles from a bank, and three days' ride from the nearest city.\textsuperscript{37} Hampden-Sidney could boast that its "quite locality in the country, removed from the bustle of life and from temptations to idleness and vice, incident to a town or city neighborhood . . . renders this college one of the most desirable retreats to every student who aims to secure the thorough culture of his mind and heart, and the formation of correct habits."\textsuperscript{38}

There were some, of course, who put little stock in the advantages claimed by the advocates of rural settings. While North Yarmouth supported its bid for Bowdin College on the grounds that it was "not so much exposed to many Temptations to Dissipation, Extravagance, Vanity and Various Vices as great seaport towns usually are," Portland countered that it would be a better site because of the influence a larger town would have for polish and refinement.\textsuperscript{39} Columbia, committed to an urban existence, found occasion to use the "moral argument" to justify not moving to the outskirts when such was proposed in 1854. A country location, the trustees argued, would lead to frivolity and vices, gaming and extravagance, while in the city few students would be so affected, for home and church influences would act as restraints.

\textsuperscript{37}Schmidt, The Liberal Arts College, pp. 9-12.

\textsuperscript{38}Godbold, pp. 107-108.

To the Columbia trustees, the "commuting student" lives a more normal, and therefore a more moral life.\(^40\)

As the history of American higher education shows, the debate between the urban vs. the rural environment has never been conclusively settled, but it is of significance to note that of great importance to advocates of both positions was the effect location would supposedly have on the morals of the students. Neither camp was yet prepared to disavow responsibility for this aspect of the collegiate way.

Since most of the colleges were born in the country (although many found themselves growing up in towns and cities), dormitories and commons were found necessary and, to some at least, desirable. Here again supporters of the collegiate way couched their arguments in moral and religious terms. Rudolph has described the main rationale for this system by noting that:

\[\ldots\] The dormitory held young men to a common experience. It took them from the bosom of a sheltering home and placed them under the same roof, where they might share the experiences which made men and boys. The dormitory made possible--so the argument went--the supervision and parental concern of the faculty for the well-being of their young charges. The dormitory brought to bear the sense of common decency and the sense of self-respect which taught responsibility. In the dormitory young men talked deep into the night deeply about deep matters. A revival might be sparked in the dormitory, where under the influence of a wiser chum a young man might move from indifference to belief, from idleness to profound inspiration. So the argument went, and everywhere the dormitories went up--because it was the tradition, because students had to be housed, and finally because people actually believed the dormitory rationale.\(^41\)

\(^{40}\)Schmidt, The Liberal Arts College, p. 12. There were, of course, other factors influencing the decisions regarding the location of colleges besides the "moral environment." See Schmidt's analysis of "Colleges in the Wilderness," pp. 3-22.

\(^{41}\)Rudolph, p. 96.
Such close living actually produced more pranks and riots than revivals, but to those committed to the residential pattern, original sin might serve as a better explanation for such activities than the dormitory system itself. However, Rudolph contends that the dormitory, by concentrating students in barracks-like structures, actually facilitated rebellion. The validity of this view increases when one is reminded that between 1800 and 1875 students were in rebellion on at least one occasion at Miami University, Amherst, Brown, University of South Carolina, Williams, Georgetown, University of North Carolina, Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Lafayette, Bowdoin, City College of New York, Dickson, and DePauw—and doubtless elsewhere as well. But, though the system had its critics, it became an integral part of the collegiate way, one of the many schemes designed to protect the morals and strengthen the character of students.


42 Ibid., pp. 98-99.

43 See W. H. Cowley, "The History of Student Residential Housing," School and Society, XL (December 1, 1934 and December 8, 1934), pp. 705-712 and pp. 758-764. Noting that college founders typically conceived of the college more as a religious institution than as a seat of learning, Cowley states that the faculties were bent on saving the students' souls. "To have a student entirely under their control from 5 A. M. rising time until light out at 9 gave them the opportunity they sought to minister continuously to the souls' welfare of their charges." See p. 708. Cf. Eugenie Andruss Leonard, Origins of Personnel Services in American Higher Education (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956), p. 38, who notes that where lack of funds prevented the construction of dorms during the early years of a college's existence, students were housed in homes of the faculty or in other "carefully selected Christian homes."
students yet another mechanism of influence. Appearing with the rise of Jacksonian democracy in the United States, the manual labor movement for a few decades held out glowing promises. Not only would the students develop habits of industry, respect for labor, insight into scientific agriculture and more, but they could, by working on college farms or in college shops, reduce the costs of their education.\textsuperscript{44} Certainly the economic rationale proved more of an impetus to the creation of manual labor colleges than any effect it supposedly would have on morals. But the fact that several hours of work daily in the fields would dampen the restlessness of college youth was not overlooked. If the devil finds mischief for idle hands, then surely steady occupation would simplify the tasks of those standing in loco parentis.

The advantages claimed for the manual labor system proved sounder in theory than in practice. Although Oberlin, Davidson, Wake Forest, Mercer, Lafayette, Marietta and many other colleges began with the system, they soon found sufficient cause to discontinue it. Manual labor proved to be uneconomical, a hindrance to study, and just another source of student discontent. Whatever motivated students to attend college, certainly the desire to "make brooms and barrels for the salvation of their souls" was absent.\textsuperscript{45}

More direct attempts to save the souls of students met also with varying degrees of success. At the cornerstone-laying ceremonies at Amherst, Noah Webster proclaimed that one of the chief purposes of

\textsuperscript{44}See Godbold, p. 57.

\textsuperscript{45}Schmidt, The Old Time College President, p. 89.
American colleges was "to reclaim and evangelize the miserable children of Adam."\textsuperscript{46} As noted above, attempts to Christianize students continued long after strict orthodoxy declined. Revivals, especially in the 1830's and 1840's, caused excitement on many campuses and resulted in numerous conversions. Compulsory chapel, even at state universities (except Virginia), continued into the second half of the nineteenth century. College presidents, of whom nine out of ten before the Civil War were theologians, stood not only \textit{in loco parentis}, but by inference \textit{in loco dei}. In chapel exercises, prayer meetings, and from the Sunday pulpit, presidents and concerned professors could move their captive audiences with appeals to their religious instincts or by threats about the wrath of God.\textsuperscript{47} Regardless of the sect to which individual presidents adhered, they agreed on the notion that to be genuine, education must include training in morality and religion.

Religious and moral teachings were by no means limited to chapel and church services. From the late eighteenth century into the second half of the nineteenth, an almost universal feature of the college curriculum was a course in moral philosophy. Given to seniors almost always by the president, the course in its broadest sense included information from the fields of biology, sociology, psychology, politics, economics, and, of prime importance, religion and ethics. A study of lecture notes and texts prompted Schmidt to conclude that "there is

\textsuperscript{46}Claude M. Fuess, \textit{Amherst, the Story of a New England College} (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1935), p. 30.

\textsuperscript{47}Schmidt, \textit{The Liberal Arts College}, p. 35 and p. 87. Cf. his \textit{The Old Time College President}, p. 18:\textsuperscript{48} "Two-hundred-sixty-two of two-hundred eight-eight pre-Civil War presidents, more than nine-tenths of the whole, were ordained ministers."
scarcely a subject touched upon . . . which does not lead to a series of moralizing reflections. At times these come naturally, at times they are rather forced; but always they gave point and purpose to the discussion."

The lectures of President Eliphalet Nott of Union for the year 1829 typify not only the moralizing so prevalent in such courses but also the unlimited range of topics deemed worthy of consideration. Using Lord Kames' *Elements of Criticism* as a point of departure, Nott counseled his students to use restraint in reading: "Read but little, and turn that to the best account." Reason, he warned, may exist in man as an individual, "but in society feeling rules all." The President recommended physical exercise, gave advice on courtship, criticized actors, hypothesized that Methodist preachers do not live long because they do not laugh enough, and asserted that he knew of a boy in Connecticut with mudturtle flappers for arms as a result of prenatal influence.

Obviously not a profound course, it unquestionably captured the attention of many students. And, when tempered with religious and moral teachings, the information imparted by Nott and other presidents could exert quite an influence. Francis Wayland, himself to be revered as a teaching-president of great power at Brown, recalled that sitting in Nott's class "we began to think ourselves as men." No greater

---


compliment could be paid to one who held: "It has been my endeavor these twenty years, since I have had the care of youth, to make men rather than great scholars." 51

Timothy Dwight at Yale, Mark Hopkins at Williams, Horace Holley at Transylvania as well as Nott and Wayland only head the list of those presidents who dedicated themselves to the task of shaping opinions and molding character in the old-time college. In class and out, men such as these never ended their vigil. Wayland movingly expressed the keen sense of responsibility felt by such presidents:

It is a most touching thing to me to receive a new boy from his father, when I think what an influence there is in this place for evil as well as for good. I do not know anything which affects me more. If I could ever receive a fresh boy from his father without emotion, I should think it high time to be off. 52

Students frequently enough ignored or defied the moralizing of the presidents and whenever possible tried to escape their watchcare. But there were some who found presidential concern comforting. A Dartmouth student not noted for his faith in prayer admitted that whenever President Nathan Lord closed morning prayers with an appeal to God to "bless these young men, every one of them," he felt secure for the remainder of the day. 53

**Rules and Their Enforcers**.—Although applicants for admission into the colleges were expected to be boys of clean habits and good

51 Schmidt, The Liberal Arts College, p. 115. For more than sixty years (1804-1866) Nott carried out his purpose as President of Union. See Cornelius Van Santvoord, Memoirs of Eliphalet Nott (New York: Sheldon and Co., 1876).

52 Francis and H. L. Wayland, I, p. 260.

morals, the college officials could not assume that the students' home training would be enough to insure proper conduct even when reinforced by the traditional curriculum, and supported by the religious atmosphere and collegial pattern. From the first there were rules, which, through the first half of the nineteenth century, displayed a decided tendency for growth but seldom for pruning. Rules fixed the student's time for rising and retiring, the time for eating and relaxing, the time for studying and for praying. Harvard's first code of laws, patterned after the Elizabethan statutes of Cambridge, reaffirmed the validity of the Ten Commandments and for good measure spelled out in more detail the prohibitions on students. Students were warned to "eschew not only oaths, lies, and uncertain rumors, but likewise all idle, foolish, bitter scoffing, frothy wanton words and offensive gestures." The laws restricted the students from frequenting the company and society of "such men as lead an ungirt and dissolute life." Students were not allowed to leave the college without permission nor to purchase anything exceeding the value of six-pence "without the allowance of [their] parents, guardians, or tutors." The pattern adopted by Harvard was expanded upon in other colleges until frequently more pages in college catalogs were given over to rules than to course offerings—a fact in itself indicative of priorities. Rules governing student conduct were often composed by boards of trustees and not

infrequently enforced by them, at least when serious infractions occurred. But, whether boards interfered with the internal administration of the colleges or not, the major responsibility for the discipline of students rested with the president. It was his duty, assisted by his professors and tutors, diligently to "inspect and watch over the manners and behavior of the students, and in all proper methods, both by example and precept, to recommend to them a virtuous and blameless life, and a diligent attention to the public and private duties of religion." 55

The administration of the Rev. Thomas Clap at Yale (1739-1766) presents in bold relief the attitude that, to be effective, principles of government must rest squarely on a foundation of written law. In 1764 Clap advised a correspondent that "the more perfect state of any [Judiciary or] Polity is to have large numbers of good general rules to go by, and to act pro hie et nunc only in that case where they have not had wisdom, time or experience enough to fix upon more particular rules." 56

Prior to Clap's ascension to the presidency, Yale had operated largely on an ad hoc basis. Whenever an administrative problem or question of discipline arose which was not already covered by existing law, it had been customary to turn to the Harvard laws. By the time Clap took the reins, Yale had only a handful of general rules, a situation most upsetting to one so enamored with "constitutional government." Accordingly, Clap compiled a new law code, drawing its provisions from

55Leonard, p. 47.

the "ancient Laws and Statutes" and past customs of Yale, from the
laws of Harvard, from the statutes of Oxford, and, for good measure,
added regulations of his own.\textsuperscript{57} The Yale trustees approved Clap's
"College Laws" in 1745, thereby putting in force what must be the
classic example of detailed college regulations.

The eleven chapters of the laws covered every conceivable phase
of administrative concern. Clap spelled out the requirements for
admission to the College, regulations insuring religious and virtuous
living, and standards of scholarship. The regulations defined the
hours of study and directed that the tutors and/or the president were
to visit student chambers after nine o'clock to see if all were diligent-
ly at work. Even the duties of the nonacademic personnel were drawn
out in meticulous detail. The steward, for example, was to present an
annual report "to ye President & Fellows in writing of the Platters and
Other Utensils in the Kitchen belonging to the college. . . ." The
steward was also reminded of his obligation to keep the kitchen and all
utensils "Neat & Sweet."\textsuperscript{58}

The most significant section of Clap's code was Chapter IV--
"Of Penal Laws." Beginning with the most heinous offenses--blasphemy,
fornication, robbery, forgery--the rules run on for pages, listing

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{57}Tucker, p. 67.
\end{itemize}
crimes and the corresponding punishments. A few samples should serve
to illustrate the comprehensiveness of the regulations:

3. If any Scholar be Guilty of Profane Swearing, Cursing, Vowing, any Petty or Implicit Oath, Profane or Irreverent Use of the Names, Attributes, Ordinances or Word of God; Disobedient or Contumacious or Refractory Carriage towards his Superiors, Fighting, Striking, Quarrelling, Challenging, Turbulent Words or Behaviour, Drunkenness, Uncleaness, Lacivious Words or Actions, wearing woman's Apparel, Defrauding, Injustice, Idleness, Lying, Defamation, Tale bareing or any other Such like Immoralities, He Shall be Punished by Fine, Confession, Admonition or Expulsion, as the Nature and Circumstances of the Case may Require.

5. If any Scholar Shall break open any Other Scholars Door or Open it with a Pick-Lock or a False Key, He Shall be Fined One Shilling for the first Offence: and Two Shillings for the Second: and for the Third publickly admonished, Degraded or Expelled.

6. If any Scholar Shall Play at Cards or Dice at all: or at any Lawfull Game upon a Wager: or Shall bring any Quantity of Rum, Wine, Brandy or other Strong Liquor into College or into his Chamber where he Resides without Liberty from the President or Tutors, or Shall Go into any Tavern within Two miles of College and call for any Strong Liquor, or Spend his Time idly there unless with his Parent or Guardian, he shall for the first Offence be Fined Two Shillings and Sixpence, or be admonished: and for the Second Offence be Fined Five Shillings and be Degraded: and for the Third Offence be Expelled: and if any Scholar Shall Play at Swords, Files or Cudgels, He Shall be Fined not Exceeding One Shilling.

And, lest somehow a loophole exist, a final clause was designed to cover any oversight:

22. That inasmuch as particular Laws cannot be made for all Emergent Affairs and Cases that may occur in the Government of College, the President Shall have Power to Give Such particular Direction, Orders and Rules from Time to Time as he shall think proper, agreeable to the Nature and Tenour of the Laws here prescribed. And besides the particular Crimes herein mentioned Shall have Power to inflict any reasonable Punishment agreeable to the Tenour of these herein Mentioned for any other Crimes of the like Nature which are contrary to the holy Rules of God's Word, the wholesom Laws of the Civil Government, or the Good Order and Regulation of this Society.59

59Dexter, Biographical Sketches and Annals, II, pp. 6-10.
President Clap, determined to keep Yale free from New-Light tendencies running rampant in other colleges, not only detailed exacting rules but assumed prerogatives that placed him even to the right of the concept of in loco parentis. In matters of religion, at least, Clap denied that parents had more responsibility over the students than the college authorities. If parents were to say how their children should worship and thereby take this decision out of the authority of the college, then, he reasoned, there would be as many kinds of worship at college as there were different opinions of parents. To Clap this was quite unacceptable and he did not hesitate to act on his beliefs when, in 1744, two students committed the grievous error of attending Separatist church services with their parents while home on vacation. When they refused to confess, as required, that they had "violated the laws of God, of the Colony, and of the College," they were expelled.\(^6\)

Clap's autocratic reign was marked by resentment and reaction from many quarters. His dictatorial manner, expulsions, fines, increased tuition, and servings in the commons—which apparently were far from "Neat and Sweet"—caused a mob of students and townspeople to attack his house in 1765, breaking windows and slightly injuring the President. Disorder became so prevalent the following year that both tutors and students withdrew, bringing the operations of the college to

---

\(^{60}\) Ibid., I, p. 771. Cf. Hofstadter and Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*, who present an enlightening study of the reactionary climate of the period, pp. 163-177. Wertenbaker, *Princeton*, pp. 16-18, notes that this incident and similar evidences of Clap's hostilities toward the New-Lights convinced Aaron Burr, Jonathan Dickinson, and Jonathan Edwards, among others, that a new collegiate institution more favorable to the spirit of the Great Awakening was necessary; hence the founding of Princeton in 1746.
a temporary standstill. Having brought the college to the brink of ruin, Clap resigned in 1766.61

Few college presidents went as far as did Clap, either in codifying rules or in assuming autocratic powers of such magnitude. It was at the same time that Yale was following Clap's reactionary policies that Harvard and other colleges were becoming more liberal. Still, the influence of the Yale laws of 1745 was as great as was its later contribution to conservatism, the famous Yale Report of 1828. Long and complex lists of rules accompanied by carefully determined penalties could be found in the majority of colleges down to the middle of the nineteenth century. Princeton students, at any rate before the Revolution, were instructed to raise their hats to the president at a distance of ten rods and to tutors at five, while at Transylvania students were forbidden to learn on one another during recitations.62 The first rules of the University of Georgia covered sixteen pages in a large ledger book and provided, among other penalties, that students who failed to attend prayers were to be fined 6 1/4 cents and those who entered late without good reason or slipped out before the benediction must pay 3 cents.63 Determined to curb extravagance, authorities at Wake Forest limited students' pocket money to five dollars per year.64

61Hofstadter and Metzger, pp. 176-177 and Dexter, Biographical Sketches and Annals, III, pp. 167-168.

62Schmidt, The Old Time College President, pp. 80-81.

63Coulter, p. 81.

64Godbold, p. 110.
Men who in later years were to reflect credit upon their alma mater were not as students immune to the confining regulations. Nathaniel Hawthorne while a student at Bowdoin confessed in a letter to his mother that he had been caught playing cards for money and was fined fifty cents by the president, but, he assured her, he would not repeat the offense, for that would bring suspension. James Russell Lowell was "rusticated" (suspended) from Harvard in 1838 "on account of continued neglect of his college duties" which included a breach of propriety in chapel which the faculty felt could not be overlooked.

Although the University of Georgia rules conformed closely to the Yale Code of 1745, authorities in a few other Southern colleges and state universities, especially those not far removed from the aristocratic tidewater sections, claimed to find petty and detailed regulations quite unwarranted. Rules that might seem necessary at Georgia or in New England schools or even in neighboring denominational colleges were deemed insulting by proper "Southern gentlemen" (whether the title be deserved or fancied). At William and Mary the cornerstone of behavior was the student's personal honor. "The student comes to us as a gentleman," asserted the William and Mary authorities. "As such we treat him. . . . He is not harassed with petty regulations; he is not insulted and annoyed by impertinent surveillance." Accordingly, liquor was prohibited at the College


67Schmidt, The Liberal Arts College, p. 80.
"except in that moderation which becomes the prudent and industrious student."\(^6^8\) Similarly, Thomas Jefferson boasted that at the University of Virginia "we studiously avoid too much government. We treat them as men and gentlemen, under the guidance mainly of their own discretion. They so consider themselves, and make it their pride to acquire that character for their institution."\(^6^9\)

At the University of North Carolina the president was charged with the responsibility of superintending all studies, providing for the performance of the required morning and evening prayers, and examining each student every Sunday evening on questions previously given them on the general principles of morality and religion. And, there were the usual prohibitions against profanity, "keeping ardent spirits in their rooms," gambling, and other immoralities. But at Carolina, as at some other Southern institutions, the students were protected by a "Declaration of Rights." It was provided that "students charged [of misconduct] shall have timely notice and testimony taken on the most solemn assurance shall be deemed valid without calling on a magistrate to administer an oath in legal form."\(^7^0\) Thus, where the gentleman's code prevailed, a student's word was assumed to be the truth and the president and faculty were not supposed to probe behind this \textit{prima-facie} evidence.

\(^6^8\) Schmidt, \textit{The Old Time College President}, p. 80.


\(^7^0\) Battle, I, pp. 56-57.
Laudable though it was, the gentleman's code did not always work effectively, as is evidenced at least partly by the fact that in 1851 the faculty of the University of North Carolina handled 282 disciplinary cases from a student body of 230.\textsuperscript{71} An unavoidable corollary of the gentleman's code was the notion that a student should under no circumstances be expected to report the misdeeds of another. After a long and agonizing debate, the faculty of the University of Alabama reluctantly decided in the 1850's to require students to give evidence, distasteful as the idea was. Professor Frederick Barnard, later to become president of Columbia, reduced the issue to its simplest terms: "Shall law prevail or shall misrule be triumphant and all the operations of college come to an end?"\textsuperscript{72} A similar cry of concern was raised by a professor at Davidson College in 1855:

Indulged, petted, and uncontrolled at home, allowed to trample upon all laws, human and divine, at the preparatory school, . . . the student comes to college, but too often with an undisciplined mind, and an uncultivated heart, yet with exalted ideas of personal dignity, and a scowling contempt for lawful authority, and wholesome restraint. How is he to be controlled? . . . Admonish him? Why, he will go off and laugh with his classmates at the solemn visage and old-fashioned remarks of the Honored Praeses, and jeer at the rebuking looks of their "most potent, grave, and reverend signiors," the venerated faculty.\textsuperscript{73}

One college history after another seems to indicate that the harder professors tried to control the students, the more rebellious they became. It was no idle fear that led the faculty of Lafayette College to add to their regulations in the 1830's the rule that "No

\textsuperscript{71}Ibid., p. 627. Battle notes, however, that the large majority of students were perfectly orderly. "The records seem to show that if ten or a dozen had been rigidly excluded, disorder would have ceased. . . ."

\textsuperscript{72}Schmidt, The Liberal Arts College, p. 85.

\textsuperscript{73}Godbold, p. 117.
student shall wear about his person any pistol, dirk, stiletto, or other dangerous weapon." 74 Besides hopefully preventing duels, a custom legislated against rather frequently in Southern colleges with good cause, faculty members in all parts of the country were given occasion to be concerned for their own safety. Reactions to "the system" led to the murder of a professor at the University of Virginia, the stabbing of the president of Oakland College in Mississippi, and the stoning of a professor and the president of the University of Georgia. 75 Not all dissatisfaction was expressed so violently, of course. Two students at Randolph-Macon College who openly defied the order of a tutor to refrain from making noise and return to their rooms were called before the faculty whereupon they declared that they had refused to obey because they believed the tutor had no right to order them; both were dismissed. 76 Frequently, students accepted their punishment without comment, but at least one Georgia student, after being expelled for profanity, turned and directed his best phrases to the professors who had cast him out. 77

The fact that tutors and professors as well as presidents had to serve as policemen acted against the creation of pleasant faculty-student relations. Tutors, often young and unmarried, were not


75 Rudolph, p. 97.

76 Godbold, p. 115.

77 Coulter, p. 89.
infrequently required to live in the dormitories in a manner similar to the beadles of Oxford and Cambridge. Many tutors and professors objected to their police duties, but some, like William D. Wash of the University of Georgia, developed the art of spying to a high degree of precision and won the respect of the students for fearlessness in the face of danger. Unlike a great many others who became proficient in espionage, Nahum Hiram Wood at least displayed a sense of humor. When students got in the habit of emptying buckets of water on his head as he passed under their windows on his rounds at the University of Georgia, he adopted the simple device of carrying an umbrella and casually raising it as he came into the pathway of the descending torrents.

Whether at state universities or denominational colleges the situation was much the same. Andrew D. White, destined to play a significant role in shaping the American university ideal, could look back to his freshman year at Hobart College and question the value of

---

78 Wertenbaker, pp. 94-95 says of the tutors at Princeton: "Selected for their piety and scholarly ability, egged on by the faculty and trustees, often inexperienced and tactless, they were resented and sometimes hated by the students." Of the early tutors at Harvard, Hofstadter and Metzger note, p. 85: "Unmarried men in their early twenties, residents of the college hall who supervised the lives as well as the studies of undergraduates, the tutors were usually future clergymen waiting and studying for the required three post-baccalaureate years for their M.A. degrees. Normally they resigned their tutorships as soon as a ministerial call came to them, since their teaching careers were in their own minds no more than a way of marking time." Wertenbaker's description of professors at late as the nineteenth century is hardly more encouraging. Granting that there were a few good teachers, he adds, p. 94: "Most professors of the nineteenth century, it is safe to say, were uninspired pedants, well-meaning and conscientious, but neither masters of their subject nor psychologically equipped to communicate it to others."

79 Coulter, pp. 83-84.

80 Ibid., p. 84.
the small church college and its "direct Christian influence."

Faculty members who tried to dampen the spirits of the undergraduates did so at the risk of life and limb. White recalled that:

> It was my privilege to behold a professor, an excellent clergyman, seeking to quell hideous riot in a student's room, buried under a heap of carpets, mattresses, counterpanes, and blankets; to see another clerical professor forced to retire through the panel of a door under a shower of lexicons, boots, and brushes, and to see even the president himself [Dr. Benjamin Hale], on one occasion, obliged to leave his lecture-room by a ladder from a window, and, on another, kept at bay by a shower of beer-bottles.

One favorite occupation was rolling cannon-balls along the corridors at midnight, with frightful din and much damage; a tutor, having one night been successful in catching and confiscating two of these, pounced from his door the next night upon a third; but this having been heated nearly to redness and launched from a shovel, the result was that he wore bandages upon his hands for many days. 81

Maintaining discipline caused professors at many colleges to go to great lengths. Students at Davidson College in 1855 gained the impression that their mathematics problems were too difficult and, in frustration, began a riot. Faculty members who came to investigate were held at bay with rocks until one, a West Pointer, drew a sword and led a charge on the dormitory. When at last the door gave way to an axe, the rebellion was suppressed. 82

Reaction to a demand that students give information as to the guilt of their fellows led to the suspension of every student except a single senior and two freshman at the University of Alabama in 1843. 83 A rebellion at the University of South Carolina in 1853 resulted in the expulsion or withdrawal of all but


82 Schmidt, The Liberal Arts College, pp. 82-83.

about thirty students. Thus, by rioting, scheming, rebelling against rules and burlesquing them, students in the nineteenth century colleges were registering their dissatisfaction with the restricting confines of the collegiate way. Enforcing detailed rules frequently created more problems than it solved. One can well appreciate the frustration which finally led Harvard's president Jared Sparks to admonish his zealous faculty with the remark, "On, gentlemen, let the boys alone."\

From Legalism to Paternalism.--Complaints against the burdensome rules and the mechanical systems of penalties—all carefully graded as to severity of the crime—increasingly grew during the nineteenth century, from college officials as well as from students. Rudolph has observed that the strict, authoritarian, patriarchal family was making no headway in American life, and for the colleges to insist upon minute observance of detailed regulations was to fight the course of history.

There continued to be those like President Thomas Cooper of the University of South Carolina who interpreted talk about the rights of boys and girls as the offspring of Democracy gone mad, but gradually the views of men like Randolph-Macon's president, Stephen Olin, made headway. In his inaugural address, 1834, Olin condemned the multitude of vexatious

84 Godbold, p. 174.

85 Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard, p. 281. (Sparks was president from 1849-1853). W. H. Cowley in his "History of Student Residential Housing," School and Society, XL (December 1, 1934), pp. 709-710 offers still more examples of the continuing hostilities between students and faculty.

86 Rudolph, p. 104.

enactments” pertaining to student conduct, declaring that they "uniformly operate as provocatives to transgression." He further stated:

. . . The frequent arraignment of students upon charges of petty delinquency, is a fruitful source of corruption which would be, at least partially removed by absolving them from allegiance to the chapter of crimes and punishments, and holding them accountable for their conduct upon the common obligation of morality and duty. Such occasions often present temptations of prevarication and falsehood, too strong to be resisted by ordinary minds, and a trial before the faculty has often produced a ruinous prostration of selfrespect and all honorable feeling.88

Olin's remarks were certainly in keeping with the nobler aspects of the Southern tradition, but the new attitude toward discipline appearing in the first several decades of the nineteenth century was by no means a regional phenomenon. The administration of President Mark Hopkins at Williams College (1836-1872) marked a new approach to discipline at that college, one that depended upon student sympathy and respect, rather than law, for its success. An 1874 resolution by the board of trustees requesting the "gentlemen of the Faculty to exercise a fraternal and paternal interest in the students outside of the recitation rooms, and by cultivating personal relations with them, to promote their social and moral welfare,"89 was only the culmination of the policies set in motion by the President who inspired the notion that the ideal classroom is a teacher on one end of a log and a student on the other. In his inaugural speech, Hopkins asserted that "that

88Stephen Olin, Inaugural Address as President of Randolph-Macon College (March 5, 1834), p. 26, as quoted by Godbold, p. 112.

college is in the best state in which the least government is necessary."90

Thus, at Williams, fines and prowling tutors were replaced with love and influence; the President himself privately dealt with many students whose crimes thereby did not go before the faculty. Hopkins succeeded in becoming "a firm but kindly father to his student body."91

Paternalism was perhaps pushed to the extreme by President Nott at Union when he housed faculty families in the college dormitories, but the tenor of student behavior became so praiseworthy that for a- while Union was something of a showplace.92 But as important as the increased faculty-student contact was Nott's prevailing influence. He had little appreciation for the legalistic system in vogue at Union in earlier days. In 1860 he wrote:

Fines, suspensions, and expulsions were the principal instruments of college government. The Faculty sat in their robes as a court; caused offenders to be brought before them; examined witnesses, and pronounced sentences with the solemnity of other courts of justice.93

As soon as the trustees found occasion to reverse a faculty resolution calling for the expulsion of a student, Nott set about to change the entire procedure. Determined to remove disciplinary actions from the control of the faculty, he undertook to deal personally with student offenders. "He had studied every individual in the class, and could readily decide as to the kind of moral artillery that could be brought

---

90Mark Hopkins, An Inaugural Discourse, Delivered at Williams College, September 15, 1836, p. 25, cited in ibid., p. 58.

91Rudolph, Mark Hopkins and the Log, p. 59.

92Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 103.

93Schmidt, The Old Time College President, pp. 90-91.
to bear on each," writes Schmidt. "He knew exactly how to adapt himself to the fears of the cowardly, the bluster of the vain, the moral or religious principle of the conscientious." Not the least effective of his weapons was causing the offender to feel the pressure of his classmates or family. Hoping to teach the young men "to bring themselves under the rule of inward principle rather than outward fear of restraint," Nott emphasized moral and religious instruction, the sense of honor, and the love of knowledge.

Timothy Dwight of Yale (1795-1817) employed similar tactics, causing the spirit of Yale discipline to change considerably from that inaugurated by Clap. Without proposing any serious alterations in the written code of laws, President Dwight gradually and effectively changed the whole system of administration. The intercourse between the officers and students was placed on a new footing; the latter were addressed and treated as young gentlemen, and no other marks of respect were demanded of them than those which gentlemen were naturally expected to render each other. The system of fines was replaced by a policy of private remonstrance; appeals were made to the conscience of the delinquent, appeals founded on the guilt of his conduct, on his love of reputation, the happiness of his parents, and his prospects in life. Jeremiah Day, Dwight's successor, continued to weaken the

94 Ibid., p. 91.
95 Van Santvoord, p. 150.
legalistic pattern of government at Yale, asserting that "all displays of authority, all discipline proceeding from the love of power is to be scrupulously avoided."  

Presidents who began to rely on kindly paternalistic appeals were if anything more concerned about the morals and actions of their students than those who continued to increase the rules and penalties. To men like Nott, Hopkins, Olin, and Dwight, it was obvious that long lists of rules, rigid surveillance, and harsh penalties had accomplished little of a positive nature. Precept rather than force, love rather than fear were being seen as more desirable means toward the long-standing end--the development of manly character.

Summary

The colonial colleges and their descendants can be understood neither as theological seminaries nor as institutions committed to secular learning alone. Largely founded by religious denominations, the ante-bellum colleges were naturally concerned with supplying ministers for their respective churches, but from the earliest years there was evident also a willingness to serve those who aspired to professions other than the ministry. And always, regardless of the student's vocational leanings, there was displayed by college officials a firm conviction that one of their most vital responsibilities was to strengthen the moral fiber of the youth in their care. A religious flavor permeated all the colleges and even most state "universities"

well beyond the middle decades of the nineteenth century. Compulsory chapel and Sunday church attendance, prayer meetings, presidential and professorial counseling in and out of class, student religious societies, revivals, community pressures—all served to impress upon the student the necessity of the Christian way of life. From the colonial period on, students were exempt from conformity to the specific doctrinal creed of the denomination sponsoring the college, but throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries general evidence of sound character and Christian commitment were expected.

Following the collegiate tradition and adapting to new circumstances as frontier conditions demanded, founders and officials of American colleges accepted their role in loco parentis. Standing in place of the parent, responsible for the physical, spiritual and moral as well as the intellectual well-being of the students, the molders of the college went to great lengths to carry out their responsibilities. Encouraging proper religious attitudes became an unquestioned task of the college. The classical curriculum was used not only as a further source of profitable ideals, but also was highly valued for its disciplinary qualities. And everywhere rules, varying in complexity, were deemed necessary. Usually made by boards of control, the execution of the rules was delegated to the president and his staff. It was in reality the president who set the tone of the college. Presidents, by their interpretation of the rules and by their methods of discipline, gave witness to their philosophy of in loco parentis. Some, like Clap of Yale, relied heavily on complex codes of rules, thus underlining their acceptance of the doctrine of man's
depraved nature. Others, like Nott of Union, followed a milder policy, reflecting at least partial acceptance of the optimistic Enlightenment faith in the perfectibility of man. But these and others, each in his way, acknowledged a serious responsibility for the character of their students. Nott expressed quite neatly the prevailing view: "The college is a family, and its government is paternal. These young students are my children. I am to them in place of a father."\(^{98}\)

Thus, whether in the style of an autocratic despot or a kindly patriarch, the responsibility was the same. Presidents who viewed the students as immature, irresponsible and impressionable usually had their prophecies confirmed, as did those who saw the students as young gentlemen, immature and impressionable to be sure, but anxious to do the right. At some colleges student government took a few faltering steps,\(^{99}\) but by and large the reigning philosophy of \textit{in loco parentis} smothered such developments. In general, one can conclude that the role of the student in the old-time college was one of submission to authorities who, standing \textit{in loco parentis}, supposedly knew best how to develop their most prized (and perhaps rarest) commodity—the cultured Christian gentleman.

---

\(^{98}\)As quoted in Schmidt, \textit{The Liberal Arts College}, p. 113. The fact that students were young and enrollments light by modern standards must be considered as at least partial explanations for the existence of \textit{in loco parentis} policies. Students were typically boys between fourteen and eighteen years of age, and enrollments numbered in the low hundreds. During its first sixty-five years, Harvard graduated an average of eight students a year; in 1838, when the institution was two hundred years old, its enrollment was only 216. Columbia could list only 122 students in 1870. See Ernest Earnest, \textit{Academic Procession: An Informal History of the American College, 1636 to 1953} (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1953), pp. 13, 19-47.

CHAPTER III

SOCIETAS MAGISTORUM ET DISCIPULORUM:
DANIEL COIT GILMAN OF JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
(1876-1901)

The Idea of a University Considered

In the will which endowed the university which was to bear his name, Johns Hopkins presented no clear description of the nature the institution was to assume. The two paragraphs relating to the university charged the trustees to provide for scholarships for deserving students from Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina, to refrain from using the principal for buildings and current expenses, and to administer wisely the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad stock included in the bequest. Beyond expressing his desire that the university should ultimately incorporate the medical school he was also endowing, Hopkins gave no hint as to its character.¹ It was enough for the Founder to provide the funds for the education of youth and the alleviation of suffering; the administrative details he left in the hands of a carefully chosen body of fourteen men. Of the fourteen, ten were to serve as trustees of both the university and the hospital, while each institution was to have two trustees who were to concern themselves with its affairs only. If Hopkins had shown little understanding of the nature of the university he was founding, he definitely made up for

¹The complete text of the will is in Helen Hopkins Thom, Johns Hopkins, A Silhouette (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1929), pp. 91-120.
this limitation by selecting as trustees men who were informed, capable, and determined to create in Baltimore an institution of no mean stature. Seven of the twelve who were to serve as the midwives of The Johns Hopkins University were wealthy businessmen; four were lawyers, and one was a physician. At least ten of the number had been to college, and seven had college degrees.2

The judiciousness of the trustees equaled that of the Founder as they too refrained from prematurely committing themselves publicly to a specific program. Following the death of Mr. Hopkins in December, 1873, the trustees assembled during the early months of 1874, adopted by-laws, appointed committees, and, in keeping with the wishes of the Founder, began the process of obtaining "the advice and assistance of those at home and abroad" who had achieved success in the field of higher education.3 The very men to whom the trustees turned for advice indicated the latters' awareness of the dawning of a new era in higher education. Invited to share his ideas with the trustees was Andrew D. White, who was leading Cornell University to the first ranks of those few American institutions championing equality of studies, non-sectarianism, coeducation, and special attention to agricultural and mechanical studies. The trustees wisely turned to Harvard's Charles William Eliot, who was gaining fame as an advocate of the elective system and was the acknowledged leader in challenging the sterility of the "old" education. In James Burrill Angell the trustees


3 Ibid., pp. 22-23.
found an eager confidant, one who was leading the University of Michigan from the status of a small frontier college to the heights of a leading midwestern state university. These three, each of whom was to join the future president of Johns Hopkins as the most outstanding molders of the emerging American university ideal, gladly consented to share their experiences and dreams with the Hopkins' trustees.  

The meetings and exchanges of letters that followed allowed the trustees and presidents to probe into almost every conceivable aspect of higher education. Questions regarding admission policies, dormitories, academic buildings, curriculum, religion, coeducation, discipline, faculty and presidential qualifications, professional schools, graduate training, the elective system and other concerns were explored in depth. It was not a matter of the presidents patronizingly informing the trustees of the latest movements abroad in the educational world. The trustees themselves proved to be informed and imaginative; their questions often outran the thinking of the experts they were consulting. So penetrating were the discussions that Eliot later wrote Daniel Coit Gilman, first President of the University, "If you will ask Mr. Johnson [chairman of the trustees' executive committee] for the report of what I said to the Trustees last June, you will never need...

---

4It is of more than passing interest to note that James McCosh of Princeton and Noah Porter of Yale did not accept their invitations to consult with the Hopkins' trustees. Princeton and Yale proved to be in the wake rather than on the lip of the wave of reform in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. See Thomas J. Wertenbaker, Princeton: 1746-1896 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946) and George Wilson Pierson, Yale College: An Educational History, 1871-1921 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952).

to talk to me any more. I . . . told them all I know and a great deal more."6 A quarter of a century later President Angell could recall: "I was shut up in a room with these Trustees and a stenographer, and what few ideas I had in those early days were squeezed out of me remorselessly. . . ."7

It would be interesting but would divert us from our immediate concern to pause for an analysis of the many topics touched on in those conferences and letters of 1874. It should suffice to say that the advice given by the presidents, while often conflicting in detail, favored the idea of Hopkins joining the ranks of the universities as opposed to the traditional college system. But none of the presidents seemed to grasp the daring which motivated the trustees and which enabled its first President to guide Johns Hopkins to standards of graduate work which they themselves would soon strive to emulate. Hopkins was a new page in educational history. Unlike Harvard which was shackled to a long tradition, or Michigan which was bound to the whims of a state legislature, or even Cornell with its commitment to the land-grant philosophy, Johns Hopkins was unrestrained, free to enter upon the scene without prior commitments or a binding philosophy. Eliot, White, and Angell were willing enough to advise the trustees as

6Letter from Charles W. Eliot to Daniel C. Gilman, May 20, 1875 as cited by ibid., p. 103.

7Johns Hopkins University Celebration of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1902), p. 133.
to what to avoid, but as to charting a specific course of action, they were found wanting. 8

On at least one matter there was agreement, however. Angell advised that the president of the institution should be a man of ability and should be found as soon as possible. "If the organization is right during these formative years," counseled Angell, "errors of administration can be survived. Get a man at the beginning, and do not let matters drift too long without him on the ground." 9 There was unanimous agreement as to the man best qualified for the presidency. When later in the year the trustees asked for a specific candidate, each of the three presidents (and Yale's Noah Porter as well), without prior knowledge as to whom the others had recommended, put forward the name of Daniel Coit Gilman, then president of the University of California. 10

The task of defining the nature of the Johns Hopkins University thus became the work of Gilman during the twenty-five years of his presidency.

The Idea of a University Defined

When Gilman graduated from Yale in 1852, in the class ahead of his close friend, Andrew D. White, he had no clear notion as to what his life's work would be. Yale life had been pleasant enough, but there was no indication that Gilman was burning with a desire to join


9 Letter from James B. Angell to Reverdy Johnson, Jr. [chairman of Trustees Executive Committee], April 21, 1874 as cited in Hawkins, "Three University Presidents Testify," American Quarterly, XI, p. 112.

10 Ibid.; Johns Hopkins University Celebration of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary, p. 134.
the ranks of the august professors in order to continue the conserva-
tive Yale tradition; nor did he display any discernable leanings toward
educational reform. In fact, if one were to hazard a guess as to the
destiny of young Gilman based on his experiences through his Yale
days, the logical conclusion would be that here was a man well equipped
by disposition and training to enter the ministry. Writing to his
sister from Berlin, where he was studying for a short time in 1854 with
his friend White, Gilman confided:

For some things I rejoice to find that my notions grow more and more
definite. For instance, in the desire to act upon the minds of men,
to do my part, even though it may be but little, for the elevation
and improvement of such society as my lot may be cast in. It seems
to me I care less and less for money and fame, but I do desire to
use what influence I can for the establishment of such principles
and the development of such ideas as seem to be important and
right.12

This desire to serve mankind might find expression in any of several
occupations, Gilman continued. "Whether this is done by the voice or
pen, or by both, whether in the pulpit or in the college, at the Cooper
Union or in the Mercantile Library, in the editor's chair or in the
office of a common school superintendent, cannot, I suppose, for many
months, perhaps for many years, be decided."13

Talking with Noah Porter in the same year, Gilman declared that
if he did enter the ministry, he would want to stress contemporary

---

11See Fabian Franklin's The Life of Daniel Coit Gilman (New York:
Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1910), esp. chapter I, "Boyhood and Youth," written
by his brother, William C. Gilman, and chapter II, "New Haven," written
by Emily and Margaret Whitney, daughters of Prof. W. D. Whitney.

12Letter from Daniel C. Gilman to Maria P. Gilman, April, 1854,
quoted in ibid., p. 30.

13Ibid., pp. 30-31.
issues "instead of dwelling long and regularly upon such points as original sin and the doctrine of election." Five years later he did obtain a license to preach, although he still hesitated to embark upon a full-time ministerial career. Hawkins has suggested that if Gilman had been born a century earlier, he would almost certainly have fulfilled his desire "to influence New England minds" by becoming a minister, but the new science, the new scholarship, and the new industrialism of the nineteenth century opened for Gilman and other activist-oriented men of the age alternative platforms from which they might exert an influence. As it happened, Gilman found his work in education welcomed and honored and thus charted a course which served to keep him "aloof from political and ecclesiastical affairs." By 1872 he could reflect the worldly temper of his age by defining the religious spirit as one which looks "upward and not downward, forward and not backward, outward and not inward, and which lends a hand." Thus it was that Andrew D. White could recommend his friend to the trustees of Johns Hopkins by paradoxically referring to his "liberal orthodoxy in religious matters."

14 Ibid., p. 29.
16 Ibid., p. 18.
18 Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 17.
Prior to assuming the presidency of Johns Hopkins, Gilman began to gain an understanding of the potential and problems of university education by serving as librarian at Yale and, more importantly, by actively engaging in the work of the University's stepchild, the Sheffield Scientific School. By raising money and enthusiasm for the new institution as well as by serving on its faculty, Gilman increasingly became identified with the "new education." In 1856 he wrote a "Proposed Plan for the Complete Organization of the School of Science Connected with Yale College," a document which emphasized an idea that was to become a recurring theme in his later years: it is important to gain a thorough knowledge of what is being done in kindred foreign institutions, not in order to transplant fully their methods, but to adapt them to local conditions. The plan proposed by Gilman clearly reflected his faith in the value and necessity of a more scientific education than that offered in the traditional college.

Gilman's vision of the nature of the ideal university was refined further by his experiences as President of the University of California, 1872-1875. University education, he declared in 1872, should serve the wants of the present. To be of any value, education should relate to the great problems which belong to the present generation and to those which the future might bring. To the traditional studies should be added those scientific and professional studies that would prepare "men of honest and earnest purpose, men of true wisdom,"

18 Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 17.

for the tasks of the modern age. In his inaugural address he asserted that a university is not a high school, nor a college, nor an academy of sciences. "The University is the most comprehensive term which can be employed to indicate a foundation for the promotion and diffusion of knowledge--a group of agencies organized to advance the arts and sciences of every sort, and to train young men as scholars for all the intellectual callings of life."

Despite the progress made at California in advancing a university program, it was not until Daniel C. Gilman came to Baltimore in 1875 to take charge of The Johns Hopkins University that the university ideal began to acquire definite shape. Unhampered by tradition, trustees, wishes of the founder or legislative or ecclesiastical ties, Gilman found in Baltimore the stage on which he could present a new drama. Under Gilman's direction, Hopkins became the first American institution of higher learning to pattern itself after the German university ideal. As one of his biographers proclaimed, through his work at Johns Hopkins, Gilman "naturalized" the idea of a university:

The first great merit of President Gilman was that, from the moment he was called to Baltimore, the object which he set before himself was that of making the institution which was to arise under his guidance a means of supplying to the nation intellectual training of a higher order than could be obtained at existing

20 Franklin, p. 120.

21 Gilman, University Problems, p. 156.

22 For an analysis of Gilman's work at California see Vernon Austin Ouellett, "Daniel Coit Gilman's Administration of the University of California" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, 1951).
colleges and universities, and thus distinctly raising the standards of American science and scholarship.\textsuperscript{23}

E. L. Godkin reported in The Nation in 1875 that the freedom and liberality of the Hopkins endowment would enable the trustees to create "any kind of university they please," thus giving them "a power which has never before been lodged in the hands of any body of men in this country."\textsuperscript{24} Noting that the trustees had recently quizzed Gilman as to what he would do if he were "put at the head of the new enterprise and were left perfectly free," Godkin reported:

He [Gilman] said in substance that he would make it the means of promoting scholarship of the first order, and this by only offering the kind of instruction to advanced students which other universities offer in their post-graduate courses, and leaving the kind of work now done by undergraduates to be done elsewhere. For this purpose he would select as professors men now standing in the front rank in their own fields; he would pay them well enough to leave them at their ease as regards the commoner and coarser cares; would give them only students who were far enough advanced to keep them constantly stimulated to the highest point; and he would exact from them yearly proof of the diligent and fruitful cultivation of their specialties by compelling them to print somewhere the results of their researches.\textsuperscript{25}

In numerous articles and speeches Gilman sought to amplify his concept of the nature of the American university. In one address he described the university as an institution:

\ldots Where knowledge is advanced, by experiment, observation, inquiry, verification, demonstration; where the experience of mankind from the dawn of civilization until now is deemed worthy of study; where youth of unusual talents are encouraged to consecrate their lives to the discovering of truth; where treatises, memoirs, journals and books are prepared for the enlightenment of the public; where grave questions of philosophy, religion, finance,

\textsuperscript{23}Franklin, pp. 182-183.

\textsuperscript{24}[E. L. Godkin], "Notes," The Nation, XX (January 28, 1875), p. 60.

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid.
government and international intercourse may be calmly investigated for the enlightenment of legislators and the edification of the people. This conception of the university is not yet widely accepted. Those who advocate it are still inadequately supported. But the idea here. It has come to stay. . . .26

In trying to uncover Gilman’s views regarding the status of students in the university structure and his ideas as to the degree of freedom they should have, it is vital to understand his philosophy of the nature and function of the university as opposed to the college. To Gilman, the terms college and university were far from being synonymous. Not only did the institutions differ in purpose, but they differed in composition as well. Nowhere could one turn in the 1870’s, he contended, and find in operation a true university, a "Societas Magistrorum et Discipulorum; an association, by authority, of Masters, who are conspicuous in ability, learning, and devotion to study, for the intellectual guidance, in many subjects, of youthful Scholars who have been prepared for the freedom of investigation by prolonged discipline in literature and science."27 Gilman’s aspiration was to create in Baltimore an indigenous institution of higher standards and aim than any yet in existence.28

There is some question then as to whether Gilman originally planned on admitting undergraduates into his university in which


"instruction by investigation" was to be the keynote. Godkin's 1875 report attributed to Gilman the hope that undergraduate work could be done elsewhere, thus freeing the Hopkins scholars for advanced work. Too, one of Gilman's favorite themes dealt with the distinctions between collegiate and university aims and methods. In his Hopkins inaugural address he proclaimed the university as "a place for the advanced and special education of youth who have been prepared for its freedom by the discipline of a lower school," while the nature of the college implied "restriction rather than freedom; tutorial rather than professorial guidance; residence within appointed bounds; the chapel, the dining-hall, and the daily inspection." "The College," he contended, "theoretically stands in loco parentis; it does not afford a very wide scope; it gives a liberal and substantial foundation on which the university instruction may be wisely built."  

Gilman accepted as an unmistakable fact the view that before reaching the age of twenty or twenty-one, "every boy requires positive guidance from those who have had longer experience in the ways of the world." He argued:  

It is always cruel, and it may be criminal, to allow a youth to experiment for himself upon conduct—to say that he must sow his wild oats, that experience is the best teacher, that he must choose his own course. Every boy is entitled to know what older persons have discovered of the laws of conduct, and to receive restraint,  

---


caution and warning until his eyes have been opened and his powers of judgment developed.  

Since "the end of education is undoubtedly the development of character," Gilman contended that "the average man is greatly helped by submission, during all his adolescence, to the precept, example, criticism and suggestion of those who have themselves been well trained." So strongly did Gilman approve of collegiate guidance that he was prompted to write near the end of the century that "a college education would be much more highly valued, and would be much more advantageous to the world as well as to him who has received it, if a far greater amount of personal supervision attended its progress."  

But these were the methods of the college; Gilman made clear repeatedly that Johns Hopkins was to be a university in the fullest meaning of the term, an institution in which advanced students guided by advanced scholars might be free to explore the limits of truth. As late as 1880 Gilman pleaded for some wealthy philanthropist to endow an undergraduate college in Baltimore, linking this request with one for a separately endowed women's college, both of which were to be largely distinct from the university. So frequently and strongly


32Daniel C. Gilman, "Modern Education," The Cosmopolitan, XXIII (May, 1897), p. 36.  

33Ibid.  

34Hawkins, Pioneer, pp. 238-239.
did Gilman allude to the distinctions between collegiate and university training that it seems obvious that, to him, a merger of the two institutions would subvert the higher aims he envisioned for Johns Hopkins. In 1881 he wrote of the differences not only between colleges and university students but of professors as well.

The university requires a different sort of teacher from the college, because the methods employed are essentially different. The earlier stages of liberal culture depend on discipline; the later on inspiration. Hence, a college requires professors who love the pedagogic work, who are skilled as teachers, and who will exert a strong influence on the development of the character of their pupils; the university may be less exacting in these respects, and seek for professors whose pedagogic value will consist to a very considerable extent in their power to add to human knowledge, and the corresponding and inseparable power of interesting the highest class of youthful minds.35

**The University Ideal Modified**

Whatever may have been Gilman's true feelings regarding the admission of undergraduates, Hopkins from the start included a limited number in its student body.36 Soon after Godkin's report appeared in the Nation, the Baltimore American attacked the graduate school.


36 The relative importance of graduate and undergraduate students from 1876 to 1896 can be perceived from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1876-77</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-81</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-86</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-91</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-96</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

philosophy and demanded that an undergraduate division come first. Mr. Hopkins, the American argued, had been interested in "education for the people and not the sinecures for the learned." How significant the pressure from the American proved to be is a matter of conjecture, but when Gilman and the trustees completed the plan of organization which actually guided the institution during its earliest years, provision had been made for the admission of undergraduates--students sixteen years old with the preparation required by the best colleges and scientific schools in the country. Gilman was later to assert that "from the beginning the plans included collegiate instruction for those who were not ready for graduate work," but the evidence seems to indicate that he had initially hoped to create a distinctively graduate institution.

37 Baltimore American, February 2, March 6, 1875, as cited in Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 23. 

38 Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 27. The quality of applicants was always of greater concern to the Hopkins authorities than age, however. Charles Homer Haskins was refused admission to Harvard when he was fifteen, but was accepted by Hopkins and awarded the A.B. one year later; after three more years at Hopkins he received his Ph.D. Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 242; See Joseph R. Strayer, "Charles Homer Haskins," Dictionary of American Biography, Robert Livingston Schuyler and Edward T. James, eds., XXII (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), p. 289. 


40 Cf. Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 238. Cf. also Gilman's letter to George J. Brush, January 30, 1875, in Franklin, p. 191, in which Gilman states: "I incline more and more to the belief that what is wanted in Baltimore is not a scientific school, nor a classical college, nor both combined; but a faculty of medicine, and a faculty of philosophy; that the usual college machinery of classes, commencements, etc., may be dispensed with. . . ."
In the early 1880's, the position of the undergraduates—"matriculated stepchildren," as Hawkins characterized them—was sufficiently unsettled enough to cause some to accuse the university of merely tolerating them. To be sure, there were some professors like Henry A. Rowland who were so immersed in their researches that they might openly admit that they neglected their students, but such men were hardly more concerned with graduates than with undergraduates. Probably more typical was the attitude of Charles F. Peirce, who saw the advanced student, at least, as an apprentice, "a learner but a real worker." Gilman himself increasingly began to stress the mutual dependence of college and university work and to assure all concerned that the two could coexist not only harmoniously but with profit to each.

In an effort to impress upon the public the willingness of the University to accept undergraduate students, Gilman published in the University Circulars in 1883 a statement "On the Opportunities Here Afforded for Acquiring a College Training." To those parents who hesitated to send their sons to the city of Baltimore for collegiate training, Gilman offered reassurances:

If they [parents] will take the pains to inquire they will ascertain that most of the temptations to which youth are exposed may be found in the neighborhood of country colleges as well as in large towns. Wherever young men are congregated they need to be on their guard.

---

41 Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 239.
42 Ibid., p. 218.
43 Ibid., p. 217.
against open as well as insidious allurements by which their physical, intellectual, and moral natures may be impaired for life; and every right-minded teacher must feel the responsibility of guiding those who come under his influence in the paths of rectitude. But the arrangements of the Johns Hopkins University are favorable to good conduct. The students become inmates of families in different parts of the city. They are governed by the social, moral and religious influences of the homes to which they belong. While assembled in the university they are brought into constant relations with their teachers. An attractive library is continually open to them. There are gymnasiums, not very far distant, to which they may resort for physical culture and entertainment. There are numerous societies and clubs to many of which the teachers belong. All these circumstances have been favorable, it is believed, not only to the preservation of good order, but to the formation of good habits.

Besides contending that life in an urban environment could be as "moral" as life in a rural setting, Gilman faced also the problem of placating those who saw the university as a threat to religion. In Maryland, as had been true in California, Gilman was forced to counter attacks against the "godless university." In his 1883 defense of undergraduate participation in university affairs, he cautioned his readers that being nonsectarian did not mean that Johns Hopkins was irreligious. The University "inculcates the love of truth," claimed Gilman. "It insists upon uprightness of conduct in all its members. . . . The trustees have expressed a desire to see the university pervaded by a spirit of enlightened Christianity; the ethics taught is Christian ethics; the daily religious service is Christian worship."


45 See Franklin, p. 130; Ouellette, p. 75.

Anxious to avoid sectarian hostilities, Gilman attempted to guide the University along the precarious path of "benevolent neutralism;" he himself had refrained from joining any local congregation, choosing instead to leave his membership in the Yale College Church. But much more crucial than sectarian squabbles in the latter half of the nineteenth century was the antagonism between "Darwinianism" and natural theology. Gilman had assured the public in his inaugural address that "religion has nothing to fear from science, and science need not be afraid of religion." Convinced in his own mind that science and religion could be harmonized, Gilman insisted that religion claims to interpret the word of God, and science to reveal the laws of God. "The interpreters may blunder," he admitted, "but truths are immutable, eternal, and never in conflict."

Not all Baltimoreans were as sound in their Thomism as Gilman appeared to be. Even before Hopkins officially opened, defenders of the faith were preparing to put an end to the atheism and materialism that they felt surely would appear. Gilman had invited Thomas Huxley to deliver the opening address, an invitation which provoked considerable speculation as to what the famous publicist of Darwinism might say. As it turned out, the speech was at best only mildly interesting or perhaps even boring to most of those assembled, and

---

47 Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 68.

48 Gilman, University Problems, p. 18; see also pages 95-97.

attempts to find in his words telling heresies were in vain. But, if Huxley's text escaped censure, the ceremony itself was not as fortunate. Against the advice of Gilman, the exercise had been conducted without an opening or closing prayer, a matter which did not escape the notice of a reporter for a Presbyterian weekly who informed his readers: "As they [the exercises] had been opened, so they were concluded, without prayer or benediction." A few weeks later Gilman was given a letter written to a Presbyterian minister in Baltimore from a colleague in New York which protested: "It was bad enough to invite Huxley. It were better to have asked God to be present. It would have been absurd to ask them both."51

The Huxley episode was an unnecessary reminder to Gilman of the importance of maintaining tranquil relations with religious groups. The President of Hopkins was well aware that, sectarian or not, "college faculties will be held responsible by the public for the influence they exert upon the moral lives of those whose intellectual training they have undertaken to direct." Seldom did he miss an opportunity to inform the public of the contributions the University was making to religion, whether in preparing young men for the ministry or by inviting famous clergies to address the university community,


or through the increased understanding of scriptural languages resulting from faculty scholarship.53

It is true that Gilman—a "liberally orthodox" Christian—was genuinely concerned about the religious life of the students. "Never was there a time," he wrote, "when it was more important to uphold the essentials of religion, and to encourage the formation of right moral habits, for the temptation to forget 'the things which are unseen' is very strong."54 In a manner highly reminiscent of the old-time college presidents, Gilman frequently lectured to the undergraduates in a special Friday assembly initiated in 1883. One of his homiletics, "A Lesson on Truth," told of the ease with which one might slip into lies while another, "The Training of the Will," listed seven guides: training the attention, forecasting consequences, avoiding undue exertion, avoiding "nervine stimulants," developing the habit of overcoming, "submission to wise authority," and the assimilation of the human will to the divine.55 At both California and Hopkins, Gilman instituted daily chapel exercises "upon a simple and catholic basis"56 and for many years conducted the services personally. At the beginning of each academic year the members of the Hopkins community would see posted the terse announcement: "A brief religious service will be held

53Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 72.


55Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 252.

every morning at 8.45 in Hopkins Hall. No notice will be taken of the presence or absence of anybody."57 Yet, beyond Gilman's personal concern for the religious and moral attitudes of the students, there remained a keen awareness of the necessity of maintaining the favor of religious groups. It was a perceptive student who confided in his diary that one of Gilman's commencement speeches was "full of the usual taffy, flattered the Baltimoreans and lugged in religion to please them."58

Even though Gilman's dream of a purely graduate university was thwarted and even though the pressures of his position demanded that he take cognizance of public attitudes, it is lastingly to his credit that he retained intact the central features of his philosophy. Hopkins began, he later remarked, "without formulas and rules, without decrees of the faculty or trustees, without regulations, and yet with that which was more binding than any code, the unanimous recognition of certain clear and definite principles in respect to the methods, the duties and the possibilities of a new university."59 During the formative years at Hopkins, a spirit of unity pervaded the societas magistorum et discipulorum. "Here are masters and pupils," wrote Gilman, "not two bodies, but one body, a union for the purpose of __________________

57 Franklin, p. 220.


acquiring and advancing knowledge. In this society there are different grades or ranks, each has its rights and each has its duties, but there are no diversities of interest, no divergent efforts.\(^6^0\)

Josiah Royce, one of the first graduate fellows to attend Hopkins, recalled the fledgling university as a place wherein "twas bliss to be alive." At Hopkins, he said:

> Freedom and wise counsel one enjoyed together. The air was full of rumors of noteworthy work done by the older men of the place, and of hopes that one might find a way to get a little working-power one's self. . . . One longed to be a doer of the word, and not a hearer only, a creator of his own infinitesimal fraction of a product, bound in God's name to produce it when the time came.\(^6^1\)

Guided by scholars recognized as leading authorities in their fields—James Joseph Sylvester in mathematics, Henry A. Rowland in physics, Basil L. Gildersleeve in Greek, G. Stanley Hall in psychology, Charles S. Peirce in philosophy, only to start the famous list—the graduate students devoted themselves to study and spurned the frivolities of college life. Walter Hines Page voiced the sense of adventure and dedication of many of his fellow students when he wrote that "the eyes of all the world are on us here."\(^6^2\)

Johns Hopkins was singularly free from disciplinary troubles during its early years. The trustees proudly went on record in 1880 that they were "particularly pleased to be assured that during nearly

\(^{6^0}\)Ibid., p. 466.


four years there has not been reason for any officer of this in-
stitution to censure a single student for disorder or discourtesy;
that the halls which are daily occupied by scores of young men are not
defaced by marks of mischief or carelessness. . . ."63 Certainly the
fact that requirements for admission for undergraduates at Johns Hop-
kins were more strenuous than the norm in the late nineteenth century
partially explains this utopian state of affairs.64 But perhaps even
more significant is the fact that undergraduates as well as graduates
were caught up in the spirit of the university adventure. Gilman
sensed this when he wrote:

The university students, who are here in large numbers, exert a
very strong influence upon undergraduate life. Their intellectual,
moral, and social character is of the greatest value. The books
they read, the topics they discuss, the investigations they make,
and the pursuits upon which they enter are known to younger men
and are constantly inspiring them.65

Gilman at one point likened the intangible quality of university life
to a "spiritualizing influence." The influence of study, he contended,
is "favorable to the growth of spiritual life, to the development of
uprightness, unselfishness, and faith, or, in other words, it is opposed
to epicureanism and materialism."66

63Statement from the Board of Trustees on Commemoration Day,
February 23, 1880 in the JHU Circulars, I, p. 38.

64First-year students at Hopkins engaged in work equivalent to
the sophomore level of most American institutions. Gilman explained
that "the standard of admission was placed high, in order that boys
might be encouraged to remain in the neighboring schools and colleges
until their studies were carried through what is commonly known as the

65Ibid., p. 576.

66Gilman, University Problems, p. 56.
It was in keeping with Gilman's personality to cultivate warm and open relations with students as well as colleagues. While he found it inconvenient to teach regularly at Hopkins, he frequently invited graduate students to his home for discussions and set aside the hour between nine and ten daily as a time he could be seen "on minor matters." But, expecting even the undergraduates to display maturity, he refused to involve himself in disciplinary matters. Gilman informed one professor of undergraduates that only he himself could control classroom disturbances and that "any interference of outside authority" would merely increase the problem. He wrote a mother whose son was being readmitted on probation that "if he does not devote himself with energy to his studies, his connection with the University shall be terminated without any words." To Gilman, a student's age apparently made little difference; if he enrolled at Hopkins, he was expected to enter fully into the spirit of the scholarly enterprise. Those who found themselves "indifferent to the advantages afforded them" would do well to leave the ranks.

It was a point of pride to Gilman as well as others in the Hopkins community that the University bathed in a climate of freedom. Speaking at the fifth anniversary celebration of the University, Gilman boasted that no one had complained about any restrictions on their freedom: the founder had not curtailed the freedom of the trustees, or


the trustees the instructors, or the instructors the students. Certainly Gilman received his share of unsolicited advice as to how to run the University, but on this score his reply to one such critic is revealing: ". . . I should be sorry to see fetters put upon a professor in any department of science— as to what he should or should not hold. Our plans look toward the freedom of 'the University' and not to the restrictions of 'the College.' "

The spirit and unity of the early Hopkins drew much of its strength from its commitment to academic freedom. Gilman set forth the essentials of his interpretation of Lehrfreiheit and Lernfreiheit in his inaugural address:

> If we would maintain a university, great freedom must be allowed to both teachers and scholars. This involves freedom of methods to be employed by the instructors on the one hand, and, on the other, freedom of courses to be selected by the students.

Basic to Gilman's vision of the ideal university was the belief that men can make their own designs and that the freer they are the better they will discipline themselves.

---

69 Untitled notes for address of February 22, 1881, as cited in Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 91. However, anxiety over public relations caused Gilman to exert subtle pressures against the faculty on occasion. Once the President felt it necessary to remind a professor that it was not the custom of Hopkins faculty members to smoke in public; another professor received a sharp note reprimanding him for leaving the University before the conferring of degrees. Formal rules at Hopkins were few, but with the passage of time customs gained a degree of fixity. As one professor put it, "there was an outward decorum that had to be observed." See Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 215.

70 Letter from Daniel C. Gilman to John Miller, January 5, 1876, as cited in ibid., p. 91.

71 Gilman, University Problems, p. 33.

72 Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 92.
Lernfreiheit at Johns Hopkins proved to be of a restricted nature, however. Students, most of whom were engaged in graduate studies, were not required to attend chapel or live in dorms or adhere to prescribed hours. There were no petty regulations that had to be observed as in many of the colleges of the same period. And, as announced by Gilman in his inaugural, students were free to select their own courses—almost. A strong advocate of the "new education," Gilman championed the broadening of the curriculum to include modern languages, applied as well as theoretical sciences, and professional studies. With great care he selected the most renown scholars he could secure for the Hopkins faculty. "The day has gone by for a professor of science or a professor of languages or a professor of history," he once wrote. "Those gentlemen who are willing to teach anything or take any chair are not those we must require."73 But specialization and unlimited course offerings presented problems. For all of his faith in freedom of choice, Gilman hesitated to remove all restrictions. "Discipline requires effort, and strength comes by exercise," he wrote in 1883. "The young scholar must not recline upon a bed of roses if he would make progress."74 Graduate students, driven by their desire to learn, caused Gilman no concern, but thinking of some of the less mature students he said:

Human nature, and especially young human nature, it such, that the easiest path is likely to be chosen without a strict regard to the


point it leads to. Doubtless, in all the colleges where elective courses are permitted, the inexperienced student, thinking less of preparation for the future, than of enjoyment for the present, selects with unerring instinct the courses which are likely to be most pleasant.  

Gilman suggested there were two ways to prevent the elective system from being abused. One procedure would be to pattern studies into groups, thus allowing students free election of predetermined areas of study. Another way in which students might be prevented from "shirking and from being listless and discursive" would be to provide advisers to counsel students in the selecting of courses. After a careful study of the Hopkins situation in 1882, Gilman and a committee of eight faculty members decided that wisdom would recommend the adoption of both safeguards.  

As it evolved at Hopkins, the group system was a compromise between the rigid curriculum of the traditional college and the freedom of election that permitted each student to make up his own plan of study. This system, which gave the student some choice without leaving him prey to "the infirmities of human nature," was one of the notable features of the Sheffield Scientific School and had been introduced at California by Gilman. Gilman outlined in a general way the essentials of the group system during his first year at Hopkins, but not until increasing undergraduate enrollment prompted the 1882-83 study did the program take definite shape. Undergraduates were allowed to choose.

---

75Ibid.


77Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 244.
their area of study from among seven groups: classical, mathematical-physical, chemical-biological, physical-chemical, Latin-mathematical, historical-political, and modern language. Once an area had been chosen, the student was expected to stand by his decision unless good cause for change could be given. Regardless of the area elected, certain studies were deemed necessary for all. Gilman explained the rationale of the group system in his Report for 1886 as follows:

... We have not required these courses to be identical, but in recognition of the wants of most of those who have come to us, we have marked out several parallel plans of study,--which have come to be called "Groups,"--and have offered them to the choice of matriculated students. Each of these courses has been so arranged as to make it certain that the student who completes it will have a good mathematical discipline, a knowledge of Latin, French, and German, at least one year of instruction in science, besides an introduction to logic, ethics, and psychology and to history, physical geography, and English. In addition, during two years of his college course he must give steady attention to two dominant subjects, such as the classics, mathematics, physical, chemical or biological science, history and politics, or the modern languages. In this way we have endeavored to provide a liberal education which should have a tendency toward some future occupation.79

Although Eliot called the Hopkins group system "the arbitrary device of a few minds,"80 Gilman held fast to his belief that it was the most reasonable approach to the elective system. In placing limits on the range of studies students might elect, however, Gilman fought against the tendencies of uniformity and undue standardization. The traditional four-year residence pattern held no sacredness for him,

---

78 French, pp. 66-67.

79 Daniel C. Gilman, Annual Report, 1886, as quoted by ibid., p. 67.

and he deliberately made the normal Hopkins undergraduate curriculum cover only three years. College classes were just as expendable, and bright students were encouraged to move through their programs as fast as their abilities would allow. By proving his proficiency a student could remove or abbreviate any of the requirements. Abraham Flexner, who graduated in two years, enrolled in courses that met at the same hour, alternated his attendance between them, and received credit for both. 81

Other colleges and universities were experimenting with the group system in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, but the accompanying adviser system introduced at Hopkins was unique. 82 In describing the function of the advisers, Gilman compared the relationship between the student and the faculty guide to that of "a lawyer to his client or of a physician to one who seeks his counsel." He explained further that:

The office is not that of an inspector, nor of a proctor, nor of a recipient of excuses, nor of a distant and unapproachable embodiment of the authority of the Faculty. It is the adviser's business to listen to the difficulties which the student assigned to him may bring to his notice; to act as representative if any collective action is necessary on the part of the board of instruction; to see that every part of his course of studies has received the proper attention. 83


82According to Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 248, Gilman credited Prof. C. D. Morris with this idea, saying that he [Gilman] had in mind the tutor system of the English colleges, but that the term "tutor" had been so robbed of meaning in American colleges that the name "adviser" was chosen instead.

The significance of the adviser system far surpasses any value the student may have received regarding his choice of studies, however. With the introduction of this system as early as 1877-78, Gilman was intentionally fostering closer student-faculty relations. The adviser system was an attempt to preserve the romanticized ideal of the collegiate way of life. Gilman may have described the adviser as a lawyer or physician rather than as a father, but the spirit was the same, for as he observed:

The collegiate residence, the common table, the enforced attendance upon chapel, and the sharp distinction between study hours and play-time are wanting; but the best characteristic of college life is perpetuated and revived,--the friendly guidance of young scholars by those who are more mature and who love the work of teaching.84

And to what end this friendly guidance?

For my own part, I believe that the merit of a college consists in what it does for the character of students. If they are taught fidelity and accuracy; if they learn to appreciate the value of authority as well as the privileges of freedom; if their wills are trained to overcome difficulty; if their social, intellectual, and religious natures are developed; if the love of knowledge is quickened,--then the college is a success. Manliness will be its product.85

Thus, the advisers were to bring to the university community some of the personal concern of the old-time college faculty. In 1882-83 there were approximately thirty faculty members teaching forty-nine undergraduates, and enough of these were advisers to guarantee personal attention.86 Gilman was determined to recruit only the best scholars

84 Ibid., p. 576.

85 Ibid., italics added.

86 Hawkins, Pioneer, p. 248.
for graduate and undergraduate instruction alike, but he was concerned too that they be men worthy of emulation. "It will be a great misfortune to American education," he cautioned, "if, in choosing specialists for collegiate professorships (as must be done in the future), the authorities fail to make sure that these specialists are men of general cultivation, of sound morals, and of hearty sympathy with the youth they are to teach." Students tend to follow those whom they admire, he warned. "Hence it seems to be that the college will be efficient in direct proportion to the character of its academic staff . . . . Not what the college is called, but what it is, should be the criterion by which it is estimated." 

Johns Hopkins remained a university in name and in the quality of work conducted within its halls, but as the institution entered the "Gilded Decade" of the 1890's, the "college spirit" made ever increasing advances. The pride with which Gilman had alluded in his early reports to the absence of disciplinary problems was pricked when in 1886 he was forced to confer with the faculty on "Punctuality etc." In 1889 a teacher of undergraduates asked for help in controlling disturbances in his classes, and by 1892 the classic prank--the explosion in the classroom--had occurred. Increased interest in fraternities,


yearbooks, and athletics were all unmistakable signs that the societas magistorum et discipulorum was developing schizophrenia. When in 1889 a Congregationalist minister, Edward Herrick Griffin, was appointed dean and instructed to be "a moral and intellectual force among the undergraduates," their "guide and friend," no one could deny that the undergraduates had made a difference.90

Summary

The dream of Daniel Coit Gilman for Johns Hopkins was that of an institution offering advanced professional and nonprofessional study to scholars who had previously completed collegiate training. Gilman clearly recognized the value of collegiate instruction and discipline; early and late in his career as president of Johns Hopkins he expressed the view that "the rigid training of a college, or its equivalent, seems to many the best if not the indispensable prerequisite for the advanced work of a university."91 Yet, even though undergraduates were matriculated at Hopkins from the beginning, he had hoped that the neighboring Baltimore City College and similar institutions could "relieve our foundation from much which is called 'collegiate' in distinction from 'university' work."92 The high standards of admission and the reputation of the University as an institution of scholarly merit did

90 Ibid., p. 257.


92 Gilman, University Problems, p. 8.
serve to attract quality students to Hopkins even in the undergraduate division, however.

The existence of the collegiate division received little publicity during Gilman's administration and was generally understood to serve as a feeder to the university. As the undergraduate enrollment began to increase in the 1880's, however, special attention was given to the curriculum, and the group system and adviser program were strengthened and formalized. With the appointment of a dean in the late 1880's, even more recognition was given to the needs of the undergraduate students.

At least during its formative years, Gilman liked to think of the University as a societas magistorum et discipulorum in which both professors and students could enjoy the freedom to which their seriousness of purpose entitled them. Believing that "example is more powerful than legislation in the training of young men,"93 Gilman refrained from imposing cumbersome rules on even the undergraduates. He saw the group system of studies and the adviser system not as attempts to curtail the freedom of students, but rather as necessary aids to those who, because of their immaturity, might make decisions contrary to their best interests as scholars. The key to Gilman's philosophy regarding the status of the student in the Hopkins community seems to hinge on his expectation that everyone enrolled, graduate and undergraduate alike, aspired to a scholarly or professional career.94 Hence,


94In his last annual report Gilman noted that of 1499 men who had entered the University as undergraduates, 383 had continued as graduate students, and many of these had received the Ph.D. degree. French, p. 69.
he had little patience for those who displayed a lack of self-discipline. At the same time, he realized that undergraduates lacked this essential quality in full measure. Thus, although the standard of admission was placed high, the collegiate division was prepared to offer necessary guidance to its junior scholars. Gilman defended this policy by saying:

Collegiate instruction is properly introductory to university teaching; it is elementary, formal, and disciplinary. It is largely devoted to the training of the intellectual powers and the formation of habits of attention, acquisition, memory, and judgment, while it stores the mind with the elements of knowledge. The lessons to be inculcated during a college course include obedience to recognized authority, the performance of appointed tasks, punctuality in meeting all engagements, and attention to physical development. To acquire knowledge, to attain the arts of clear reasoning and fit expression, to test the capacity for different kinds of intellectual exertion, to develop the resolution that masters difficulties, and to form intellectual friendships and associations are among the objects of a college course. Such discipline implies but little freedom; but restraints, if wisely adjusted, are found to be as welcome to the scholar as they are to the athlete.

That "such discipline implies but little freedom" may be true enough, but true also is the fact that undergraduates at Hopkins breathed much a freer air than their contemporaries in more traditional colleges. The spirit of the collegiate way affected the University in time, but great was the influence of the university ideal on the collegians enrolled at Johns Hopkins. The essence of the Hopkins' atmosphere and of Gilman's philosophy was captured by the reporter who observed that at Hopkins, students were "permitted and directed how to grow, not molded, and hammered, and chiseled into form."

CHAPTER IV
FREEDOM THROUGH RESPONSIBILITY: ANDREW DICKSON WHITE OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY (1866-1885)

A Merger of Dreams and an Expanded University Ideal

"It is very much easier to run an old university than to start a new one right, but there is more fun in a new one, where all traditions are to be made and where every finger-post points forward." So observed David Starr Jordan, speaking not of his adventures as the first president of Stanford University, but of the challenges accepted by Andrew D. White, first president and chief architect of Cornell University. Cornell was, like Johns Hopkins and Stanford which were to follow, a "new" university, made possible by the benevolence of a wealthy patron. But unlike Stanford and Hopkins, Cornell was also a recipient of the land-grant funds made available by the Morrill Act of 1862. Thus, not wholly a state university, like Michigan, or altogether a privately endowed university, like Harvard or Hopkins, Cornell was destined to play a vital role in the educational renaissance of the last third of the nineteenth century. More than any other university it may be said to have represented, in its organization and its aims,

---

all the dominant trends of the time.\textsuperscript{2} Increasing demands for expanded course offerings, scientific research, advanced professional and graduate training, and instruction in agriculture and mechanical arts all found their realization in the new institution at Ithaca. Cornell was a blend of the old and the new, a mixture of the practical and the theoretical, a conjunction of the American stress on the useful and the German ideal of scholarship. As such, Cornell became the standard bearer in a long parade of American institutions of higher education committed to the not always harmonious goals of advanced research and scholarship, quality teaching on both graduate and undergraduate levels, and service to the state and nation.

If Ezra Cornell had had his way, his endowment would have in all likelihood supported a trade or technical institution rather than a university encompassing varied aims. The university's benefactor was a hard working, practical man who was as little impressed with abstract scholarship as he was with orthodox religion. Born of Quaker parents of limited means, Cornell died a wealthy Unitarian. He had a strong dislike for idlers, weaklings, and "gentlemen loafers," and hoped to use his great benefaction to give poor ambitious boys like himself opportunities which he had lacked.\textsuperscript{3} "My greatest care now," he wrote in 1864, "is how to spend this large income, to do the most good to


those who are properly dependent on [me], to the poor and to posterity."\(^4\) Andrew D. White, a newly elected senator from Syracuse who joined Cornell in the New York Senate in 1864, influenced the philanthropist to found an institution of advanced learning "where any person can find instruction in any study,"\(^5\) and in time resigned from the Senate to become president of the new university.

Long before he took the helm at Cornell, White had developed definite ideas as to improvements needed in American higher education. At his father's insistence, White had begun his collegiate career at Geneva College (now Hobart) in 1849, an Episcopalian foundation whose boast was that it was "able to exercise a direct Christian influence upon every young man committed to its care."\(^6\) Here White learned one of his first lessons in the practical politics of college administration. Looking back on his distasteful introduction to college life, he recalled:

The college was at its lowest ebb; of discipline there was none; there were about forty students, the majority of them, sons of wealthy churchmen, showing no inclination to work and much tendency to dissipation. The authorities of the college could not afford to expel or even offend a student, for its endowment was so small that it must have all the instruction fees possible, and must keep on good terms with the wealthy fathers of its scapegrace students. The scapegraces soon found this out, and the result was a little pandemonium. . . .\(^7\)

\(^4\)Ezra Cornell, Cyphering Book, August 29, 1864, as reproduced in Becker, p. 154.


\(^6\)Ibid., p. 19.

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 18.
Besides the lack of firm control by the college authorities, White saw in the rowdyism of the Hobart undergraduates the signs of yet another failure of the old-time college. Claiming for himself the role of "a good-natured spectator" rather than that of an active accomplice in the mischief, White observed that the young boys had no other outlet for their "animal spirits." "Athletics were unknown; there was no gymnasium, no ball-playing, and, though the college was situated on the shore of one of the most beautiful lakes in the world, no boating." As will be seen, a large measure of White's philosophy was shaped by the negative reaction he had to his experiences at Hobart.

With no small amount of difficulty, White gradually convinced his father of the wisdom of leaving Hobart and finding "some seat of learning where there was less frolic and more study." Yale held out this promise, and young White joined the ranks of the Class of 1853 as a sophomore after one year at Hobart. White found the change pleasant as regarded conduct, noting that "I respected the institution, for its discipline, though at times harsh, was, on the whole, just, and thereby came a great gain to my own self-respect." But other disappointments awaited at Yale, which, like his dissatisfactions at Hobart, were to stimulate in him thoughts of reform. White found that the Yale professors were men of high character and attainments, but to his chagrin, students in the lower classes were taught almost entirely by tutors,

---

8 Ibid., p. 22.
9 Ibid.
young men "who took up teaching for bread-winning while going through the divinity school."\textsuperscript{11} The work was thus of a perfunctory nature, largely dependent on recitations with little opportunity for real intercourse between teachers and the taught. Even the professors proved to fall far short of White's expectations. With a few exceptions like President Theodore Dwight Woolsey and Professor Noah Porter, most of the Yale professors were "fettered by a system which made everything of gerund-grinding and nothing of literature."\textsuperscript{12} In language classes, content and style of translation were always subordinate to the mechanics of grammar. White found instruction in history no better, recalling that the method of Professor James Hadley "consisted simply in hearing the student repeat from memory the dates from 'Putz's Ancient History.'"\textsuperscript{13} Such uninspired teaching naturally reinforced tendencies toward apathy in many students, and White himself found that he yielded "to the general indifference of the class toward all this instruction." Lessons, he remarked, were "listlessly heard and grievously neglected. The fault was mainly our own;--but it was partly due to 'The System,' which led students to neglect all studies which did not tell upon 'marks' and 'standing.'"\textsuperscript{14}

The forces which over the years determined White's educational philosophy were by no means all of a negative sort. Even while at

\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{14}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 29.
Hobart he had chanced across Huber and Newman's volumes on the English universities and was impressed by the description of the intellectual atmosphere and the beauty of the engraved views of quadrangles, halls, libraries, and chapels. It was here, he later recounted, that the germ idea of Cornell University was conceived and quickened. Reading of the majesty of Oxford and Cambridge made every feature of Hobart seem all the more sordid. In consolation, he recalled, he began constructing air castles:

These took the form of structures suited to a great university: with distinguished professors in every field, with libraries as rich as the Bodleian, halls as lordly as that of Christ Church or of Trinity, chapels as inspiring as that of King's, towers as dignified as those of Magdalen and Merton, quadrangles as beautiful as those of Jesus and St. John's. In the midst of all other occupations I was constantly rearing these structures on that queenly site above the finest of the New York lakes, and dreaming of a university worthy of the commonwealth and of the nation.

To what degree an old man's dreams and a young man's visions may have fused in White's mind when he wrote his Autobiography will be left to the reader to determine, but there is no disputing the fact that the university which in 1868 began to take shape high above Cayuga's waters had existed in some form in White's mind long before circumstances placed him in the State Senate with Ezra Cornell.

White was able to exchange the engravings of Oxford and Cambridge for a direct exposure following his graduation from Yale. Accompanied

---


16 White, Autobiography, I, p. 287.

17 Ibid., p. 288.
by Daniel C. Gilman, Cornell's future president toured England and traveled and studied on the Continent, absorbing the lessons to be learned from the architecture and collegiate system of the English universities, the lecture system, museums, and art galleries characteristic of the French institutions of higher learning, and the renowned professors, laboratories, and international flavor of the German universities. When the duo returned to the States, Gilman chose to remain at Yale, but White, overhearing Francis Wayland advise the graduates of 1856 that "the best field of work for graduates is now in the West," eagerly accepted an appointment in history at the University of Michigan. From 1857 until 1864 White was associated with this midwestern state university, and here as elsewhere he refined his notions of the form and functions of a true university. He found in Henry Philip Tappan, Michigan's president, an avid leader in the struggle against the tired and outmoded pattern of the conservative eastern institutions. Tappan also had studied in Germany and was trying to graft German ideals onto the fledgling University of Michigan. Greatly to White's satisfaction was Tappan's insistence that the University be free from sectarian control. Allowing some freedom of choice regarding courses of study was also applauded by White as a proper attribute of the university ideal. White objected to the fact that the University at that time did not offer technical studies and that it excluded women, but in general he saw in the work of Tappan the evolution of

---

\[18\] Ibid., p. 257.

\[19\] Ibid., p. 292.
a university worthy of the name. Michigan deserves credit for being the pioneer in the university movement, White contended, "for it stands practically at the beginning of the transition from the old sectarian college to the modern university, and from the simple, single, cast-iron course to the form . . . in which various courses are presented, with free choice between them." Although public opposition to Tappan limited his success at Michigan, the mark he left on White was indelible. "To no man," White later wrote, "is any success I have had in the administration of Cornell University so greatly due as to him."

So strongly did White sense the need of university reform that he seriously considered endowing such an institution himself. Upon the death of his father in 1862 he inherited about three hundred thousand dollars, the greater part of which he was willing to devote to the establishment of a university in central New York. White had been informed that Gerrit Smith had thought of endowing a university, and in September, 1862, he wrote Smith proposing that the two combine their gifts and create a "university worthy of our land and time." The university proposed by White would be open to all, "regardless of sex or color." It would be an asylum for science, "where truth shall be

\[20\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 276.\]

\[21\text{See infra, Chapter VI and Appendix C.}\]


\[23\text{Letter from Andrew D. White to Gerrit Smith, September 1, 1862, as reproduced in Becker, pp. 154-158.}\]
sought for truth's sake, where it shall not be the main purpose of the
Faculty to stretch or cut science exactly to fit 'Revealed Religion.'"
The institution, White continued, could serve to check the mercantile
morality and military passion which were sweeping through the land.
But to fulfill these and related dreams, the university must be
"splendidly endowed," White challenged. Promising to throw in the bulk
of his property and willing to let Smith have all the glory, White
assured him that:

My soul is in this. The offer of my fortune and life for it is not
the result of any sudden whim— it is the result of years of thought
and yearning for better things in our beloved country. No other
bestowment seems to me to strike so deep or reach so far.\(^24\)

White's ambitious challenge was not accepted by Smith, however,
and for the time, at least, his cherished scheme faded away "like the
baseless fabric of a vision."\(^25\) But, when he joined the Senate in 1864
he was appointed chairman of the Literature Committee and was thus
thrown into contact with Ezra Cornell, who as chairman of the Agricul-
tural Committee, was wrestling with the proper manner of utilizing the
Morrill Act funds. Initial differences of opinion were shortly over-
come, and the two senators combined their talents to secure the charter
in 1865 for a new university to be established at Ithaca on land pro-
vided by Cornell.\(^26\) At that time the university could boast of only a

\(^{24}\)Ibid., p. 157.

\(^{25}\)White, Autobiography, I, p. 293.

\(^{26}\)On their "temporary estrangement" and the fight to obtain the
charter, see ibid., Chapter XVIII and Dorf, Chapters XXXIII and XXIV.
charter, a board of trustees, a farm of two hundred acres, and an endowment of approximately one million dollars. When the University opened three years later, it was still far from presenting an impressive appearance. None of the buildings were completely finished, and some of the first professors were not given official approval until the day before the opening. Those who were on the grounds were busily unpacking books and apparatus and wondering what would be done with the unexpectedly large number of students drifting into Ithaca. Incomplete though the university was in a tangible sense, it was far from incomplete in terms of its guiding philosophy. The trustees had elected Andrew D. White president of the University in 1866 and had given him the responsibility of drafting its bylaws and developing its general plan of organization. The buildings that were in time erected, the books purchased, the professors engaged, the students attracted, and the courses offered were all in keeping with the plan of organization completed by White in 1866. Ezra Cornell's aspirations were realized, the Morrill Act's provisions were respected, and most importantly, Andrew D. White's dream of a university "worthy of our land and time" gave to the institution its fundamental spirit and personality.

The University's Responsibility to the Student

Properly acknowledging his debt to Wilhelm von Humboldt and John Stuart Mill, White advised the trustees in 1866 that the fundamental and formative principle of Cornell University should be the recognition of

27 See Becker, p. 130.
"the absolute and essential importance of human development in its richest diversity."

The terms of the land-grant act and the biases of the Founder naturally committed Cornell to a utilitarian philosophy even before it was officially chartered, but even without these conditions, White's collegiate experiences, his study and travel abroad, and his sensitivity to the needs of the age predisposed him to rebel against the suffocating uniformity so highly valued by the aristocratic eastern colleges. It was White, the crusader, who wrote of the eastern colleges that "each of them was stagnant as a Spanish convent, and as self-satisfied as a Bourbon duchy. . . ." White flatly rejected the view that the wisdom of the ages had been distilled into one compact four-year course of study which should be mastered by all who would call themselves educated. The established pattern of forcing all to follow the same curriculum he compared to the fashion of caring for the geese at Strasburg: "every day sundry spoonfulls of the same mixture forced down all throats alike."

It was thus the recognition of the diverse population which Cornell was to serve that led White to concentrate on three general ideas in his one-man-committee report on organization: first, that agriculture and the mechanic arts should be regarded as "the peers of any other subject;" second, that the traditional liberal arts course

---


should be expanded to include history, political science, and modern literature; and third, that students should be given, in respect to choice of studies and in respect to discipline, a greater degree of freedom than was the norm in most colleges. 31

From the outset, then, White proclaimed that the University should dedicate itself to meeting the needs of its students and that it should respect the ability of students to chart their own destinies. The popular belief that students were unfit to select their own programs of study was to White completely erroneous. The fallacy in such reasoning, White argued, exists in "the virtual assumption that because a young student is not a perfect judge regarding his complete wants, therefore he is no judge at all, and shall have others to choose for him; and but one course opened to their choice." 32 Neither in theory nor in practice did White contend that students should be given a completely free choice, however. "We hold, indeed," he continued, "that most students need advice as to details of study, and that probably none could construct the best possible course of study..." Granting that students did need some direction but yet insistent on respecting their judgment, White outlined a program very similar to the "group system" Gilman was to introduce later at Johns Hopkins:

We... hold than an overwhelming majority of students are competent to choose between different courses of study, carefully balanced and arranged by men who have brought thought and experience to the work.


32 Ibid., p. 9.
By the aid of older friends, and the faculty of the university, a young man ought to be able to make a choice based upon his previous education and means of future education—upon his tastes, position, and ambition. Certainly the results could not be more wretched under such a system than under the existing system, even by the confession of its most earnest advocates.33

Students who entered in the first year were thus informed that they could select a program of study leading to a degree in science, philosophy or the arts, or, if they so chose, could take any courses without aiming for a degree.34 The elective courses offered, the Register announced, "are intended to give to the student full and entire freedom in the selection of his studies—a freedom every way equal to that which prevails in the universities of continental Europe."35 Inasmuch as White did not feel it necessary to elaborate on the role of advisers at Cornell, it must be assumed that their function was not valued as an integral part of the program as was the case at Hopkins.

To those critics who objected to departures from the classical-mathematical curriculum on the grounds of mental discipline, White had a ready answer:

Discipline comes by studies which are loved, not by studies which are loathed. There is no discipline to be obtained in droning

33 Ibid.


35 Ibid., pp. 50-51.
over studies. Vigorous, energetic study, prompted by enthusiasm or a high sense of the value of the subject, is the only kind of study not positively hurtful to mental power.\textsuperscript{36}

The University's responsibility to the student was only partially discharged by the provision of multiple curricula and an elective system. While the trustees were concerned over buildings, White gave top priority to securing a respectable faculty. "Buildings never yet made a great university," he told the trustees. "Some of the greatest are in very poor buildings. Better a splendid and complete faculty in a barn than an insufficient faculty in a palace."\textsuperscript{37} In addition to searching out the most promising men as permanent professors, White also inaugurated a system of non-resident lectureships, a plan which had not been tried to any extent in the past and was, as worked out at Cornell, White's own invention.\textsuperscript{38} White defended his plan by suggesting that contact with non-resident professors would stimulate the faculty and would tend to counter any provincialism of thought in a faculty forced to live in rural Ithaca. Besides introducing a "constant influx of light and life from the great centers of thought and action," the addition of famous lecturers to the staff would appeal to the public who might thereby enroll for short terms. Moreover, the reputation of Cornell would certainly benefit from its association with leading scholars, as it

\textsuperscript{36}White, Report of the Committee . . . , p. 10.


\textsuperscript{38}Rogers, p. 155.
obviously did when White engaged such men as James Russell Lowell, Louis Agassiz, George William Curtis, Goldwin Smith, and Theodore Dwight. Perhaps reflecting on his own disappointments at Hobart and Yale, White also pointed out the very great value such men would have from the students' point of view. Their presence at Cornell, he said, would work against the "regularity in routine, a dullness, a listlessness, a want of enthusiasm" which was typical of most university students. Further, contact with exciting scholars would turn students' thoughts from dissipation to constructive work. "If these special professors were men of the greatest ability and eminence," he maintained, "an enthusiasm might be aroused among the students in regard to various departments of knowledge, which would direct their energies mainly into channels of study and thought. It was with this thought in mind that White explained to George William Curtis the value his lectures would have:

We need them for their general effect on the ideas and general culture of our young men. They are just the kind of men who need them most. Discipline they will have had enough of--the lectures by you and Lowell and Bayard Taylor and others will place them in an atmosphere which will make them better as long as they live.

---


41 Letter from Andrew D. White to G. W. Curtis, November 1, 1870, as quoted by Rogers, p. 156.
White's concern for the non-resident professorship program stemmed from his recognition of the fact that, as a new university, Cornell would not be able to attract outstanding scholars on a permanent basis from the beginning. Accordingly, his efforts in recruiting permanent professors were directed at finding young but promising men who had reputations yet to make. The need to place men behind lecterns did not suggest to him that second-rate appointments were at all desirable, however. In discussing the qualifications desired in Cornell professors, White unfolded further his philosophy of the university's responsibility to the student. Professors were needed, he contended, who could make a name for themselves and who could discover and impart the truth; but, of great importance also was their ability to contribute to the culture and manliness of the students. He warned the trustees: "Nothing short of . . . extreme necessity should lead us to place men of low grade, as to general culture, among young men whose habits of thinking and living are just receiving the form and impress which they are to bear during life."\(^4\) White granted that the university existed to produce scholars, but he added that it also had a higher duty: "It must make men--men manly, earnest, and of good general culture." He warned further:

We must not make the mistake so common in older colleges--in selecting to govern and guide bright, high-spirited young men, tutors who do not and cannot know anything of the world and of what the world is thinking,--instructors who lead students to associate learning with boorishness or clownishness. We must

make no man an instructor simply because he is poor or pious or a "squatter" on the college domain. We must have men who are what we would have our sons be, and we must have them at any cost.43

Once such men were found, White hoped that a conscious effort could be made to improve student-faculty relations. White confessed to the trustees that:

One of the saddest deficiencies in existing colleges is want of free intercourse, and even of acquaintance, between professors and students. In most of the larger colleges the great mass of students know really nothing of either President or Professors. They are generally strangers, or worse than strangers. They have met in lecture rooms or recitation rooms, but they have met as natural enemies. Their only conversation outside the lecture room has been when the student made excuses, or the professor gave reproofs; and in these the student is normally a culprit, and the professor a detective.44

The contention that the large size of many colleges and universities accounted for the poor relationship between the teachers and the taught White discounted as merely a feeble excuse. White offered to the trustees a plan which promised to overcome this poor state of affairs characteristic of other institutions:

It is therefore recommended that the duty of acquaintance and social intercourse with students be impressed upon the faculty, and that additions be made to professors' salaries expressly as an indemnity or provision for such social privileges to students. The same principle which has led wise governments to make extra allowances to ambassadors, for the express purpose of keeping up genial social relationships with the people among whom they are sent, is the basis of the experiment now suggested. The experiment can be tried, either by moderate additions to salary or deductions from rents of University houses.

It is also suggested that some provision be made for weekly or fortnightly reunions of faculty and students; that at an early day pleasant rooms be allotted for that purpose, and that some small expenditure be made to render such gatherings attractive and profitable.45

43 Ibid.
44 Ibid., p. 21.
Whether because of the trustees' skepticism or of lack of funds, White's plan was not put into practice. To be sure, the spirit of adventure characteristic of the Johns Hopkins community of scholars found some expression in Ithaca as well and served to encourage close faculty-student relations, at least for those in both camps willing to make the extra effort. Professor T. F. Crane could recall, after the passage of several decades, the "early days at Cornell where teacher and pupil felt that they were engaged in a common enterprise and were willing to make personal sacrifices for its success."\(^{46}\) David Starr Jordan recounted: "At that time we were all young together, freshmen students, freshmen professors, freshman president, without experience, or tradition to guide or impede. But we had youth and we had truth, and not even the gods have those!"\(^{47}\) On at least one occasion White was worried lest faculty-student relations become too informal and relaxed--Professor Willard Fiske received a reprimand for offering a student a glass of ale when the latter called on Fiske at home and found him satisfying his occasional thirst.\(^{48}\) Close faculty-student contact White wanted, but he was also concerned about student character.

\(^{46}\) T. F. Crane, "Reminiscences," History of the Class of 1872, p. 11.


\(^{48}\) See letter from D. W. Fiske to Andrew D. White, Sept. 4, 1869, MS (Andrew D. White Papers, Collection of Regional History and University Archives, Cornell University Library, Ithaca, New York). Not to be outdone, however, Fiske defended his action on the grounds of politeness and rather sharply informed White to "take me as you find me, or leave me alone together." This letter has been reproduced in Horatio S. White, Willard Fiske: Life and Correspondence (New York: Oxford University Press, 1925), p. 405.
"Character is the key to all success worth having," he once informed the Cornell students. "Better the simplest primary education with character than all that Cornell or Oxford or Leipzig can give you without it."^49

Character Formation and University Ideals

White's concern for the character development of students was tempered by his progressive ideas of university and social reform in a manner that caused him to reject much in the collegiate way. At the inauguration ceremonies, Ezra Cornell expressed the hope that the University would elevate the manners and morals of its students.

I desire that this shall prove to be the beginning of an institution which shall furnish better means for the culture of all men of every calling, of every aim; which shall make men more truthful, more honest, more virtuous, more noble, more manly; which shall give them higher purposes and more lofty aims, qualifying them to serve their fellow men better, preparing them to serve society better, training them to be more useful in their relations to the state, and to better comprehend their higher and holier relations to their families and their God.50

Cornell's sentiments were fully endorsed by White. The Founder and the first President were also in total agreement with respect to the role religion should play as a means to these ends. "It shall be our aim


^50 Ezra Cornell, "Address at the Inauguration," The Inauguration of Cornell University: Reprinted from the Account of the Proceedings at the Inauguration, October 7, 1868 (Ithaca: The University, 1921), pp. 7-8. Henceforth cited as The Inauguration of Cornell University.
and our constant effort to make true Christian men," Cornell continued, but "without dwarfing or paring them down to fit the narrow gauge of any sect." The charter of the University expressly stated that "persons of every religious denomination or of no religious denomination, shall be equally eligible to all offices and appointments," and both Cornell and White took full advantage of the inauguration exercises to impress upon a skeptical public the firmness of their convictions. Sectarian rivalry, declared White, had done more to keep colleges in an impoverished state than any other single factor. The deplorable lack of academic freedom in American institutions of higher learning was to him no less a direct consequence of narrow sectarianism. Many may have objected but few missed his meaning when White asserted: "From the days when Henry Dunster, the first president of the first college in America, a devoted scholar, a thorough builder, an earnest man, was driven from his seat with ignominy and with cruelty because Cotton Mather declared him 'fallen into the briars of anti-paedobaptism,' the sectarian spirit has been the worst foe of enlarged university education." A few years later he expressed the same sentiment when

51 Ibid., p. 8.
52 As quoted by Rogers, pp. 72-73. See ibid., p. 14.
53 Andrew D. White, "Inaugural Address," The Inauguration of Cornell University, p. 13. White's comment is obviously a misinterpretation of a passage in Josiah Quincy's The History of Harvard University (Cambridge: John Owen, 1840), pp. 17-18. Cotton Mather, born in 1663, was not a party to Dunster's dismissal (1654), but was rather passing judgment on the episode at a later time.
he wrote: "As to 'sound' learning and 'safe' instruction, it has well-nigh killed the great majority of colleges which have boasted it."\textsuperscript{54}

White's continued attacks against sectarianism gained for him the reputation of one of the leading champions of secular education. His famous The Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom was an attempt to prove that religion and science were fundamentally harmonious, and that if religious teachers would confine themselves to teaching religion and scientists to the propagation of science, both could work together in harmony for the benefit of mankind.\textsuperscript{55} There were many, however, who construed White's motives differently. A reviewer for the London Times Literary Supplement recently concluded: "White's thesis is simple. In the conflict between science and religion, the theologians have always been in the wrong; and the sooner the theological control of universities is ended, the better it will be both for science and for religion. . . ."\textsuperscript{56}

White's opposition to denominational control and sectarian rivalry was not that of an irreligious man. Like so many others of his age who found themselves in education, White at one time leaned toward the ministry and entertained the thought of taking orders in


the Episcopal Church.\textsuperscript{57} Not atheism but what resembled "a High Church disdain for the various bickering sects and creeds who as erring children had left the protecting arm of the mother church"\textsuperscript{58} formed the basis for his hostility. White carefully followed reports of controversies stemming from intolerance at various colleges and universities around the country. His reaction to the dismissal in 1878 of Alexander Winchell, a professor of geology at Vanderbilt University, is most revealing. He wrote to Gilman:

I have been rather interested of late in the Winchell imbroglio at Nashville. What an idea of a University these trustees must have! What was tragical in Galileo's case is farcical in this. It appears that Bishop McTyeire took great pains to show to Winchell that there was no similarity between the two cases. Neither of them were aware that the Bishop used precisely the same argument to Winchell---indeed, virtually verbatim---which Cardinal Bellarmin used to Galileo. Bellarmin told Galileo that his ideas "vitiated the plan of salvation;" McTyeire told Winchell that his ideas "were contrary to the plan of redemption." You see how great minds run in the same channel. What a theory of a University it is to be sure, and yet that is what our opponents all over the country seem to be struggling for. Very hard to see that the world progresses any, if, instead of being in the hands of a Roman Catholic Cardinal, we are to fall into the hands of a Methodist Bishop. The real advance is in the fact that they have no longer any power to oppose us with physical torture. In view of the spirit shown, and the articles written, against Winchell for his very moderate tendency to evolution doctrines, it would seem that the absence of torture is not due to any lack of will in the matter...\textsuperscript{59}

White's general religious attitudes reinforced by his none too favorable estimation of the value of chapel exercises while a Yale

\textsuperscript{57}Rogers, p. 81. On his religious development and views, see White, Autobiography, II, Chapters LVIII-LXI.

\textsuperscript{58}Rogers, p. 81.

student rather naturally disposed him to argue against compulsory chapel at Cornell. To the idea of chapel services per se he expressed no opposition, however. In his inaugural address he announced:

From yonder chapel shall daily ascend praise and prayer. Day after day it shall recognize in man not only mental and moral but religious want. We will labor to make this a Christian institution—a sectarian institution may it never be.61

It was in this same address, however, that the Cornell President inveighed against the deadening atmosphere characteristic of most chapel services—"prayers dogmatic or ceremonial; praise with doggerel hymns, thin music and feeble choir; the great body of students utterly listless or worse."62 As long as chapel services could be so described, students must be either compelled to attend, or, more humanely, be allowed to exercise their free will, in which case the services would in all probability cease to exist. White's alternative was to provide for the students chapel exercises of a nature which would attract their presence voluntarily. Henry Sage accordingly established a chapel on the university grounds recognizing White's conditions that it be free from any one sect and non-compulsory. A son, Dean Sage, endowed a preachership, which, again following White's convictions, was to be open to men of all faiths and held on a rotating basis. White's rationale for requiring that the preachership be assigned to no single minister was twofold: first, to do otherwise would violate the nonsectarian

60 See White, Autobiography, II, pp. 529-540.

61 White, "Inaugural Address," The Inauguration of Cornell University, p. 15.

62 Ibid.
nature of the University, and secondly, he knew that developing strong ties between a preacher and the congregation would be impossible given the shifting student population. "Hence it is," he maintained, "that even the most brilliant preachers settled in universities have rapidly lost their prestige among the students." White carefully selected men for the chaplaincy who avoided sensational or emotional preaching. "I had no wish to make the chapel a place for amusement or for ground and lofty tumbling by clerical performers," he later recalled; "the result was that its ennobling influence was steadily maintained." Those who felt that Cornell students were "raw recruits for Satan" failed to appreciate the "ennobling influence" so dear to White. "The whole system was indeed at first attacked," he related in his Autobiography, "and while we had formerly been charged with godlessness, we were now charged with 'indifferentism'--whatever that might mean." White learned that he could escape such charges no more successfully than other presidents with similar convictions, but he nonetheless maintained his course. Typical of many defenses offered in behalf of the University and his policies was the one offered in 1872:

The Cornell University is governed by a body of Christian Trustees, conducted by Christian Professors, and is a Christian Institution as the Public School System of this State is Christian. Its inaugural exercises were commenced with simple

---

64 Ibid., p. 405.
65 Rogers, p. 75.
Christian worship, and not a public exercise of any sort has taken place since that has not been begun with that great comprehensive petition from the Founder of Christianity Himself--The Lord's Prayer.

Every working day since has been begun in the University Chapel in the same manner.

It is not believed, however, that forcing young men to attend chapel exercises promotes reverence for Christian graces. It is believed that even a handful of students coming voluntarily and taking part heartily, is better than hundreds forced to come under penalties, and either sitting listlessly, or preparing their lessons stealthily for the following hour.67

Compulsory chapel and sectarianism were not the only ingredients of the collegiate tradition which White hoped to overcome at Cornell. In a letter to the Hopkins trustees he expressed his views on the dormitory system.

The erection of dormitories is one of the greatest mistakes a University or College can make. They make little or no return for the effort expended, and what is still worse, they increase the labor of the Faculty ten-fold. I am entirely in bounds when I say that three-fourths of the difficulty in governing American Colleges and Universities arise from the dormitory system... The sooner our university authorities learn that the proper duty of a university is to educate students and not to lodge and feed them the better for all parties concerned.68

White's objections to the dormitory system went beyond the argument that educational institutions were not intended to compete with hotels and boarding houses. In rejecting the dormitory system, he was also acknowledging the failure of the English system of faculty governance as it had evolved in the United States. In his report on the proper


68Letter from Andrew D. White to the Trustees of Johns Hopkins University, March 13, 1874, as quoted by Corson, pp. 154-155. Henceforth cited as White to JHU Trustees in Corson.
organization of the University he expressed his dislike for the system which "tends to put the professorial corps in the attitude of policemen" and added:

The situation is made all the worse by the fact that the professor is armed with no authority under the law of the land, and so comes to be regarded not even as a policeman, but as a spy—not as a judge, but as an inquisitor. Nothing could be more fatal to hearty, kindly relations between teachers and taught.69

In his Autobiography he recalled some of the embarrassments suffered by faculty members carrying out their duties in loco parentis: "I have seen a professor driven out of a room, through the panel of a door, with books, boots, and bootjacks hurled at his head; and even the respected president of a college, a doctor of divinity, while patrolling buildings with the janitors, subjected to outrageous indignity."70 He warned the Hopkins trustees that "the theory that the dormitory system protects the morals of the student is utterly exploded."71

As far as maintaining good conduct and influencing the character of students were concerned, White placed far more confidence in lodging students in private residences than in herding them into dormitories. "Experience has shown that better discipline can be maintained without them [dormitories],&quot; he advised the Cornell trustees in 1866. Further, "students separated from each other and brought into small groups under the restraint of lodging with quiet families are generally more easily


71White to JHU Trustees, March 13, 1874, in Corson, p. 155.
managed than when brought together under a single roof." In his inaugural address he asserted that it was the aim of the Cornell authorities "to promote more and more the residence of students in private families, and thus to bring the young men under family influence, and under the feeling that they are members of the community, subject to the same laws and customs which bind other members." And in his letter to the Hopkins trustees he similarly stated: "Leaving the students in the position of citizens amenable to the laws that govern other citizens, having them dispersed among the families of various appointed persons, breaks up the opportunity for caballing and mischief, and also brings each student under the influence, to some extent, of a home circle.

White was a shrewd enough administrator not to miss an opportunity to impress upon the public the virtuous qualities of Cornell as when he described its location as "unrivaled for beauty and salubrity," adding effectively:

The town presents comparatively few of the allurements from study, and the numberless temptations to dissipation of body and mind found in larger cities, and which have always made thoughtful men hesitate to select cities for the residence of university students.

---

72 Andrew D. White, "Report Submitted by the Committee on Buildings," March 14, 1866, p. 4, MSS (Ezra Cornell Papers, Collection of Regional History and University Archives, Cornell University Library, Ithaca, New York).

73 White, "Inaugural Address," The Inauguration of Cornell University, pp. 23-24.

74 White to JHU Trustees, March 13, 1874, in Corson, p. 155.
Nor is there any city near enough to afford a rendezvous for students in hours of leisure.75

In spite of his promotional urges, however, White had no desire to advertise Cornell as a paternalistic college. The elective system, endeavors to acquire stimulating professors, nonsectarianism, voluntary chapel, his dislike of the dormitory system and his belief that students should be held to the same laws that govern other citizens were all clear declarations of his hope that at Cornell students could be treated "not as boys, but as young men, held to the duties and responsibilities of men." The same pamphlet which carried the comforting description of cozy little Ithaca also carried the warning that students would be held responsible for their actions: "Those who are thinking of entering the University should first consider whether they are ready for this. If they are not, if they still need watching and petting as boys, they are not ready to enter."76

Basic to White's educational philosophy was thus the attitude that a student would profit from his experiences only if he were made

75White, Cornell University: What It Is and What It Is Not, p. 30. Revealing as to the lengths to which White would go to improve public relations is an early letter from White to Daniel C. Gilman, February 27, 1859, in which he informed Gilman of "some droll experiences" which befell him on a speaking tour in behalf of the University of Michigan: "Tell Charlie Tiffany when you see him that I was quartered in a strong Methodist family in the western corner of the State, was asked to say grace and that summing up Charlie's good words on such occasions I did it with considerable unction. The University, you know, must not be allowed to suffer in reputation for want of a grace before meat." Quoted by Corson, p. 131. (Charlie Tiffany was a Yale friend who later became a bishop.)

to feel responsible for his actions. "You are not here to receive an education but to educate yourselves," he once told the students. What was true of education in a formal sense was also to be true of character development. "In Heaven's name be men," he challenged in his inaugural. "Is it not time that some poor student traditions be supplanted by better? You are not here to be made; you are here to make yourselves... This is no place for children's tricks and toys, for exploits which only excite the wonderment of boarding-school misses." Capturing the essence of White's interpretation of the limits of the university's responsibility regarding student conduct was his declaration that "the Institution is not a 'Reform School.'"

Its work is to aid earnest, determined, manly young men in obtaining the best education their talents allow. To do this the professors will direct all their efforts. They will not waste their strength in trying to bolster up weak characters or to reform vicious ones. The Charter of the Institution does not prescribe it; common sense does not permit it. With the great number of zealous, hard-working youth pressing on them, in classes larger than have ever before been known at any American institution of learning, it would be a perversion to turn from these to waste labor on those on whom a maximum of labor produces a minimum of result. The labor bestowed in keeping half a dozen unruly students within decent bounds, or in urging on a dozen uninterested students to work, is always more exhausting than that of instructing a hundred students really anxious to make themselves men. The Faculty will indeed give advice and use all possible forbearance in the treatment of all; but they cannot retain in the University anyone who is found to be really unworthy. Whenever it


78 White, "Inaugural Address," The Inauguration of Cornell University, p. 30.
shall appear that any young man is pursuing such a course as to render his stay injurious to those about him, or not conducive to his own interests, measures will be taken for his exclusion. 79

It was White's hope that the students would prove capable of self-government at Cornell. Before university operations were under­way he informed the trustees that "much is trusted to the manliness of the students. The attempt is to teach the students to govern them­selves, and to cultivate acquaintance and confidence between faculty and students." 80 By placing the faculty over students "not as police, but as a body of friends," White maintained that self-regulation might be made to work better than any other form of government. 81 William Russel, who as Cornell's vice-president was to find himself more deeply involved in disciplinary procedure than he had anticipated, endorsed White's views on behalf of the faculty at the inauguration by saying:

We shall undertake no police duty nor constitute ourselves watchmen to preserve order. The students themselves will regulate that, leaving to the professor the relations of friend, and guide, and instructor. We shall consider them as gentlemen, and treat them as such. ... 82

White's anxiousness to allow students to regulate their own affairs necessitated admitting students who were beyond the need for

79White, Cornell University: What It Is and What It Is Not, p. 21; cf. ibid., p. 29.
80White, Report of the Committee ... , p. 36.
81Ibid., pp. 36-37.
82William Russel, "Address at the Inauguration," The Inauguration of Cornell University, p. 38.
parental control. To a father who wanted to enroll his twelve year old son, White wrote:

The lowest age at which we admit students here is sixteen years. The reason of this regulation you will understand when I state that the fundamental idea of government is to treat the students as young men and not to watch and regulate their conduct in trivial particulars as boys. . . . Our study also presupposes a maturity of mind not to be expected in one so young as twelve.83

One potential student who stated he had heard Cornell took ignorant, ill-mannered boys and made gentlemen of them was informed by White that such was not at all the case and added that the young man was "ill-directed" in writing to him if this was his purpose in attending college.84

Although in theory the student was to be independent at Cornell, White felt the University should quite properly provide aids and encouragements to the development of manliness. While it is true that he regarded football as a vestige of barbarity85 and was peculiarly fond of boasting to alumni gatherings that he had never seen a game of football or baseball,86 he nonetheless valued physical exercise as an aid to manliness and as a preventive of dissipation. Lack of physical

83Reply by White on back of letter from Joseph H. Kuhns to Andrew D. White, September 12, 1870, MS (Andrew D. White Papers).

84Letter from Edward J. Knox to Andrew D. White, January 10, 1872, as cited in Zimmerman, p. 47.

85Often quoted is White's classic rejection of a request to allow Cornell footballers to engage the University of Michigan squad at Cleveland in 1873: "I refuse to let forty of our boys travel four hundred miles merely to agitate a bag of wind." See Bishop, p. 48.

86Ibid.
exercise in the old colleges, he once remarked, had produced graduates who were "too often ex officio dyspeptics."\footnote{White, "The Need of Another University," \textit{The Forum}, VI, p. 471.} Ezra Cornell was also an advocate of exercise, but, never one to condone wasted energy, the Founder felt that a manual labor program would not only improve the physical health of students, but would aid them and the University financially. A diligent and thrifty student like David Starr Jordan might enter the university with seventy-five dollars in his pocket and leave four years later with the same amount,\footnote{Jordan, \textit{The Days of a Man}, I, p. 51.} but White concluded that as far as the University was concerned, it would have been cheaper to support many of the manual labor students in a hotel and to have employed day laborers in their places, since much of their work had to be re-done at a cost greater than the original would have been.\footnote{White, \textit{Autobiography}, I, p. 345.}

Nonetheless, White reluctantly followed the Founder's wishes in this respect until the latter died in 1874, at which time the unprofitable venture was discarded at Cornell.\footnote{On the manual labor system at Cornell, see \textit{ibid.}, pp. 344-345; Rogers, pp. 182-186; and Waterman Thomas Hewett, \textit{Cornell University: A History}, I (New York: The University Publishing Society, 1905), pp. 243-254.}

White remained convinced that exercise and hygiene were indispensable ingredients of character as well as physical development. He had pleaded with Ezra Cornell in 1869: "Is it utterly impossible to secure a neat, inexpensive gymnasium building this fall? It would
It was not until the 1880's that provisions for a gymnasium were made, but White did not wait until then to act upon his theory. Physiology and hygiene were required courses from the start, and grounds were set aside for various athletic events. White's aversion to football did not in the least affect his fondness of boating. In 1873 he presented the students with a cedar shell, "one of the best investments I ever made," he later reminisced. Boating not only provided maximum exercise with a minimum of danger, he advised, but it also developed spirit and a sense of fair play. Of great importance was yet another value of the sport: "The most detestable product of college life is the sickly cynic; and a thorough course of boating, under a good stroke oar, does as much as anything to make him impossible."

Many of the college and university presidents who criticized White's stand on athletics also found objectionable his views regarding fraternities. The Cornell president insisted that it was only natural for students to form associations, and that fraternities, properly administered, could serve as a useful adjunct in university discipline.

---

91 Letter from Andrew D. White to Ezra Cornell, July 31, 1869, MS (Ezra Cornell Papers).

92 See White, Report of the Committee ..., p. 40; Rogers, pp. 186-193; Bishop, pp. 133-137.


Pressure from rival fraternities and from brothers among the alumni tended to make the young men aware of their responsibilities and desirous of high standards, he asserted. Administrators who were impressed with only the negative aspects of fraternities and who attempted to drive them out only made matters worse, he advised. White contended that instead of attacking the whole system, thereby forming rebellious sub rosa groups, a wiser policy was to openly approve of the system and abolish only the disreputable ones. In this action the administration would have the support of the better fraternities, he alleged, and the mere threat of abolishing a fraternity would often be enough to excite its members toward improvement. White followed just such a course of action when he once warned Cornell students that to join one particular fraternity was to "vitiate their college course and to lose the respect of the faculty."

The fact that fraternity men are all "to a certain extent responsible for each, and each for all" also provided White with a mechanism for aiding young men in their search for manhood. White noted:

More than once, when some member of a fraternity has been careless in conduct or study, I have summoned senior members of his chapter, discussed the matter confidentially with them, dwelt upon the injury the man was doing to his fraternity, and insisted that it must reform him or remove him. This expedient has often succeeded when all others had failed. It is within my knowledge that a

---

95 Andrew D. White, "College Fraternities," *The Forum*, III (May, 1887), pp. 243-244.


97 Andrew D. White, "Toast to Psi Upsilon," 1884, MSS (Andrew D. White Papers).
considerable number of young men have thus been rescued from courses which might have brought great sorrow to them and to their families. 98

White also valued fraternity houses as a means for developing maturity. He informed Willard Fiske that "it seems to me that the care and responsibility for such houses will take students out of the category of boys more rapidly than any other agency." 99 Writing in 1887, he compared fraternity accommodations with dormitories by saying:

One of the greatest difficulties with American students has risen from the fact that they have been considered neither as men, to be subjected to the laws governing the public at large, nor as boys, to be subjected to the discipline of preparatory schools. Some of the consequences of this abnormal condition have been wretched. Place twenty or thirty students in the ordinary college dormitory, and there will be carelessness, uproar, and destruction; but place the same number of men belonging to any good fraternity in a chapter-house of their own, and the point of honor is changed; the house will be well cared for and quiet. . . . The reason is simple; the young occupants had been brought into a sense of proprietorship, into a feeling of responsibility for the maintenance of the property and its reputation. 100

Noting that "any properly constituted chapter contains steady, thoughtful, earnest men who exercise almost a parental care over younger members," 101 White informed some Oxford professors that "I should not be sorry to see the whole body of students in the university with which I was connected divided into fraternities, each living upon the

99 Letter from Andrew D. White to Willard Fiske, May 26, 1884, MS (Andrew D. White Papers).
university grounds in its own house, with full responsibility for its keeping and character, and never to be interfered with until it proved its incapacity for proper self-government."\textsuperscript{102}

\textbf{White the Administrator vs. White the Theorist}

The one recurring theme appearing in White's speeches and writings regarding the role of the student in the university setting is his insistence that they act like and in turn be treated like young gentlemen. There is no reason to doubt that White was sincere in his devotion to this principle, yet in the actual operation of the university White felt it expedient to compromise this ideal in part. At least four reasons suggest themselves as to why in practice White fell short of his aspirations. First, the dreams and proposals White had for Cornell could not all be immediately realized, thus forcing the authorities to rely on temporary measures. Secondly, White's ideal of freedom from external governance carried within it the corollary of responsibility. He hoped the University could function with few rules and regulations and that the students could exercise self-discipline without interference. But at the same time, White was fervently an opponent of anarchy. White saw license as a far greater threat to liberty than regulation, and whenever the situation seemed to demand it, he did not hesitate to sacrifice freedom for order. Thirdly, White, as every administrator, was subject to numerous pressures from influential individuals, not the least of whom were trustees. The fact that he

\textsuperscript{102}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 247.
was absent from campus frequently--one time (1876-1881) for almost five years--gave opportunity to those who would form power cliques and press for measures in his absence. Even when he was in Ithaca, pressure from powerful individuals could not be ignored. A fourth factor diminishing White's ability to execute his principles totally was his dislike of administrative details. Bishop has observed that White "could work endlessly, but only if the purpose was passionately sought. The routine of administration bored him; most of his later troubles at Cornell arose from his eagerness to abandon the tiresome tasks and to escape for months or years."\(^{103}\)

The first two of these factors can be seen at work with respect to the housing and governance of students during the early years. Yielding to demands of the moment, White informed the trustees in 1866 that dormitories would be necessary in spite of his hopes to the contrary. "The Committee generally admit their [dormitories] necessity reluctantly, . . ." he advised. "The University property is so remote from the village of Ithaca and at such a distance above it, that some provisions must be made for the lodging of students upon the University

\(^{103}\)Bishop, p. 44. Cf. letter from Andrew D. White to Daniel C. Gilman, September 22, 1873, as quoted by Corson, p. 127: "As things go now I have to give up what I enjoy--lecturing on history--to do what I dislike and am very poorly fitted for--look [sic] after a world of details of business. I have been no failure in this respect--in fact am generally thought to have succeeded. A student secretary takes my answers to letters from dictation--a Vice President takes details of discipline--a Registrar keeps track of examinations and Faculty business. . . . Still my repugnance to office work . . . is rapidly becoming invincible."
Seeing dormitories as nothing more than a necessary evil, White was pleased to report to the trustees in 1874 that an increasing number of students were living in the town.\footnote{Andrew D. White, "Report Submitted by the Committee on Buildings," March 14, 1886, p. 4, MSS (Ezra Cornell Papers).}

Unable then to avoid housing students on the University grounds, White was determined not to lose his ideal of self-responsibility altogether. In his Report of the Committee on Organization he recommended that:

Residence in the college building [be] a reward of good work and conduct, and that good order in every student hall be entrusted to the self-governing powers of the students residing in it, with a full understanding that the University authorities will enter into no inquisitorial process to discover the authors of disorder, but that if the tenants are not able to maintain good order, they must give place en masse to those who can. If this does not accomplish the purpose, the hall shall be closed altogether.\footnote{Andrew D. White, "Annual Report to the Board of Trustees," July 1, 1874, p. 14, MSS (Andrew D. White Papers). Three-fourths of the students were living in town in 1873 according to James Morgan Hart, "Cornell University," Scribner's Monthly, VI (June, 1873), p. 206.}

Still not admitting defeat, he added:

It is hoped that ere many years accommodations for students may mainly be provided among citizens residing in neat, tidy dwellings bordering upon the University property. In these a kindly, restraining family influence would be exercised upon students, never found in the prevalent poor imitation of the English semi-monastic system.

The committee are decidedly opposed to any large adoption of a dormitory system.\footnote{White, Report of the Committee ..., p. 45.}

In this same Report White explained to the trustees the relative merits of various patterns of institutional discipline. Rejecting the
collegiate pattern for obvious reasons, he considered a military system as desirable in that it put all students on an equal level as to dress and manner of living and noted further its advantage regarding control. He continued, however, by stating that the diverse ages of Cornell students, some temporary, some living in dorms and others not, tended to make such a system undesirable for the whole University. He concluded by saying that "the system of university freedom of government is believed by the committee to be our best government. In this system laws are few but speedily executed, and the University is regarded neither as an asylum nor a reform school."\textsuperscript{108} To this ideal White tried to remain true, but he nonetheless found that his notions regarding student self-government "were vague, unformed, and finally changed by the logic of events."\textsuperscript{109}

The presence of dormitories and the provision of the Morrill Act calling for military training were "events" which combined to give early Cornell an atmosphere which could hardly be characterized as free. The University Register for 1868-1869 carried the notice:

In compliance with the Act of Congress, a scheme of military instruction has been elaborated, is already in partial operation, and will be still further developed on and after the beginning of the academic year 1869-70. After that date, undergraduates, unless exempted by the Faculty for special reasons, will be required to wear the University uniform—which can be readily and reasonably procured in Ithaca—and to participate in the regular military exercises. The ordinary government at large of the University, however, is not military, but those students who choose rooms in the University buildings must do so with the full understanding that they submit themselves to a simple code of semi-military regulations necessary to the preservation of

\textsuperscript{108}Ibid., pp. 36-37.  
\textsuperscript{109}White, \textit{Autobiography}, I, p. 342.
quiet, order and health. For this purpose the buildings are placed under charge of the Commandant, who selects his officers from the students, and each of the officers is bound in honor to see that his command obey the rules.\textsuperscript{110}

Commandant of the students was Major Joseph H. Whittlesey, who organized the "Cornell Cadets" on the day following the inauguration. The logistics of that first operation have been described as follows:

He lined them up two abreast down the entire length of the long south corridor, and then went down the line, counted off a certain number of men, and said: "You are Company A." Next he picked out an intelligent-looking boy from among their number and said: "You are Captain," and to a second: "You are Lieutenant." In all he formed thus six companies. Companies A, B and C were sent off to their new quarters in Morrill Hall. The officers were given the best quarters downstairs, and the privates were in the dormitories above.\textsuperscript{111}

The officers who had been so carefully selected were responsible for preventing, checking, and suppressing all disorderly conduct occurring in the dormitory. The faculty gave the Commandant the authority to arrest students for disorderly conduct; those arrested were subject to restrictions of their privileges, but no restrictions could last longer than eight days without special faculty permission. In no case, however, could the Military Commandant place restrictions on students which interfered with their academic duties.\textsuperscript{112}

One veteran later recalled that "there were only a few sporadic cases of grumbling over the military requirements, and when the handsome, West Point gray uniforms were at last ready and donned, the boys felt so

\textsuperscript{110}The Cornell University Register, 1868-1869, p. 32. Cf. "Minutes of the Board of Trustees," October 6, 1868, as quoted by Zimmerman, p. 95.

\textsuperscript{111}Cornell Magazine, November, 1895, p. 51, as quoted by Bishop, p. 90.

\textsuperscript{112}Cornell Era, June 30, 1869, p. 5, as cited in Zimmerman, p. 96.
proud of their natty looks, their erect bearing, their shining buttons, and the admiring glances of the Ithaca girls, that the most pacifistically inclined among them would, for the moment, have marched upon a battlefield with drum-beating heart and resolute lip. However, the appeal of shiny brass buttons must have been somewhat tarnished as the college boys fell into the routine of reveille at 5:00 A.M. from April to September, 5:30 in March and October, and 6:00 in the winter. Bishop reports that after dressing, making their beds, and sweeping their rooms:

The cadets stood at attention, with broom or feather duster at Shoulder Arms, while the student officers made their inspection. The companies in Morrill and White were then marked to Cascadilla for breakfast. At 1:15 Dinner Call sounded on the chimes, at 4:15 Drill Call, at 5:15 Supper Call, at 9:30 Tattoo, and at 10:00 Taps and lights out. To go downtown, dormitory cadets had to get a pass from the Commandant.

Even White, who thought that military leveling and a common uniform would serve to break down the bulwarks of caste and was hopeful the training would counter the "rustic slouchiness" of many students, admitted after the first year that he was of two minds about the success of the system. The system prevailed with modifications, however, until student protests prompted the trustees in 1875 to allow students to substitute other subjects for military science. Passive resistance had conquered military force, but White still held in his Autobiography that "I doubt whether any feature of instruction at Cornell University
has produced more excellent results upon character than the training thus given."\textsuperscript{117}

Another test of White's theory of self-discipline and responsibility appeared when women joined the young men on the hill above Ithaca. White and Ezra Cornell had both anticipated coeducation before the university opened, but, fearing the loss of support of some of the more conservative men in the legislature, they tactfully avoided pressing the matter when drawing up the University charter. "All that I could do at that time I did," White later noted, "and this was to keep out of the charter anything which could embarrass us regarding the question in the future, steadily avoiding in every clause relating to students the word 'man,' and steadily using the word 'person.'"\textsuperscript{118}

In his inaugural address the President less cautiously announced that he was "perfectly willing to undertake the experiment as soon as it shall be possible to do so."\textsuperscript{119} One brave lass thought the time right as the University entered its second year and was admitted, but, forced to live in town for lack of provisions on the grounds for women, found the New York winter made the trek up the hill too hazardous and withdrew after a few months.\textsuperscript{120} It was her determined struggle, however, which

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{117}White, \textit{Autobiography}, I, p. 389.
\item \textsuperscript{118}Ibid., p. 389.
\item \textsuperscript{119}White, "Inaugural Address," \textit{The Inauguration of Cornell University}, p. 26.
\item \textsuperscript{120}White, \textit{Autobiography}, I, p. 399. On the development of coeducation at Cornell, see Bishop, Chap. IX; Hewett, I, Chap. XVII; Rogers, pp. 84-89; and esp. Zimmerman, pp. 107-121. The most comprehensive general study of coeducation in the United States is Thomas Woody, \textit{A History of Women's Education in the United States}, II (New York: The Science Press, 1929).
\end{itemize}
led Henry W. Sage to offer two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to be used as endowment on a separate college for women in the University. Until 1875, when Sage College of Cornell University finally opened, the few coeds in attendance continued living with families in the town, but after that date, they had the privilege of residing in the "family hotel of women students" on the University grounds if they so desired.

During the early years of Sage College, the young ladies were allowed a degree of self-government and, in general, enjoyed the freedom of hotel guests. By 1879 however, the initial freedom of activity was challenged when it was recommended that a lady superintendent be appointed. Vice-President Russel wrote to White that her duties should include the "general care and advisory superintendence of the comfort, health, and deportment of the young ladies, and the enforcement of such regulations as may from time to time be established in the interests of the University and of the ladies of Sage College." Realizing that restrictions (such as a 10:00 P.M. curfew) might cause some women to prefer living in town, the Executive Committee recommended a ten percent reduction in the price of room and board to Sage occupants.


122 Letter from William Russel to Andrew D. White, September 6, 1879, MS (Andrew D. White Papers).

123 Ibid.
But, except for regulations regarding hours, the women were still relatively free to guide their own lives pretty much to the same degree as the men students. In 1884, however, the Executive Committee announced: "Resolved, that all lady students be required to room and board at Sage College unless specially excused, for due cause, by the Committee on Sage College."\textsuperscript{124} Graduate and special as well as undergraduate women were included in this resolution. Further, it was announced that a new lady principal was to be appointed with greater powers than the former supervisor had exercised. In the circular advising women students of the new policies, White described the new principal as a "guide, counselor and friend; one who will act in the interest of all and of each, one to whom each can go for confidential counsel and advice, one whose influence cannot fail to be elevating and refining to all the inmates of the College."\textsuperscript{125} The President added that if any student did not wish to return under the altered circumstances the University would give them an honorable dismissal.\textsuperscript{126}

Thus, the Cornell coeds, like the Cornell cadets before them, found themselves restricted by in loco parentis policies. Many complained and asserted their rights, arguing that they should be as free to come and go as the men students. The natural target for their frustration was White, who, in his Autobiography, claims to have

\textsuperscript{124} Andrew D. White, "Circular Sent to All Women," 1884, as cited in Zimmerman, p. 110.

\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., pp. 112-113.

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid., p. 111.
answered them by saying that their case was not the same as that of the men.

When young women insisted on their right to come and go at all times of the day and night, as they saw fit, without permission, it was like their right to walk from the campus to the beautiful point opposite us on the lake: the right they undoubtedly had, but insurmountable obstacles were in the way; and I showed them that a firm public opinion was an invincible barrier to the liberties they claimed. 127

There is no doubt that public opinion did approve of the increased supervision Cornell was offering to its women students. Yet White, politically tactful though he was, was not one to bend to public opinion readily, especially if a valued principle were at issue. It was in the face of much public opposition that he committed Cornell to coeducation in the first place. A careful perusal of the correspondence between White and Sage has convinced Zimmerman 128 that the real force behind the changes regarding women's policies was not White but Henry Sage. Although White accepts the responsibility for the changed policies in his Autobiography, he was always an advocate of equal treatment for men and women students. Sage, however, a powerful trustee and benefactor of the University, was able to make effective use of public charges that the University was too lax to pressure White into the concessions. White's theories had made no provision for Henry Sages.

The President and the Students: A Summary

The reverses described above should not be construed as evidence that White was insincere in his pronouncements or that he failed in his

128See Zimmerman, pp. 113-121.
attempt to introduce at Cornell a progressive philosophy of student freedom. The military system of government initiated in the first few years (which applied only to dormitory students) and the increasing restrictions on women students detracted from but did not destroy his ideal of student self-discipline. By not requiring chapel attendance, by allowing freedom in selection of studies, by providing stimulating professors, an expanded curriculum and adequate materials, by encouraging off-campus living, and by emphasizing the positive contributions athletic activities and fraternities might make to the development of manly qualities, White was striving to make university life appealing and at the same time was consciously fostering an attitude of self-reliance. Cornell University, by the wishes of its founder and its president, was designed to meet the demands of a new age. White's greatest aspiration was to provide the environment which would prepare intelligent and self-reliant graduates for the challenges they would face when they left Ithaca and entered a world which rewarded "men, manly and earnest," not pampered schoolboys.

To White, one rule was "ideally" sufficient: "For any neglect of duty or any conduct unbecoming a scholar and a gentleman, they [students] will be liable to suspension, expulsion, or to a request addressed to their parents or guardian, that they be withdrawn."\(^{129}\) He advised the trustees in 1873:

The policy pursued in the relations of the faculty towards the students is to abstain from governing too much, to allow a good degree of liberty, to make the necessary rules and regulations as

\(^{129}\)Catalog of the Officers and Students of Cornell University, 1868-1869 (Ithaca, 1868), p. 20, italics added. (Andrew D. White Administra-
brief as possible, and then, simply to hold the young men to the
observance of their duties as gentlemen and scholars, and as soon
as it has been found that any young man will not live up to this
standard, to insist that he go elsewhere.130

When occasion seemed to warrant more specific interpretation of
"gentlemanly conduct," rules were added,131 but effort was made to
keep regulations to a minimum.132 White was insistent that "one of
the most important lessons to be taught young men while in college is
that they are no longer children, but that they are men; amenable
to the laws and to the rules of society..."133

In following this principle, White proved at once both intolerant
of student misbehavior and disdainful toward it. His absences and his
dislike of administrative details forced on Vice-President Russel many
of the disciplinary responsibilities undertaken in course by other
presidents. Believing that students should feel the force of civil law
rather than university regulations whenever possible, the President was
sometimes reluctant to involve himself with student antics. Moses Coit
Tyler, often a critic of the President's disciplinary policies, offers
a revealing picture of White's refusal to be bothered with student
misbehavior when on one occasion some students destroyed a bridge

130 Andrew D. White, "Annual Report to the Board of Trustees,"
June 27, 1873, p. 80, MSS (Andrew D. White Papers).

131 See Zimmerman, p. 50ff.

132 Ibid., p. 53.

133 Andrew D. White, "Report of the Discipline Committee on the
linking the campus to the town. 'Commenting on the "greatest piece of
destruction ever committed here by the students," Tyler observed:

They had completely broken to pieces the bridge near the Prentisses. We all have to cross that gorge now in the primitive fashion--going
down one bank and up the other. The ruin looks very picturesque. The Pres. told me that he was informed at what was going on; that he telephoned the police offering a reward of $25 for each person
detected; and then went to bed and to sleep. . . . Although it was
repeatedly said in the papers that mischief was intended, no prepa­
ration was made to prevent or stop it. If I had been the Pres., I
would not have done as he did. But A.D.W.'s mind is not concen­
trated on his work here.\footnote{Diary of Moses Coit Tyler, November 1, 1882, as cited by
Zimmerman, p. 64.}

Mr. Henry W. Sage forcefully informed the Executive Committee that he
too would have handled things differently,\footnote{Bishop, p. 248.} a censure which caused
White to confide in his diary that which he felt could not be said
publicly: "His view was that I--in feeble health--ought at 2 in the
morning to have thrown myself into a mob of nearly 100 men, many
disguised and all bent on mischief. His remarks were simply those of
a 'good business man,' as utterly blind to the realities of this case
as to the beauties of a sonata of Beethoven."\footnote{Odgen, ed., The Diaries of Andrew D. White, p. 230.}

When he felt the situation demanded his attention, White did not
hesitate to demonstrate his belief that "one of the main difficulties
in our colleges and universities, as well as a very serious difficulty
in our country at large, has been, and is a want of a thorough appre­
ciation of the necessity of discipline, obedience to law and submission
to order." Students who failed to act responsibly were often quickly suspended whether a specific rule covered their actions or not; a concept of gentlemanly conduct was all Andrew D. White needed to rely on. While he wanted students to govern themselves and while he encouraged the civil authorities to fulfill their responsibilities, he reserved for the faculty committee on discipline, of which he was chairman, the last word. Unconcerned with double jeopardy, White suspended for one year some students who were arrested for one incident by local authorities, the appeals of a citizen's delegation headed by the Chief of Police notwithstanding. When on another occasion he called for the suspension of five students and forty-four others protested, White reaffirmed his opposition to lawlessness: "If it becomes necessary for the purpose of maintaining good discipline, and for keeping the reputation of the University where it ought to be in this respect, to suspend or even expel members or even an entire class, the committee ought not to hesitate to recommend it, and the Faculty ought not to hesitate to take the responsibility of action upon such a recommendation."

White thus wanted order over anarchy, but he prized self-regulation over restraint. He would take action, sometimes severe, when he felt it necessary, but always he placed his greatest faith in

138Bishop, p. 131.
the judgment of students to act responsibly if accorded the status of mature individuals. By standards of a later day his estimation of student judgment might be questioned, as when he felt that students were incapable of accurately estimating the value of their professors, but in the main White was a firm supporter of student freedom as an outgrowth of student responsibility. In his speeches to the students, White did not assume the attitude of a father talking down to his children, but rather spoke to them as one concerned adult to another. White tried to create in students the feeling that they were partners in the Cornell enterprise, and as such, were responsible for the welfare of the University. Following some sharp attacks on the character of Ezra Cornell, White assembled the students and informed them:

It is your right to know the facts. I recognize fully that right, and meet you this morning not as an officer of the institution, not as a trustee, not as a professor, but, putting off all other relations, I stand among you as a man among men, having a common interest with yourselves in the institution, in its prosperity and its honor. On another occasion his appeal was similar:

Some of you may hereafter be Professors here, some Trustees, most of you as alumni will be called upon to take part directly in the election of Trustees, and therefore indirectly in university government. It is for this reason that I thus treat you as men, thus call you into counsel, thus seek to develop in you a sense of your present duties and coming responsibilities.

---

140 Andrew D. White, Annual Report of the President of Cornell University, 1884-1885 (Ithaca: Andrus and Church, 1885), p. 56.


There were problems of discipline at Cornell, as at every university, but the success of White's approach is amply documented in his annual reports and in the student press. Typical is an editorial in the Cornell Era of 1871:

The general good order which has always prevailed among our students and which has particularly characterized our University, is attributed to the fact that here students are treated as men, with all the rights and privileges. This treatment, no doubt, is very powerful in producing a high sense of honor and a noble independence of character in those upon whom it is exercised. Trust usually begets trustworthiness...

The majority of students appreciated the two-way street of responsibility and manliness, and understood well enough the requirements of "gentlemanly conduct." Looking back over a span of some fifty years, one Cornell alumnus accurately remarked that "this laudable and enlightened policy of trusting young men to exercise their own judgment and to respect their own honor, was a good deal of an innovation at that time." And that student, at least, claimed to have learned the central lesson Andrew D. White sought to instill: "It was manly character, a love of even-handed justice, and the cultivation of common sense that our Alma Mater taught us, and she planted no seeds of silly sentimentalism."

---

143 See, for example, White, Annual Report Presented to the Board of Trustees, June 18, 1884 (Ithaca: 1884), pp. 8-9. (Andrew D. White Administration: Pamphlet Collection).

144 Cornell Era, October 6, 1871, p. 37, as quoted by Zimmerman, p. 76.

145 See Appendix B, p. 274.

146 Serviss, "Class History," Class of 1872, p. 31.
CHAPTER V

DISCIPLINE THROUGH LIBERTY: CHARLES WILLIAM ELIOT OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY
(1869-1909)

Eliot, A Man Apart

One of Cornell University's historians, noting the presence of a statue of the University's first president on the grounds, quipped that "there was never a man more at ease on a pedestal than Andrew D. White." Such an observation might apply with equal justice to Charles William Eliot, president of Harvard University for forty years (1869-1909). A student of Harvard life during the "golden age" remarked: "It is hard to think of Charles William Eliot as a mere human being. He was some sort of remote superman ... who lived and acted quite beyond the scale of ordinary mortals." Committed though both men were to social democracy and educational reform, neither could shake—or desired to shake—their aristocratic demeanor. Andrew "Deity" White and Charles W. Eliot, "the Olympian," possessed indeed imposing personalities. Both were liberal reformers and rationalists, but they were first and foremost gentlemen of culture and taste.

3Bishop, p. 131.
4Brown, Chapter II.
In his autobiography, Henry Adams vividly uncovered the turmoil and anxiety felt by perhaps a great many aristocratic New Englanders who found the energized industrial world of the late nineteenth century a challenge to traditional standards of culture and of deference to one's "betters." Many, like Adams, grudgingly stepped aside as "progress" buried in its wake the refinements and polite courtesies of the old order. But a few--men like Eliot and White who, with Adams, could boast of descending from "good stock"--managed to preserve their faith in culture while leading the way toward a new society. Eliot recognized that individuals and institutions alike "in great part derive their resources, powers, and characteristics from the society to which they belong, and share the fortunes of that society." Molded by the past, tempered by the present, and sensitive to future currents of society, Eliot, like White, combined in his personality the best ideals of two worlds and sought to impose these ideals on the institution of which he was president. To Eliot there was no disharmony in advising Harvard students that they should have "the character of a gentleman who is also a democrat."

---


The democrat valued by Eliot was obviously one of Jeffersonian rather than Jacksonian persuasion. It was a point of pride to him that people could pick out Harvard men by their manners. "Manners go a long way toward morals," he advised in 1904. "An institution of learning confers a great benefit on its novices when it improves their bearing, their address, and their manners and customs." Eliot held in high esteem the essential qualities of a gentleman and, claiming that Harvard Yard was the "quietest enclosure in the country," counseled his students that "a gentleman is quiet. He does not bluster, or bustle, or hurry, or vociferate." While he insisted that the proper gentleman was generous and considerate to men of lesser talents, he unashamedly contended that a man of quality wishes to associate with superiors rather than inferiors. Eliot felt he had captured the essence of the gentlemanly ideal when he described the cultivated man as one "of quick perceptions, broad sympathies, and wide affinities; responsive, but independent; self-reliant, but deferential; loving truth and candor, but also moderation and proportion; courageous, but gentle; not finished, but perfecting." Such a man did Eliot aspire to be himself, and such was the goal which he held before Harvard students for four decades.

---

9Ibid., pp. 529-540. 
10Ibid., p. 540. 
11Ibid., pp. 540-541. 
Eliot's devotion to these high ideals and his determination to "live today and every day like a man of honor,"[13] were certainly factors contributing to his Olympian mystique. Students as well as his associates acknowledged his tenacious adherence to lofty ideals, and even his opponents granted that a sense of fairness guided his actions. But there were other factors too which caused Eliot to assume a reserved and formal manner. As a boy, Eliot was shy and made few friends. No doubt, as Henry James has pointed out, the swollen, liver-colored birth-mark that occupied most of the right side of his face down to his mouth, coupled with poor vision, were reason enough to make Eliot shun intimacy.[14] In his senior year at Harvard, Eliot wrote to his cousin, Theodore Lyman: "I am as little fitted for a social being as a civilized man can be," and described himself as "a stiff, pokerish, glum, unattractive young man."[15] A few months later he added: "I am an alkali distinguished by the property of giving many people the blues."[16]

Understandably then, Eliot found it difficult to project a warm and responsive personality. His aristocratic ideals and his inward insecurities merged to produce a man of principle and strong character, but one aloof and reserved. It may well be that such qualities account in large part for his success as an administrator and educational

---


[16] Letter from Charles W. Eliot to Theodore Lyman, July ?, 1853, as quoted ibid., p. 49.
reformer; they certainly help explain why, in spite of a few intimate and loyal friendships, he was basically "a man apart."  

After graduation in 1853, Eliot served as a mathematics tutor at Harvard from 1854 until 1858; from 1858 until 1861 he was engaged there as an assistant professor of mathematics and chemistry. While there is no evidence that students were especially excited about Eliot as a teacher, he did at least command their respect. One student in 1860 characterized him as "very fair, gentlemanly, and pleasant," and added: "Though cold as an icicle he is liked better than any other one." Conscientious execution of his parietal duties, however, caused many students to criticize him as too wooden, too strict, and sometimes meddlesome. Eliot was fully aware that the role of parental officer limited his acceptance as a teacher, but he nonetheless refused to shirk his assigned duties. Devotion to duty caused him to rather abruptly break off one letter by stating:

By Jove, there is a confounded noise up in Harrod's (?) room this moment; this Parietal business is a nuisance, disagreeable to shirk and disagreeable to do. Of the two the last evil is the least, though a certain damage to one's influence as a teacher is to be included among the bad consequences of doing this sort of work. Getting worse and worse upstairs, singing now, though it is after eleven P.M. I rather think I had better give my attention to this subject at once, so Good-bye.  

---


18 James, I, p. 68.

19 Letter from Charles W. Eliot to Theodore Tebbets, March 13, 1856, as quoted by James, I, p. 73.
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Eliot was no more successful as President of Harvard than he had been as tutor in bridging the gap separating him from the students.\(^{20}\) The atmosphere of the University was far more liberal in 1909 when Eliot retired than it had been when he assumed office in 1869, but the students generally felt no bond of friendship or gratitude. Although he was genuinely concerned with student welfare and personally extended help to students in need,\(^{21}\) his image in the students' eyes was far from that of a kindly or paternalistic president. James has observed:

> The students soon forgot how many annoying regulations Eliot had abolished, and perceived only that he was strict about the enforcement of those that remained. . . . Eliot's justice was more easily discernible than his kindness. The students saw no deeper into him now that he was President than their predecessors of the fifties when as a young tutor it had been his duty to break up noisy parties in Holworthy Hall. Nothing they heard about him, nothing they could infer from the aspect of the somberly dressed, closely buttoned-up, and very dignified figure suggested that he had ever been young.\(^{22}\)

Eliot reportedly seldom recognized or even looked at students passing him in the Yard; when they touched their hats to him out of courtesy they didn't expect a response and were apt to feel a bit foolish.

\(^{20}\)Eliot was placed in charge of the Lawrence Scientific School in 1861 and remained as "Acting Dean" of the School until Walcott Gibbs was appointed in 1863. Having lost his position to a scholar of greater reputation, Eliot saved face by traveling in Europe until 1865, at which time he accepted an appointment at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In 1869 he returned to Harvard as President. See James, I, Chapters III through VI.


\(^{22}\)James, I, pp. 311-312.
afterwards. According to James, Eliot seemed to the students "as unsympathetic as a creature of the zodiac at the head of a calendar and loomed above them as altogether the most incomprehensibly superhuman of College officials."²³ His standards were as firm as his personality was austere. When a student who was to be disciplined for a spontaneous breach of decorum informed Eliot that "there aren't five men in the College who wouldn't have done the same thing, Sir," the President replied, "You should have been one of the five."²⁴

There is perhaps a danger in placing too much emphasis on Eliot's personality and his high ideals when considering his lack of contact with the student body, however. Eliot and his contemporaries at Johns Hopkins, Cornell, Michigan and at other emerging universities were the forerunners of a new breed of educational administrators. As universities undertook increasing functions and as enrollments grew from a few hundred into the thousands,²⁵ it became impossible for the presidents to personally handle all aspects of the university enterprise. Out of necessity, powers and responsibilities were delegated to other officers, and the president steadily took on the form of the

²³Ibid., p. 313.
²⁴Ibid., p. 312.
²⁵When Eliot began his duties in 1869 the University consisted of Harvard College, together with Divinity, Law, Medical, Dental and Scientific Schools, having a total enrollment of approximately 1008 students and 60 teachers. Forty years later the University contained, in addition to the above, Graduate Schools of Arts and Sciences, Applied Science and Business Administration, and had a total enrollment of approximately 4000 students (exclusive of the Summer School) and 600 teachers.
now familiar chief executive, or, as Veblen was soon to label them, "Captains of Erudition." While some presidents sought to cushion the shifting role as much as possible, others, like Eliot and White, swam with the current and gave to subordinates many duties traditionally performed by heads of colleges and universities. Few men, however, were as well equipped as Eliot for the administrative role. Even as a teacher at Harvard he had demonstrated his keen aptitude for organizational and administrative work, so much so that President James Walker relied heavily on Eliot's wisdom and ability before undertaking many important administrative matters. Before Eliot accepted the presidential post at Harvard he was considered as a wise choice for the superintendency of Merrimack textile mills in Lowell, Massachusetts.

It was thus a combination of his ideals, personality, and his philosophy of administration that led Eliot to guide Harvard's affairs in a manner much like that of a sea-captain. Like any efficient captain, Eliot's policy was to avoid favoritism and to be prepared to say no as readily as yes. When once asked what quality was most essential to a college president, he answered: "The capacity to inflict pain."

---


27 See James, I, pp. 70-71.

28 Ibid., pp. 143-148.

29 Ibid., p. 310.
Concern for efficiency and recognition of the complex administrative tasks awaiting him prompted Eliot to announce at his inauguration that he had no intention of becoming directly involved in all the endeavors of the institution. Discussing the role he would fulfill at Harvard, he said:

An administrative officer who undertakes to do everything himself will do but little, and that little ill. The President's first duty is that of supervision. He should know what each officer's and servant's work is, and how it is done. But the days are past in which the President could be called on to decide everything from the purchase of a door-mat to the appointment of a professor. The principle of divided and subordinate responsibilities, which rules in government bureaus, in manufactories, and all great companies, which makes a modern army a possibility, must be applied in the University.30

It is therefore hardly surprising that after only one semester as President of Harvard, Eliot announced the creation of a new administrative post. Professor Ephraim W. Gurney was appointed Dean of the College Faculty and relieved Eliot of "three quarters of the work which used to be done by the President."31 A primary concern of the new Dean was the handling of student affairs. Acknowledging that the President could no longer involve himself with teaching, discipline, attendance, and sundry student matters, Eliot stated in his first Annual Report that "it is wisely provided that the Dean shall be a professor; for the duties of the office can be much better performed by one who becomes acquainted with all the students by meeting them in the classroom,


Dean Gurney's responsibilities were important, Eliot added, and noted that the Dean "has charge at this moment of more students than were found in the whole University twenty years ago. He may have a strong personal influence over many young men with whom he necessarily becomes more or less intimate."  

When in the same report Eliot presented a re-definition of the president's duties, there was significantly no mention of a direct relationship with the students:

It is the duty of the President of the University to reside in Cambridge; to call meetings of the Corporation, and to preside at the same; to act as the ordinary medium of communication between the Corporation and Overseers, and between the Corporation and the Faculties; to make a report to the Overseers, at their annual meeting, on the general condition of the University; to preside on public Academic days; to preside over the several Faculties; to superintend the official correspondence of the University; to acquaint himself with the state, interests, and wants of the whole institution; and to exercise a general superintendence over all its concerns.  

It will be amply indicated below that Eliot was by no means as unconcerned with the role of the student in the university as these policies might at first indicate. Yet, in assessing priorities, it must be asserted that Eliot interpreted his function primarily in terms of the businesslike management of the University. After a perusal of the correspondence between Eliot and Gilman, a recent scholar noted that the two made no mention of the management of student affairs or

\[32\] Ibid.  
\[33\] Ibid.  
\[34\] Ibid., p. 11.
of educational and personal guidance. Gilman, as has been shown, was greatly concerned with the guidance of students, but when discussing what they considered to be the vital issues of university administration, these two, at least, allowed matters pertaining to student concerns to recede into the background. It thus seems that in the total university Gestalt, the student could not claim primary configuration.

The editor of The Nation was not alone in recognizing that the world of higher education had drastically changed by the time Eliot announced his plans to retire in 1909. After referring to the changes that had occurred and acknowledging the pressures then faced by university presidents, the editor offered his interpretation of the effect the revolution had had on the student.

In President Eliot's case, these multifarious burdens, including much attention to civic affairs, have been borne at the expense, we are almost tempted to say, of the students themselves. By this we mean no censure. It is a fact, however, that to the undergraduates he has often been a stranger, or at most a great name. Close relations with the students have been humanly impossible; all one could ask was the necessary intercourse with the leaders of the teaching staff of 566 persons. So when one of the undergraduates was asked by a reporter the opinion of the students as to the president's retirement, he naively answered that "few of us know him, but all regret the change." True, Mr. Eliot has for some years past met each newly entering class with one of his admirable addresses of counsel and inspiration. But beyond that the influence of his lofty personality has penetrated to the undergraduates hardly more than to the general public throughout the country.

---


To that journalist, at least, the pathos was heightened by his conviction that "the moulding of character is, after all, the primary duty of a university."\(^{37}\)

Eliot's many writings and speeches on the importance of culture, refinement, and gentlemanly ideals would certainly indicate that he valued character as highly as anyone. But in reforming Harvard University, Eliot undertook to provide for character training and discipline in a fashion unlike the traditional collegiate pattern. Character, he would readily grant, is the product of discipline, but he saw the only effective discipline as self-imposed. To Eliot, education at all levels must be so administered as to keep this maxim clearly in view. One of the most hopeful and humane educational reforms of the present generation, he wrote in the 1890's, is the recognition by all teachers worthy of the name that "self-control is the ultimate moral object of training in youth—a self-control independent of temporary artificial restraints, exclusions, or pressures, as also the physical presence of a dominating person."\(^{38}\)

However, before one can fully appreciate Eliot's views pertaining to student freedom, the status of the undergraduate at Harvard, and the way in which he felt the University should assist young men in the development of character and self-discipline, it is first necessary

---

\(^{37}\) Ibid.

to consider briefly his ideals as an educational reformer. Although he may have felt no need to correspond with Gilman about student affairs, the ideals which he set in motion at Harvard sharply challenged prevailing notions as to the role of the undergraduate student in the university enterprise. As one biographer of Eliot contends, his presidency "marked a new era and not merely a new administration." 39

The Old Order vs. the Ideal of Liberty

Of all the difficulties which faced Gilman and White as university presidents, they were at least spared the frustration of trying to reform a staid and respected institution. Eliot's election to the Harvard presidency had not been without opposition; his recent articles on "The New Education" in the Atlantic Monthly 40 had caused considerable anxiety among the more traditionally minded in the Harvard Corporation. Eliot tried to make clear in his inaugural address that his advocacy of the "new education" did not entail a threat to the traditional studies. In his opening sentence Eliot bluntly declared: "The endless controversies whether language, philosophy, mathematics, or science supplies the best mental training, whether general education should be chiefly literary or chiefly scientific, have no practical lesson for us today." 41 Eliot determined that the advocates of science over

---


metaphysics or classics over mathematics were to get no hearing at Harvard University. "We would have them all, and at their best," he proclaimed. To develop the ability to reason soundly, to observe keenly, to imagine vividly, and to express oneself forcibly are all desirable outcomes of education; "to develop one of these faculties," Eliot reasoned, "it is not necessary to repress and dwarf the others."\(^{42}\)

Hoping to drive his point home, Eliot continued by saying:

> It were a bitter mockery to suggest that any subject whatever should be taught less than it now is in American colleges. The only conceivable aim of a college government in our day is to broaden, deepen, and invigorate American teaching in all branches of learning. It will be generations before the best of American institutions of education will get enough growth to bear pruning. The descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers are still very thankful for the parched corn of learning.\(^{43}\)

Although disciples of the old order may have found some comfort in Eliot's opening paragraphs, the address taken as a whole was clearly a manifesto challenging the status quo. Methodically, Harvard's new President laid down a set of principles and proposed a series of changes which during the course of his administration re-routed not only the direction of Harvard, but which, in combination with the similar views and actions of a few contemporaries, gradually altered the course of American higher education as well.

Eliot was under no illusions as to the difficulty of the task facing him. Friends of Harvard might well take pride in her long and noble heritage, but to one intent on change, such an inheritance might

\(^{42}\)Ibid.

\(^{43}\)Ibid., pp. 1-2.
be more of a curse than a blessing. It was this realization that prompted Eliot to remark in his inaugural address: "A good past is positively dangerous, if it makes us content with the present, and so unprepared for the future."  

Even as a young assistant professor, Eliot had learned that "the headquarters of Conservatism are in the Colleges and other institutions of teaching."  

"The Faculty," he informed a college chum, "is a ruminating animal; chewing a cud a long time, slowly bringing it into a digestible condition; then comes the process of assimilation which is gradual and invisible, so that by-standers do not perceive the growth and expansion of the animal."  

Not only were faculties reluctant to act swiftly, Eliot learned, but the more conservative members had little appreciation for "reformers." He wrote his friend:

Now-a-days "reformer" has become an opprobrious epithet, a satirical appellation; there is one worse name sometimes applied to a particularly narrow-minded, selfish, hypocritical, mean man,—his enemies call him "a professed philanthropist."  

As the "Eliot reforms" and the "new education" made headway at Harvard, some of Eliot's critics probably managed to find even stronger words to describe the University's captain. Wide circulation was given to the remark by one man that he had rather send his son to Hell than to Harvard. Eliot, however, believing that "the bold experiment
often succeeds where a timid one would have failed,"\footnote{19} endured criticism and gained praise as well as censure as the champion of the new education. Classic as an example of the conservatism facing Eliot and of his determined efforts to evoke change is an incident related by Oliver Wendell Holmes. "How is it?" a member of the medical faculty asked Eliot, "that this Faculty has gone on for eighty years, managing its own affairs and doing it well, . . . and now within three or four months it is proposed to change all our modes of carrying on the school--it seems very extraordinary, and I should like to know how it happens." Unruffled, Eliot reportedly answered: "I can answer Dr. ______'s question very easily: there is a new President."\footnote{50}

The force of the new President's personality and his stern determination thus made it possible for him to initiate change in spite of opposition. More central to our immediate concern, however, is the fact that basic to Eliot's educational reforms and at the core of his social philosophy was a commitment to individual freedom. Influenced by Herbert Spencer and Ralph Waldo Emerson,\footnote{51} Eliot believed that "it is choice which makes the dignity of human nature."\footnote{52} Emerson, who was present at the inauguration ceremonies on October 19, 1869,


\footnote{51}See James, I, Chapter X.

\footnote{52}Charles W. Eliot, "The Freedom to Choose," an address to new students at Harvard Union, October 1, 1906, in Neilson, II, pp. 546-547.
must have at least inwardly smiled as Harvard's young President inserted the plank of freedom in the University's new platform:

A university must be indigenous; it must be rich; but, above all, it must be free. The winnowing breeze of freedom must blow through all its chambers. It takes a hurricane to blow wheat away. An atmosphere of intellectual freedom is the native air of literature and science. This University aspires to serve the nation by training men to intellectual honesty and independence of mind. The Corporation demands of all its teachers that they be grave, reverent, and high-minded; but it leaves them, like their pupils, free.  

Eliot recognized that freedom, especially student freedom, was inherently dangerous. Even so, as late as 1906 he was still firm in his commitment and advised entering freshmen in that year that though freedom does entail risks, it is nonetheless "necessary to the growth of human character, and that is what we are all in the world for, and that is what you and your like are in college for." Indeed, Eliot continued, "that is what the world was made for, for the occupation of men who in freedom through trial win character." True to Emersonian principles, Eliot felt that "the will is the prime motive mover" and that one's will can only be cultivated in an atmosphere of freedom. "Fine human character is the object in view, and freedom is the indispensable condition of its development."

Eliot can thus hardly be accused of depreciating the importance of sound character. Addressing the National Education Association in

---


55 Ibid., p. 547.
1903 he contended that "the moral sense of the modern world makes character a more important element than it used to be in the ideal of a cultivated man."\(^{56}\) But here again he insisted that freedom is a necessary condition for character formation. Quoting Goethe, Eliot claimed that character is formed "'in the stream of the world'--not in the stillness or isolation, but in the quick-flowing tides of the busy world, the world of nature and the world of mankind."\(^{57}\)

A letter from Eliot to LeBaron Russell Briggs, who at the time (1901) was serving as Dean of Harvard College, further reveals his objection to the notion that the shielded life is the pure one. Making reference to Barrett Wendell's recently published *A Literary History of America*,\(^{58}\) Eliot admitted concern:

He [Wendell] implies that moral purity--national or individual--is the accompaniment, or the result, of an experience undesirably limited. He seems to think that the larger and richer the life of nation or individual is, the less chance of its being pure. This doctrine seems to me the reverse of the truth, if any proper sense be attributed to such words as large, deep, rich, and complex. If he be right, will not the courageous youth or nation say--give me the large, rich, various life; I prefer Voltaire to Dr. Holmes.\(^{59}\)

Arguing as he did that discipline and strong character are the products of freedom to exercise one's will did not lead Eliot to conclude that college or university faculties should excuse themselves

---

\(^{56}\)Charles W. Eliot, "The New Definition of the Cultivated Man," an address before the National Education Association, Boston, July 6, 1903, in Neilson, I, p. 194.

\(^{57}\)Ibid.


from all concerns in this aspect of education. Eliot held that "an American Faculty almost always feel a strong sense of responsibility for the conduct of their students, and give much thought to the effects of their teachings and rules and of the common academic life on the character of the student."60 Granting that not every professor feels this responsibility, he pointed out that in general "a sense of duty towards the students in respect to the formation of character may be said to be characteristic of all the American Faculties; and in this respect they all differ widely from similar bodies in Europe."61

Although impressed with the variety of studies offered in continental universities and favorably disposed to the freedom accorded students, he had no wish to see Harvard or any other American university modeled exactly after the European system. In 1864 he had written to his mother:

A German University would suit the 150 young men who enter Freshman [at Harvard] every year, about as well as a barn-yard would suit a whale . . . . The system is utterly inapplicable with us, for the reason that we could only copy its looseness without being able to imitate its restrictions.62

The restrictions referred of course to the fear of failing examinations which automatically blocked German students from entering the professions. "An American College can have no such whip as this to hold


61 Ibid.

62 Letter from Charles W. Eliot to his Mother, October 30, 1864, in James, I, pp. 136-137.
over its students," he informed his mother, for in this country colleges
had no power to control entrance into the professions.63

Eliot thus saw European professors as concerned only with im-
parting instruction and possibly inspiring their students in scholarly
pursuits. Such professors, he advised, wish to command the respect,
rouse the ambition, and open the minds of their students, but they
seldom feel much responsibility for the conduct of university
students.64

In like manner did Eliot reject the British collegiate system
as a model suitable to American conditions. He described such a system
as outmoded by saying:

The old English universities inherited some monastic habits and a
purpose to control the conduct of their students by physical means,
such as requiring their habitual presence in chapel and dining hall
at fixed hours, and the regular occupation of their chambers at
night behind bars and gates; and to this day college buildings at
Oxford and Cambridge are constructed with reference to these sur-
vivals of an antiquated discipline.65

It is thus understandable that Eliot advised caution when a benefactor
offered to endow at Harvard a quadrangle "whereby a group of students
are lodged together in chambers around a pleasant, open court, and are
provided with a chapel, dining hall, common rooms, and perhaps a li-
brary of their own, and there live in close contact with a warden, or

63Ibid.
master, and a group of older students called fellows.\textsuperscript{66} Although Eliot raised financial considerations, he was unquestionably concerned too that such a system might resemble too closely the "archiac English means and methods of exercising a physical control" over students.\textsuperscript{67}

Rejecting both the English system of physical control and the European laissez-faire policy toward students, Eliot was seeking to develop a distinctly American justification for student freedom. As he formulated his theory in numerous speeches and articles, he unhesitatingly attacked the validity of artificial restraints and controls. In 1892 he wrote:

Throughout all education, both public and private, both in the school and in the family, there has been too much reliance on the principle of authority, too little on the progressive and persistent appeal to reason. By commands, or by the authoritative imposition of opinions, it is possible for a time to protect a child, or a generation, or a nation of childish men, from some dangers and errors; but the habit of obedience to authority and of the passive reception of imposed opinions is almost inconsistent with an effective development of reasoning power and of independence of thought.\textsuperscript{68}

He later defined "the moral end of education in family, school and life" not as obedience but rather self-control.\textsuperscript{69}

Even though the American Association of University Professors committee on academic freedom felt no need to defend "student academic freedom" in 1914, Eliot in 1907 saw student freedom as an integral part

\textsuperscript{66}Eliot, "Report of the President," \textit{Annual Reports, 1906-07}, pp. 53-94.


\textsuperscript{69}Eliot, "Bringing Up a Boy," in \textit{A Late Harvest}, p. 76.
of American academic freedom. It was in his Phi Beta Kappa address at Cornell University that Eliot most concisely and confidently revealed his view of the "status" and "rights" due every student.

After discussing the freedoms professors should rightfully expect, Eliot turned to student freedom and said:

The student ought to find himself free to determine the method of his daily life with no more restrictions than the habits and customs of civilized society necessarily impose. His problem will be to regulate his own life wisely by self-control in liberty. Up to his entrance to college his mode of life has probably been regulated for him by home rules, or school rules; and he has been almost constantly under the observation of parents or teachers, or both. Now, at college, he should be free. He will probably make some mistakes, at first, about eating and drinking, sleeping, taking exercise, arranging his hours for work and for play, and using his time; but his mistakes will not be fatal or beyond remedy, and he will form habits based on his own observation and experience and his own volitions. These are the habits that prove trustworthy in adult life. As in the outer world, so in the comparatively sheltered college world, freedom is dangerous for the infirm of purpose and destructive for the vicious; but it is the only atmosphere in which the well-disposed and resolute can develop their strength.70

Eliot would also grant the student the right, and hold him solely responsible for, the selection of his associates. He stated:

Under any college regime, whether liberal or authoritative, a very valuable though dangerous part of the student's freedom is his freedom to choose his comrades, or habitual associates. That choice will show in every individual case whether the young man possesses moral principle and firmness of character or not. If the choice is good, he will be safe in liberty; if the choice is bad, he will be unsafe under any regime.71

In several respects, academic freedom as Eliot defined it required restraint on the part of certain elements in the academic

71 Ibid.
community in order to secure the rights of other segments. The president, for example, might freely advise or remonstrate with a professor who might seem to be using poor judgment, "but he should never attempt to impose his judgment or his will on a teacher."72 Similarly, professors "should enjoy perfect liberty within the limits of courtesy and of a decent respect for the opinions of mankind."73 And again: ". . . academic freedom for teachers is properly subject to certain limitations which may be best described as those of courtesy and honor. They resemble the limitations which the manners of a gentleman or a lady impose on personal freedom in social intercourse."74 With respect to student freedom, Eliot advised further that "the college student may reasonably expect to find himself free from attempts to impose opinions on him."75 This aspect of student freedom Eliot had elaborated on in his inaugural when he contended:

Philosophical subjects should never be taught with authority. They are not established sciences; they are full of disputed matters, open questions, and bottomless speculations. It is not the function of the teacher to settle philosophical and political controversies for the pupil, or even to recommend to him any one set of opinions as better than another. Exposition, not imposition, of opinions is the professor's part. The student should be made acquainted with all sides of these controversies, with the salient points of each system; he should be shown what is still in force of institutions or philosophies mainly outgrown, and what is new in those now in vogue. The very word 'education' is a standing protest against dogmatic teaching. The notion that education consists in the authoritative inculcation of what the teacher deems true may be logical and

72Ibid., p. 5.
73Ibid., p. 2.
74Ibid., p. 6.
75Ibid., p. 8.
appropriate in a convent, or a seminary for priests, but it is intolerable in universities and public schools, from primary to professional. The worthy fruit of academic culture is an open mind, trained to careful thinking, instructed in the methods of philosophic investigation, acquainted in a general way with the accumulated thought of past generations, and penetrated with humility. It is thus that the university in our day serves Christ and the church.  

Important though these freedoms were, to Eliot "the first element in a just academic freedom" was the student's freedom to choose his own studies and teachers. "Interest in a subject is an indication of fitness for its study," Eliot believed; "a student is much more likely to succeed in a subject which interests him strongly than in a subject which does not." A more detailed discussion of Eliot's principles and practices regarding the elective system will follow, but it is important to introduce here the idea that his libertarian and utilitarian ideals were inseparable. Eliot's forty years as President of Harvard were marked by repeated attacks on outworn aims of education as well as outworn methods of character formation. The elective principle was not only a cornerstone of student freedom, but was a necessary condition if every student were to obtain at Harvard the type of education most suited to his aims and needs. With White of Cornell (who actually initiated an elective program before Eliot), the Harvard President could contend that students are not to be made, but are to make themselves. "We are no longer content in either school or college,"

---

78 Ibid., p. 8.
Eliot wrote, "with imparting a variety of useful and ornamental information, or with cultivating aesthetic taste, or critical faculty in literature or art."\(^7^9\) While such outcomes were admirable, they were to Eliot insufficient justification of collegiate work. The end of education can no longer be merely the storing up of information, Eliot argued, but must now teach the student, by involving him more directly in the learning process, the procedures of acquiring new knowledge.

The main object of education, nowadays, is to give the pupil the power of doing himself an endless variety of things which, uneducated, he could not do. An education which does not produce in the pupil the power of applying theory, or putting acquisitions into practice, and of personally using for productive ends his disciplined faculties, is an education which has missed its main end.\(^8^0\)

Perhaps Eliot touched the vital nerve sensitizing his philosophy when, while offering a "new definition of the cultivated man" in 1903, he said:

"... Our conception of the cultivated man has been greatly enlarged, and on the whole exalted, by observation of the experiences of mankind during the last hundred years. ... Let us remember that the moral elements of the new education are individual choice of studies and career among a great, new variety of studies and careers, early responsibility accompanying this freedom of choice, love of truth, now that truth may be directly sought through rational inquiry, and an omnipresent sense of social obligation."\(^8^1\)


\(^8^0\) Ibid.

\(^8^1\) Eliot, "The New Definition of the Cultivated Man," Neilson, I, p. 204.
The Liberation of Harvard Students

Probably no reform is more closely associated in people's minds with the Eliot years than the elective system. To be sure, few innovations captured more of Eliot's attention during the first two decades of his administration. Eliot did not claim to have invented the system and readily referred to others at Harvard and elsewhere who had tried with varying degrees of success to liberalize the traditional course of study.\(^{82}\) Still, it was Eliot who pushed untiringly for elective reform at Harvard, and it was Eliot who, deservedly or not, was looked upon by proponents and critics of the system alike as being its most stalwart champion. Barrett Wendell, often at odds with Eliot, wrote a poem upon the latter's retirement which sarcastically but appropriately expressed a common view:

```
Election
He held, almost with Calvin, was the one
Way to salvation, and he dared expect
Boys to be God-like, and like him to elect.\(^{83}\)
```

Critics of Eliot have tended to overlook the fact that curricular reform and the expansion of the elective system at Harvard were introduced with caution. Eliot began defending the elective system with his inaugural address, but at first did not advocate giving Harvard undergraduates anything like complete freedom to select their studies.

---

\(^{82}\) See, for example, his sketch of the evolution of the system at Harvard from the 1820's through 1884 in Annual Reports, 1883-84, pp. 6-24.

All required studies were removed from the senior year by 1872; in 1879 all junior studies were elective, and by 1884 sophomores were given elective privileges and freshmen were required only to study rhetoric, English composition, and German or French for one year, plus a few lectures on chemistry and physics. \(^{84}\) Year by year Eliot carefully studied the statistics compiled by the Dean as to which courses were elected most frequently, the grades received by students, the ease or difficulty of assignments in elective course, and the logic behind patterns of courses selected by students. Eliot, and apparently the majority of the Harvard faculty as well, found that the fears of opponents of the elective system were not justified. \(^{85}\) In 1885 Eliot reported that students did not automatically select easy courses or tend to overspecialize as undergraduates. The majority of students,


\(^{85}\) President James McCosh of Princeton was typical of college leaders who failed to comprehend the dynamics of the elective system at Harvard. In a debate with Eliot before members of the Nineteenth Century Club in February, 1885, McCosh declared: "I am not antiquated, and although I am an old man I am not old-fashioned. My aim all through my professional life has been to elevate learning, and I hope to see every new branch of true learning introduced into our colleges, but I cannot indorse the course which Harvard has pursued. I believe that men should have freedom in choosing their studies. But the freedom has limits. Men are free to choose their colleges, and the departments which they will follow in these colleges, whether law or medicine or theology. But there liberty should cease, and it should be understood that certain branches must be studied. To hold the contrary leads at once to a reductio ad absurdum. What if a medical student should neglect physiology and anatomy and materia medica, for music and the drama and painting? ..." See Charles W. Eliot and James McCosh, "The American University," The Critic, VI (February 28, 1885), p. 104. Eliot's speech, "Liberty in Education," is in his Educational Reform, pp. 125-148.
he maintained, generally showed an intelligent plan in their choices, and a reasonable degree of persistency. In response to his critics, he insisted that the elective system "does not mean liberty to do nothing" and that it is not the abandonment of system:

It allows every student to choose what the subjects of his study shall be; but the amount of his work is prescribed, and its quality tested by means of periodical examination, essays, laboratory work, and personal intercourse between teacher and student. Not only does a minimum of attainment remain prescribed under the elective system; but competitive inducements to strenuous study, such as rank-lists, scholarships, grades of distinction in the Bachelor's degree, and "honors," "highest honors," and "honorable mention at graduation" are made use of, perhaps to an extreme degree. It is emphatically a method in education, which has a moral as well as an intellectual end, and is consistent with a just authority while it grants a just liberty.

Eliot also defended the elective system on purely practical grounds:

Since no student can take in four years more than a tenth part of the instruction offered him, the College must either give each student his choice of studies, or find some satisfactory way of assigning to each student in their proper order the studies most suitable for him. Inasmuch as any conceivable method of assigning studies to an individual would take account of his tastes and capacities, and endeavor to enlist his will, the question between these alternatives is one of degree, feasibility, and expediency.

The elective system as it evolved under Eliot's guidance at Harvard differed from the programs at Johns Hopkins and Cornell. Gilman placed great faith in the adviser system and group studies; White to a lesser degree emphasized advising of students but, like

Gilman, saw the grouping of subjects as a necessary restraint in an elective program. Not until 1888 did Eliot recommend the use of advisers, and even then the policy was limited to freshmen. Noting that thirteen faculty members had consented to advise about twenty-five freshmen each, he stated:

It was expected that if a profitable and pleasant relation were established during the Freshman year between the adviser and the advised, the relation would be maintained during the later College years; but the primary function of the adviser was to give counsel and encouragement to the newcomer, bewildered perhaps by the sudden freedom of College life, the multiplicity of fresh interests, and the complexity of his first problem—the wise selection of his studies.\(^9\)

Eliot refused, however, to compromise with the group system. In 1885 he contended that inasmuch as no two people were alike the group system was unwise:

It is unnatural; for minds differ infinitely, and do not fall into six or eight strongly marked categories; it is unnecessary; for all desirable concentration and continuity of work can be secured without doing such violence to liberty of choice.\(^91\)

He reasoned further that the group system committed students too early in their college careers to set programs from which they would find it difficult to escape if later they changed their minds. "This early committal may be a matter of necessity in a professional or technical school," he suggested, "but there is no need of it in a college of liberal arts."\(^92\) Eliot objected also to the fact that students must

---

\(^9\) Eliot, "Report of the President," Annual Reports, 1888-89, pp. 9-10. In his "Report" two years later Eliot noted that the ratio had been reduced slightly by the addition of five more professors to the advisory staff. See Annual Reports, 1890-91, p. 14.


\(^92\) Ibid.
modify their needs and desires if forced to follow a predetermined

group of studies. Eliot warned that:

Groups are like ready-made clothing, cut in regular sizes; they
never fit any concrete individual. Either the needs of the ad-
vised must be somewhat disregarded, that he may be forced into a
group, or a group must be patched to make it cover fairly well
the individual case. . . . To impose upon a youth for two or
more years a wrong group of studies, from which he cannot extri-
cate himself, is a much more serious matter than to allow him to
choose amiss one or two studies which he can easily replace.93

The argument that the group system can be made flexible he countered
by claiming that "a group system which was flexible enough to avoid
inflicting serious harm upon individuals would be more complicated
than a system of free choice under the natural limitations, but would
yield nearly the same results."94

Another of his arguments against the grouping of elective studies
deserves special note. "The group system," Eliot contended, "impairs
a precious privilege which every teacher enjoys under a system of free
election--the privilege of having no student in his class who has not
freely chosen to be there."95 Although Eliot frequently insisted that
"the primary object of the elective system is to enable the serious
student to select his studies in accordance with his tastes and
capacities,"96 he was nonetheless convinced that professors would

93Ibid. Cf. his objections to a prescribed system of studies in
Charles W. Eliot, "What Is a Liberal Education?" an address at Johns
Hopkins University on February 22, 1884, in Neilson, I, p. 65 or in
Educational Reform, p. 117.

94Ibid., p. 47.

95Ibid., p. 46.

96Eliot, University Administration, p. 134.
take their responsibilities as teachers much more seriously and would increase their scholarly knowledge if they were greeted in class by willing, not captive, students. Eliot's insistence that teachers and students alike should be free at Harvard was an essential step toward an ulterior goal. As James has pointed out, Eliot "intended that Harvard should become a great seat of learning, to which mature scholars should resort as they did to the best Continental universities."

Undue restrictions on either teachers or students could exist only at the expense of this goal. Eliot had planted the seed of this idea in his inaugural:

> The elective system fosters scholarship, because it gives free play to natural preferences and inborn aptitudes, makes possible enthusiasm for a chosen work, relieves the professor and the ardent disciple of the presence of a body of students who are compelled to an unwelcome task, and enlarges instruction by substituting many and various lessons given to small, lively classes, for a few lessons many times repeated to different sections of a numerous class.

Whether interpreted in light of the above or not, it is undeniable that Eliot's approach to the elective system markedly increased student freedom. At the same time—and Eliot would have had it no other way—it increased their self-discipline. The elective system "throws the responsibility of selecting his fields of work on the student himself," Eliot wrote in 1908. "Experience has shown that young Americans of the college age possess as a rule the intelligence and character to win mental and moral profit from this responsibility."

---

97 James, I, p. 260.
99 Eliot, University Administration, p. 143.
To allow freedom of choice which would contribute to self-direction and self-control was to Eliot an important object of the elective system.

Determined to encourage manliness and self-discipline by holding students responsible for their actions, Eliot also undertook to reform disciplinary procedures at Harvard. In his inaugural he announced: "The Statutes of the University need some amendment and reduction in the chapters on crimes and misdemeanors." Although he himself had been a most conscientious parietal officer in former years, Eliot used the weight of his new office to strike against the petty rules deeply imbedded in the collegiate way:

The petty discipline of colleges attracts altogether too much attention from both friends and foes. It is to be remembered that the rules concerning decorum, however necessary to maintain the high standard of manners and conduct which characterizes this College, are nevertheless justly described as petty. What is technically called a quiet term cannot be accepted as the acme of university success. This success is not to be measured by the frequency or rarity of college punishments. The criteria of success or failure in a high place of learning are not the boyish escapades of an insignificant minority, not the exceptional cases of ruinous vice. Each year must be judged by the added opportunities of instruction, by the prevailing enthusiasm in learning, and by the gathered wealth of culture and manliness. The manners of a community cannot be improved by main force any more than its morals.

When in 1874 the Johns Hopkins University trustees asked Eliot for advice regarding student control and discipline, he explained the approach being followed at Harvard at that time:

We do not undertake to exercise any parental function except this: if we find a young man is doing nothing, not studying, does not pass his examination, we tell him and his father, after sufficient

100 Eliot, "Inaugural Address," in Neilson, I, p. 18.
101 Ibid., pp. 17-18.
warning, "you must go away, we cannot have you here..." But with regard to their going in and out, going to bed, going to the theatre or studying at certain hours, we exercise no supervision whatever. We believe in freedom. They come to us at the average age of eighteen or nineteen years, some older, some younger, at a time when young men had better be thrown on their own responsibility... It is impossible with the ideas of freedom which exist in England and this country, to enforce upon young men of 19 to 25 rigid rules of conduct.102

As with the elective system, Eliot announced his intention to change antiquated disciplinary procedures as soon as he took office, but, even though he boldly informed the Hopkins trustees that Harvard students were "free" as early as 1874, the reformation of formal policy was effected only gradually. When Eliot took the oath of office in 1869, it was still customary to give entering students a copy of The Statutes and Laws of Harvard College--the "College Bible"--which in 208 articles organized into sixteen chapters defined the regulations binding on the officers and students.103 Eliot immediately set himself to the task of obtaining a revised and simplified code, but it was not until 1877 that a new set of statutes in seventeen articles, occupying less than five pages of the college catalog, was adopted.104 Prior to the approval of the 1877 code, however, disciplinary reforms had been temperately initiated with encouraging results, as when in Eliot's first year it was decided to completely separate records of scholarship


104. Ibid. See Annual Reports, 1876-77, p. 131.
In the academic year 1892-93 the rules were again revised concurrently with the reorganization of the University. Interesting by way of contrast with the procedures of some other universities of the period is the fact that the 1892-93 regulations "legalized" student petitions. The new code stated:

1. Every request from a College student to the Faculty or to the Administrative Board should be made in writing, and should be addressed to the Dean of Harvard College, 5 University Hall. A petition may be formal or informal, but must be clear. It must contain the writer's name, the name of the class in which he is registered, and his address.

Eliot amplified his respect for student rights when in his book University Administration he suggested that students should in effect be granted Fifth Amendment privileges. Eliot advised:

No faculty, or official, should ever try to make a student, who is merely suspected of having taken part in an offense, incriminate himself. Students should never be required to testify against other students. When the guilty cannot be detected, there should be no wholesale punishment which involves the innocent. A student's statement about his own conduct should be accepted, unless it be inconsistent with known facts. No publicity should be given to students' offenses or defects, and the record of actual censures and punishments should be made as little condemnatory as truth permits. No information about disorders should be ever be sought from any particular set of students, such as high scholars, recipients of money aids, church members, members of religious societies, students employed by the college, or students who in some natural and right way have become intimate with college officers. All college officials should bear constantly in mind the plain fact that most college offenders, even those who commit ordinary crimes, such as cheating and stealing, if considerately and mercifully

---


dealt with, and if not ruined in body, recover themselves completely, and turn out to be honest men and good citizens. Since the influence of a college faculty is primarily a moral influence, it is indispensable that all its methods and rules in regard to violations of good order and right conduct should be straightforward, reasonable, and fair.\textsuperscript{107}

It would be unrealistic to assume that in the actual operation of the University, Eliot and his associates invariably adhered to these principles. The several deans who served under Eliot from 1869 through 1909 were denied the pleasure of reporting in any year that the University had been free from disorder or that all students who had swerved from the path of right conduct had been reformed. Suspensions, withdrawal of privileges, probations, and expulsions occurred with regularity if only on a small scale. So concerned did the administration and faculty become over an increase in "ghost writing" in the 1890's that a rule was passed providing that any student found guilty of handing in written work not his own would be expelled and his name posted on the College bulletin boards.\textsuperscript{108} But, when the first student so charged was found guilty, the administrative committee on discipline had second thoughts about the ruling, revised it, and made the following announcement:

The name of the offending student and a statement of the offense are to be sent to every member of the Faculty; and announcement of the offense and of the penalty (without the offender's name) is to be made in the class in which the offense is committed. Any offense which, in the interest of the student public, should be made

\textsuperscript{107}Eliot, University Administration, pp. 115-116.

known may be made known by the Faculty at the request of the Dean of the College. 109

The faculty thus refrained from invoking public embarrassment in this case, but, as the Dean frankly admitted, "this kind of dishonesty has baffled the authorities." While only a few students actually violated the trust placed in them, the majority were reluctant to censure the guilty ones. "That every one of eighteen hundred men shall be honest is too much to expect," Dean Briggs admitted, "but that any considerable part of public opinion should wink at this form of falsehood is scandalous." 110 Perhaps the Dean drove to the heart of the matter when he observed:

The curse of College morals is a double standard,--a shifting, for the convenience of the moment, from the character of a responsible man to the character of an irresponsible boy. ... They jealously demand to be treated as men, take advantage of the instructors who treat them so, and excuse themselves on the ground that, after all, they are only boys. 111

President Eliot no doubt shared his Dean's concerns, but still his view was to grant as much liberty as feasible, even though some few would prove too immature to survive in a liberal environment. Harvard University existed not for the weak but for the strong in character. Unnecessary rules and artificial restraints would, he felt, only prolong irresponsibility. Motivation should be intrinsic rather than extrinsic, positive rather than negative. When in 1889 his liberal

111 Ibid., p. 102.
principles were being attacked by vociferous alumni, he informed one critic: "When they [students] come to College their life should more closely resemble the professional life or business life they are soon to lead, and their leading motives should resemble motives of adults, rather than those of school boys."112

While many would grant Eliot's premise as it might regard graduate students, he was often criticized for not employing tighter restraints on undergraduates. To Eliot, the few years separating undergraduates from graduates did not appreciably affect their status, and so instructed one antagonist:

You have doubtless read many essays which attempted to define the difference between college work proper and university work proper. To my thinking there is no difference at all, except the natural difference in the student's age and stage of advancement, but I recognize that many American parents and teachers think there ought to be a great difference in the discipline provided for a youth of eighteen to twenty-one, and that provided for a man of twenty-one to twenty-five. At Harvard there is a little difference in the disciplines to which these two sets of young men are subjected, but it is not a deep or essential difference. I think that a young man's character is, as a matter of fact, usually formed by the time he is eighteen years old, and that he will probably never be fit for freedom unless he is then fit. I observe, however, that many Americans of good quality have a low opinion of the American boy's capacity and character at eighteen. Such people would like to have a West Point system applied to all youth from eighteen to twenty-two. My view is that such a discipline is only suited to prepare young men for the very peculiar military life, which has in it only an absolute minimum of freedom."113

112Letter from Charles W. Eliot to Edwin H. Abbot, February 8, 1889, as quoted by James, II, p. 49.

113Letter from Charles W. Eliot to Dr. Henry S. Pritchett, July 13, 1907, as quoted by James, II, pp. 149-150. Pritchett, a former president of M. I. T., was in 1907 President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
Eliot relied on this same libertarian logic to effect yet another reform paralleling the elective system and the progressive disciplinary policies. In 1874 the faculty voted "to relieve the Senior class for the year 1874-75 from the operation of all regulations which imposed marks of censure for absences from College exercises other than examinations and morning prayers." As with the elective system, voluntary attendance was launched with the seniors on an experimental basis with careful records kept year after year as to its effects on the morale and scholarship of the students. Eliot suggested in 1875 that "it will probably turn out that a condition of liberty, which is thoroughly advantageous to judicious and well-disposed students, has no more effect than compulsory attendance to induce weak, foolish, or vicious students to redeem their time." The remarks and statistics of the deans for the ensuing five or six years amply supported Eliot's contention. At the end of the first year in which voluntary attendance for seniors was in operation, Dean E. W. Gurney reported that the best students took the fewest cuts even though over-all "the average number of absences from recitations was between two and three times as great as it would have been under the system of enforced attendance." He added, however, that "the influence of the change upon the average scholarship of the class was imperceptible either for good or evil."

---


Although the freedom was abused by many of the less mature seniors, Gurney advocated its continuance and gradual extension to lower classes. Clearly reflecting Eliot's sentiments, the Dean advised:

By the introduction of the elective system, the College broke with the tradition that the "average" student should determine what all others should be taught; I trust that it has also broken with the other tradition that the average student, or the student below the average, shall determine how all other students shall be treated.  

After four years of study, the faculty recommended at the close of the academic year 1877-78 that the system of voluntary attendance apply to juniors; by 1880 all classes were accorded the privilege. Thus the principle of voluntary attendance was extended throughout the whole University as another step in keeping with the general tendency of the Eliot administration to secure individual freedom with individual responsibility.

Eliot expected and found that voluntary attendance, like the elective system and liberal disciplinary policy, occasioned abuse and criticism. He himself admitted that judiciousness must accompany reform. In 1877 he reported:

It presents the old problem, never definitely and intelligibly solved either for individuals, for nation, or for the race,—in what proportions shall liberty be mixed with restraint in a training intended to develop a self-reliant and well-disciplined character. As it is the principal function of a University to train leaders,—men who have originating power, who reach forward, and in all fields of activity push beyond the beaten paths of habit, tradition, and custom,—it is evident that a large measure of liberty is essential for its students; how much, is the problem upon which Harvard College has been steadily at work for at least one generation.  


There were many toward the end of the 1880's who felt that Harvard had gone too far with its reforms. Public and especially alumni opposition to the liberalizing trends at Harvard stirred the faculty to strengthen some of its requirements. Delinquent students were more quickly put on probation and professors were urged to exercise more care in checking and reporting attendance. The policy of voluntary attendance continued, but students who clearly abused their freedom were pressured to reform or retire from the University. The Board of Overseers proposed in 1888 that the students be required to stand a morning roll-call, but the faculty's assurance of increased vigilence managed to still this move. More frequent tests and the reporting of mid-term grades to the dean were policies put into operation to impress upon students the wisdom of exercising their better judgment regarding class attendance. It was during this rather reactionary period that the adviser system for freshmen was inaugurated. Such moves were indeed challenges to Eliot's principles, and, to some, clear indication of their failure. The elective system, voluntary attendance, and absence of petty rules were faits accomplis at Harvard, but they were not beyond re-evaluation.

Voluntary chapel attendance, a practice which began in 1886, was yet another source of irritation to those who saw Harvard falling from its state of grace. When one examines the history of this development, however, Eliot emerges not so much an advocate of change as a rather cautious spokesman for the status quo. In a letter to Gilman in 1886,
Eliot conceded that the "prayer question" was "the first important change here in seventeen years which I have not promoted."  

Eliot's religious views were not appreciably different from those of Gilman and White. A Unitarian, he was definitely an opponent of sectarianism. Writing on "The Religious Ideal in Education" in The Outlook in 1911, he talked about religion in the broadest possible sense and defined the religious ideal in education as the combination of three values: truth, beauty, and goodness. These values, he suggested, could be taught by precept and example, but the teaching of special religious views was solely the responsibility of the church. Moreover, Eliot was not only insistent that Harvard be free from sectarian control, but he was a steady defender of the nondenominational Divinity School of the University. In one of his annual reports he argued that young men should study theology as they do "metaphysics, political economy, or zoology, without having committed themselves in advance to any theory, creed, or set of opinions on controversial points." Eliot's view was that the same academic freedom for teacher and pupil allowed in other departments of study should exist as well in theological schools.

---


It seems thus a bit odd that as progressive as Eliot was in other areas of university and social reform and as liberal as his religious views were, on the question of voluntary chapel attendance he appeared overly cautious. A small step toward the reforming of worship practices was made during his first year in office, but in comparison with the bold moves of White or even Gilman, this first reform pales into insignificance. Until 1869, Harvard students had been required to attend church on Sunday, whether they spent the day in Cambridge or elsewhere. This requirement was liberalized during Eliot's first year to the degree that the University absolved itself from exercising any control over "those undergraduates who are permitted to pass Sundays with their families, or with families designated by their parents or guardians." The new articles stated further that "undergraduates who do not pass Sundays with their families are required to attend public worship once on Sunday, instead of twice as formerly." In announcing these measures, Eliot tactfully noted that "the Governing Boards have simply accommodated the Statutes to the changed opinions and habits of the community at large." \(^{122}\)

Besides attending Sunday services at a church of their parents' preference (or the students', if they were over twenty-one), undergraduates were required to be present daily at morning prayers in Appleton Chapel. During the year 1872-73, this requirement was

\[^{122}\text{Eliot, "Report of the President," Annual Reports, 1869-70, p. 10. Note the revised statutes on pp. 60-61.}\]
temporarily suspended when the chapel was being repaired. Eliot's comments about this "involuntary experiment" are worth noting:

During the execution of the alterations in the Chapel, no suitable place could be found in which to hold the daily service of morning prayers, and this exercise was therefore omitted from September 26 to February 23. On February 24 the exercise was resumed. The Faculty thus tried, quite involuntarily, an interesting experiment in college discipline. It has been a common opinion that morning prayers were not only right and helpful in themselves, but also necessary to college discipline, partly as a morning roll-call and partly as a means of enforcing continuous residence. It was therefore interesting to observe that the omission of morning prayers for nearly five months, at the time of year when the days are shortest and coldest, had no ill effects whatever on college order or discipline. There was no increased irregularity of attendance at morning exercises, no unusual number of absences, and, in fact, no visible effect upon the other exercises of the College or upon the order and quiet of the place. 123

In spite of this public declaration that compulsory chapel had no direct relation to discipline, Eliot refused to support the faculty when on four occasions between 1873 and 1886 that body recommended to the Governing Boards that attendance be made voluntary. The unexpected opposition of Ralph Waldo Emerson, 124 a member of the Board of Overseers, may have influenced Eliot's feelings. Less speculative perhaps is James' contention that "Eliot was apparently influenced partly by his own fondness for the morning service and partly by a fear of giving one more occasion to the critics of Harvard to accuse her of being revolutionary and fanatical in the promotion of so-called freedom." 125

124 See Morison, p. 366.
125 James, I, p. 361.
In 1881 Eliot attempted to gauge public opinion on this issue and sent to the parents or guardians of the 826 undergraduates a questionnaire asking if they held daily family prayers in their households. Of the 741 replies received, 211 or two-sevenths answered affirmatively while 530, or five-sevenths, replied in the negative. Eliot reported that nine persons who held prayers at home advised that they be voluntary at Harvard, while thirty-six of those who had given up the practice at home recommended that at Harvard attendance be compulsory. Eliot published the findings in his "Report" in 1880-81, but did not recommend that any changes be made.

Thus, although it could not compel the worship, the College continued to require the presence of undergraduates at daily prayers and Sunday services in keeping with a two and a half century old tradition. Continued faculty pressure and student petitions which declared that compulsory attendance at worship was "a remnant of ancient encroachments on civil liberty" resulted in the appointment by the Overseers of a fact-finding committee in 1885. The committee, not unexpectedly, reported that student claims of tyranny were unsupportable and advised that "Harvard can ill afford the loss of reputation which would ensue in its being the first of all literary institutions in


127 See Francis G. Peabody's essay on "Voluntary Worship" in Morison, pp. li-lviii.
New England to abandon religious observances.\textsuperscript{128} The Overseers, with Eliot siding with the majority, voted twenty to four to continue the policy of compulsory chapel.

Circumstances more than commitment brought an end to compulsory attendance at worship services the following year, however. Andrew P. Peabody, who held the Plummer Professorship in theology and served as University Preacher as well, had resigned from his duties in 1881. After several years of interim ministers holding services, his cousin, Francis G. Peabody, was persuaded to fill the vacancy, but, feeling that compulsory attendance at worship was "repugnant" and "unjust," he recommended that the old scheme be discontinued. Describing his plan as an advance rather than a retreat, Francis Peabody agreed to hold the Plummer Professorship on the condition that additional ministers be appointed as coadjutors, thus forming a department of religion. Accordingly, five men representing four denominations were appointed as University Preachers for terms of one year, the appointments to be renewable indefinitely. To this board of six ministers the conduct of the Chapel services and the pastoral care of the students were committed, and upon their recommendation the Corporation and Overseers consented at long last to abandon the policy of required attendance at worship services.\textsuperscript{129}


Clement L. Smith, Dean during this period, recognized what Eliot previously had been unable to see when he stated that "compulsory attendance [had] lost its chief object, and its evils were aggravated by contrast with the other departments of college life in which the student had learned to do his duty without compulsion." But, whatever his initial reservations may have been, Eliot himself soon appeared as a defender of the voluntary system. In 1887 he could report:

The experience of the year indicates that all these services can be usefully and honorably maintained on the method of voluntary attendance. Religious interest among the students has undoubtedly increased with the abandonment of prescribed attendance, and the serious-minded students now have the wholesome feeling that they are themselves partly responsible for maintaining and enlarging religious influences at the University. There are, of course, students who never enter Appleton Chapel, or expose themselves in any way to the Preachers' influence; but in this respect the College closely resembles the larger community without.

Even more positive was his attitude a decade later when he stated:

Looking back through this period of ten years to the condition of the University Chapel before 1886, one cannot be too thankful that the University has escaped from the many evils of required attendance at religious services, and has won the positive benefits which the voluntary system, administered on the principles which have obtained here, has procured and demonstrated.

There was thus nothing contradictory in his assertion in 1907 that the student "has a right to be free from all inducements to cant, hypocrisy, or conformity. On this account, voluntary attendance at all religious exercises is a valuable element in academic freedom."

---

At least passing notice must be given to Eliot's views on commons, dormitories, fraternities, and athletics, for to some of his era these devices were seen as positive goods or evils with respect to the development of character. All existed and in general flourished during Eliot's administration, and in uncovering his views regarding their place and worth in the University environment, it is seen that he considered their moral as well as administrative ramifications.

The matter of providing board for students at Harvard had been a troublesome one since the founding of the College. Complaints about the food, disorder, and unsound fiscal policies led the College to abandon the business of providing meals for students altogether from 1849 to 1865. During that period, students were thus forced to shift for themselves at the boarding houses in Cambridge. This arrangement soon proved unsatisfactory, for the price of board steadily increased, causing the poorer students to "board themselves" as best they could in their own rooms. In an effort to provide for at least the poorer students meals at a reasonable price, the Thayer Club was organized in 1865-66. The Club was originally intended to serve from a hundred to a hundred and fifty students, but by the time Eliot assumed the Presidency, close to three hundred students were crowding the facility. It was in the face of this situation that Eliot recommended that Memorial Hall be fitted as a commons in 1872-73. The organization of the

---

Foxcroft Club in 1889 and the erection of Randall Hall in 1899 were extensions of the same policy.\(^{135}\)

In setting forth arguments in favor of enlarging the University's responsibility in this particular, Eliot pointed out that the Memorial Hall Commons could serve students of all financial conditions, not just the poor. Thus, the stigma of pauperism would not be attached to those students boarding on campus. He noted also that the new hall would promote good manners and fellowship which could be fostered neither in the "crowded, hot, vulgar rooms" in the Thayer Club nor in private boarding houses. As a final point, Eliot took up the moral cause:

Thirdly, the moral effect of living in that superb Hall could not but be good. It is by far the grandest Hall in the world, and there are very few rooms for secular purposes in existence which can be compared with it. Built to keep alive precious examples of brave devotion to the country, truth, and duty, it is a place to be proud of and to become attached to, a place around which in successive generations pleasant associations and inspiring memories will gather, a place to exert upon the opening mind of youth a wholesome though unnoticed influence.\(^{136}\)

There was yet another aspect of this enterprise which enlisted Eliot's support. Although the University would appoint a professional steward, the actual running of the dining hall association was to be a student responsibility. Eliot explained that "the association elects annually a President, a Vice-President, and two directors from each School of the University and each College class; and these officers regulate


the diet in the Hall, preserve order, and exercise a general control over the expenditures of the association. \(^{137}\) Furthermore, the whole cost of carrying on the Hall, including the retirement of the principal and interest, was assessed by the officers of the association upon the members. The students had the right, which they exercised, of demanding the dismissal of the steward upon a two-thirds vote. \(^{138}\) Thus, not only could such associations provide wholesome meals at reasonable prices and encourage the development of manners and fellowship, but self-responsibility could be engendered at the same time.

Eliot justified the erection of new dormitories at Harvard on much the same grounds. He explained to the Johns Hopkins trustees that dormitories had been forced on Harvard by exorbitant prices in private boarding houses and by the fact that neither male nor female householders could maintain effective control over students. \(^{139}\) In *University Administration*, Eliot claimed that "halls of chambers and large dining-halls increase not only the enjoyments of student-life, but also its ethical and democratic influences." \(^{140}\) With respect to disciplinary problems associated with dormitory living, Eliot stated:

It used to be thought among the governors of some of the newer American universities that students' halls of chambers were natural centres of disorder and turbulence, and therefore were undesirable possessions; but this view has been generally abandoned, partly

---


\(^{138}\) Ibid.


\(^{140}\) Eliot, *University Administration*, p. 21.
because some colleges with dormitories have proved to be habitually quieter and more orderly than some colleges without dormitories, and partly because experience has shown that well-managed dormitories make college life more enjoyable and more profitable.\textsuperscript{141}

The practice of having some college officials reside in dormitories apparently continued throughout the Eliot administration, but as the regulations were gradually liberalized, their duties as parietal officers became increasingly generalized. Eliot did not advocate dormitories on the grounds that such quarters would make easier the task of controlling students. Undergraduates as well as advanced students at Harvard were free to live on or off campus as they desired. Dormitories, like the commons, existed merely as a service to those students who voluntarily took advantage of their presence. Although Eliot did on occasion note the democratic influences of communal living and dining, his primary concern was student convenience. In 1906 he noted with no regret that residents of Cambridge were increasing their efforts to provide for Harvard students and stated:

Forty years ago there was but one private hall; now there are twenty. Private houses have held their business very well. More than a third of all the students in Cambridge are still occupying rooms in such houses. An experience of 270 years with dormitories has demonstrated that they are not good property for the College, it having proved impossible to earn on them so good an income as the mass of the general investments of the University yields. The President and Fellows have not built a dormitory with their own money since 1870-71, and are not likely to ever build another, unless with money given for that express purpose.\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{141}Ibid., p. 218.

\textsuperscript{142}Eliot, "Report of the President," Annual Reports, 1905-06, pp. 50-51.
Eliot's views of fraternities and clubs closely paralleled White's. He recognized that students naturally form groups of various sorts and felt that if properly handled, student organizations could serve the administration to support good order, to root out evil practices, "and to control and reform young men who have shown dangerous tendencies."\(^3\) Eliot's kinship with White is clearly revealed as he reasoned:

Public misconduct on the part of any of its members is held to discredit a fraternity or club; so that the officers and past members of any respectable fraternity or club will labor diligently with erring members, and at the insistence of college officers will take a great deal of trouble to protect a weak brother against himself, and to prevent him from injuring the reputation of the society to which he belongs. Fraternity or club companions can often exert more influence and a more constant influence on young men who are going wrong than any college officers can exert directly. It is essential to this good influence that it be private and unofficial so far as the college is concerned.\(^4\)

The Presidents of Cornell and Harvard also shared similar views regarding athletics, but between the two, White seemed to lay heavier stress upon the moral value of sport. That athletics properly conducted could contribute to moral as well as physical health Eliot recognized, as when he stated in 1881 that throughout the University it was generally agreed that:

The increased attention given to physical exercise and athletic sports within the past twenty-five years has been, on the whole, of great advantage to the University; that the average physique of the mass of students has been sensibly improved, the discipline of the College has been made easier and more effective, the work of

\(^3\)Eliot, University Administration, pp. 224-225.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 225.
many zealous students been done with greater safety, and the ideal student been transformed from a stooping, weak, and sickly youth into one well-formed, robust, and healthy.\textsuperscript{145}

Eliot agreed too that "the perseverance, resolution and self-denial necessary to success in athletic sports turn out to be qualities valuable in business and other active occupations of after life.\textsuperscript{146}

Eliot pushed for a gymnasium and for athletic fields and encouraged all Harvard students to take part voluntarily in games and athletic events. In 1874 he made a rather strong case for the advantages of voluntary physical training:

Compulsory physical exercises would not be in harmony with the general spirit and method of the University, and are, indeed, hardly suitable for young men over eighteen years of age. They should form a part of the programme of every school for boys; and should be insisted upon just as regularly as Latin and mathematics from the time a boy is ten years old until he is sixteen or seventeen. Most American schools entirely neglect this very important part of their proper function. Many young men, therefore, come to the University without skill of out-of-door games, and unable to ride, row, swim, or shoot. It is important that the University should give opportunity for a variety of physical exercises, because this student prefers one form and that another, and an exercise which is enjoyed will be ten times as useful as one which is repulsive. There is one excellent form of exercise for which there is now no opportunity at Cambridge,—military drill, with rifle shooting. A voluntary organization for this purpose would be a useful addition to the means of physical training which the University already possesses.\textsuperscript{147}

The majority of students at Harvard and elsewhere hardly needed much encouragement to participate in athletics, however. As the popularity of sports grew in the late nineteenth century, especially baseball

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{145} Eliot, "Report of the President," \textit{Annual Reports}, 1881-82, p. 19.
  \item \textsuperscript{146} \textit{Ibid.}
  \item \textsuperscript{147} Eliot, "Report of the President," \textit{Annual Reports}, 1873-74, pp. 24-25.
\end{itemize}
and football, the concern of many administrators, Eliot included, was turned to the excesses of athletic contests. Beginning in the 1870's and continuing throughout his term of office, Eliot increasingly found himself devoting space in his annual reports to the abuses seeping into college athletics. As early as 1874 he warned against the trend toward professionalism:

While the Corporation have given the best possible evidence of their desire to foster these manly sports, they have felt compelled to discourage by every means in their power the association of students with the class of persons who make their living practicing or exhibiting these games; to dissuade students from making athletic sports the main business, instead of one of the incidental pleasures, of their college lives; and to prohibit altogether the taking of money for admission to witness the sports upon the College play­grounds.148

In 1881 Eliot caused a faculty committee on athletic sports to be formed at Harvard, but failed in his attempt to persuade surrounding New England colleges to unite with Harvard to prohibit games with professional clubs. Eliot again warned: "When games are made a business, they lose a large part of their charm; and college sports cannot approach the professional standard of excellence without claiming the almost exclusive attention of the players, and becoming too severe, monotonous, and exacting to be thoroughly enjoyable."149

After prohibiting Harvard's participation in intercollegiate football games in 1885 and continuing his pressure on administrators at other colleges, Eliot by 1888 had brought into existence a league of several New England colleges designed to reform the rules regulating

148 Ibid., p. 23.

sports, especially football. Eliot feared, however, that little was to be accomplished by the association. In his 1888-89 report he lamented that the league was worse than useless for purposes of reform, and was the source of incessant misunderstandings, quarrels, and recriminations between the colleges represented. Whereas colleges used to be antagonistic to each other because of theological differences, they now argued over athletic contests—"disputes in which wild charges of ungentlemanly and unsportsman-like behavior are bandied to and fro by the students on either side, and appeal is made to official certificates and sworn statements, all the discreditable proceedings being spread out, often in exaggerated and distorted forms, in the public press."  

Even so, by 1900 Eliot was able to announce that the conference on intercollegiate athletics had finally published a report in which rules substantially the same as Harvard's were being recommended for adoption by all universities and colleges. 

The battle was far from over at Harvard or the cooperating colleges and universities, but at least Eliot had awakened an interest in athletic reform.

Eliot's main criticism was directed against football. Above all others, he felt, this sport as it was then being played was the least suitable for school and college students. An almost aristocratic disdain comes through in one of his triades against the sport:

The game sets up a wrong kind of hero—the man who uses his strength brutally, with a reckless disregard both of the injuries he may suffer and of the injuries he may inflict on others. That is not the
best kind of courage or the best kind of hero. The courage which educated people ought to admire is not that reckless, unmotivated courage, but the courage that risks life or limb to help or save others, or that risks popular condemnation in speaking the truth, or in espousing the cause of the weak or the maligned.¹⁵²

The fact that participation in this sport risked injury was not his main objection, for he held "that dyspepsia is less tolerable than a stiffened knee or thumb, and that effeminacy and luxury are even worse evils than brutality."¹⁵³ Unnecessary roughness and unsportsmanlike conduct were rather the targets of his wrath. Although he wrote of the huge expenditures that athletic teams demanded,¹⁵⁴ objected to the fact that only a few could actually play when excellence was too highly prized, criticized the diversion from studies occasioned by participation in and observation of football, and regretted the injuries which with better regulation could be prevented, his fundamental concern in the final analysis was a moral one. "Foot-ball," he wrote in 1893, "cultivates strength and skill kept in play by all the combative instincts, whereas the strength most serviceable to civilized society is the strength which is associated with gentleness and courtesy."¹⁵⁵

Some years later he wrote:

But if a college or university is primarily a place for training men for honorable, generous and efficient service to the community at

¹⁵⁴ See, for example, Eliot's "Report of the President," Annual Reports, 1905-06, p. 45.
large, there ought not to be more than one opinion on the question whether a game, played under the actual conditions of football, and with the barbarious ethics of warfare, can be a useful element in the training of young men for such high service.\footnote{156}

In striking out against tactics condemned even today by the most staunch supporters of football, such as "off-side play, holding and disabling opponents by kneeling and kicking, and by heavy blows on the head, and particularly about the eyes, nose, and jaw,"\footnote{157} Eliot was unquestionably doing a service to the sport. Enraged as he was by these abuses, it is perhaps understandable that he condemned as well the use of the curve ball in baseball.

To Eliot, then, athletics could have a positive value if played under proper conditions and in the proper spirit. To the degree that this could be accomplished, to that degree did he favor their existence at Harvard University. In the final analysis, Eliot held that university authorities should exercise a concern for the character development of their students, and if this entailed regulation of athletic sports, then the authorities must accept their responsibility. Eliot plainly stated his view of the proper role of athletics when he wrote:

The athletics ought to cultivate moral as well as physical courage, fair-dealing and the sense of honor. If any form of unfaithfulness, unfairness, or meanness is tolerated in them, they become sources of wide-spread moral corruption. If students do not find their sense of honor cultivated and refined by their College life, they may be sure that their education is failing at its most vital point.\footnote{158}

\footnote{157}{Eliot, "The Evils of College Football," in Neilson, I, p. 117.}
\footnote{158}{Eliot, "Report of the President," Annual Reports, 1883-84, p. 32.}
Summary: Discipline Through Liberty

As the chief spokesman for university reform in the last third of the nineteenth and opening decade of the twentieth century, Charles W. Eliot has rightly loomed large in American educational history. Although his reserved personality and great concern for administrative procedures worked against his developing close rapport with Harvard students, he was largely responsible for establishing at Harvard a climate of student academic freedom. Eliot was the main force behind the elective system, voluntary class attendance, and disciplinary reform. After initial reservations regarding voluntary chapel attendance were overcome, he became a strong defender of this reform as well. He felt that the University should provide facilities for room and board for students desirous of such, but did not favor forcing students to use these conveniences. Eliot recognized the worth of fraternities and athletics, but did not believe that practices injurious to physical and moral health should be allowed to continue without preventive steps being taken by the University authorities.

Although Eliot and his deans encouraged student initiative and included students on several University committees, student government did not appear at Harvard until after Eliot's retirement. A student council was organized in 1908, but its advisory functions hardly entitled it to be considered as a governing body. As Eliot tried to make clear repeatedly, every student at Harvard was expected to conduct himself as a gentleman at all times, but no official "honor

\[159\] See Morison, p. xxxviii.
system" existed during his administration. When some "idealists and malcontents," as Dean Briggs called them, pushed for an honor system in 1895-96, a canvass of the students revealed that such a system was "more dreaded than desired." Briggs, who failed to share Eliot's faith in individual freedom, reasoned that "proctors, . . . besides insuring stillness [in exams], are a common-sense safe-guard, like auditors of bank accounts or police in the streets, and (to an honest citizen) are equally inoffensive." In retrospect, it is easy to suggest that these "omissions" plus the introduction of the adviser system and attempts to strengthen the enforcement of scholastic requirements in the late 1880's undermined Eliot's libertarian principles, but perhaps the sounder view is that Eliot's administration, while ahead of the times in many respects, was nonetheless conditioned by its environment and of necessity proceeded with caution.

Eliot attempted to blur artificial distinctions between undergraduate and graduate work and codes of conduct. Qualified undergraduates were encouraged to elect courses designed primarily for graduate students, and with only a few exceptions, they enjoyed as much personal liberty as graduate and professional students. Eliot endeavored to create at Harvard an atmosphere of a societas magistorum et discipulorum in much the same manner as Gilman of Johns Hopkins.

---

161 Ibid.
A certain degree of success in this direction was attested to by Justice Holmes:

It has been one merit of Harvard College that it has never quite sunk to believing that its only function was to carry a body of specialists through the first stage of their preparation. About these halls there has always been an aroma of high feeling, not to be found or lost in science or Greek—not to be fixed, yet all-pervading.162

There were of course, professors like George Santayana who claimed that "the main concern of our typical young professor is not his pupils at all. It is science." Santayana explained that "generally speaking, he wishes to be a scholar, and is a teacher only by accident, only because scholars are as yet supported only by institutions whose primary object is the education of youth."163 Men whose primary concern was "the disinterested pursuit of knowledge" were balanced by teachers who still managed to find the classroom stimulating and important, and by deans who gradually began replacing the president as the guardians of student character. Deans like L. B. R. Briggs refused to admit that the College could concern itself with learning only and turn its back on "the character of students except in cases of public scandal."164 As to the balance of importance between the graduate and undergraduate divisions, Briggs made his position clear:

The College guides youth to manhood; the Graduate School guides manhood to scholarship. Yet the very fact that the Graduate School

---

is free to think first of learning and the College bound to think first of character gives the College a larger and a higher responsi-
bility. The College has, and must ever have, the wider range of human sympathy. It cannot take a lower place than the Graduate School till the development of a scholar becomes nobler and more abiding than the education of a man.165

Basic to Eliot's philosophy and his administration was the conviction that Harvard should refine and polish men of cultivation and character, and that the most effective and defensible way of accomplishing this aim was to create an atmosphere of freedom and to encourage self-responsibility. Discipline, to Eliot, was a consequence of liberty. Compulsion and artificial restraints were not only seen by him as damaging, but as unnecessary in the proper college environment. Eliot held that the students' protection "must be within them,"166 and argued that "the pretended parental or sham monastic regime of the common American college seems . . . to bring out the childishness rather than the manliness of the average student."167 Rejecting the in loco parentis theory as "an ancient fiction which ought no longer to deceive anybody," Eliot insisted that "it is a distinct advantage of the genuine university method that it does not claim to maintain any paternal or monastic discipline over its students, but frankly tells them that they must govern themselves."168 He informed the Johns Hopkins trustees that "I do believe in one sort of control--the indirect control which

167 Ibid., p. 129.
168 Ibid., pp. 147-148.
comes from good teaching, from good example, from the inculcation of
good manners, from the encouragement of athletic sports and from
keeping young men at work,--steadily at work."169 Impressing upon
students the seriousness of the academic endeavor and obtaining for
them the conditions of freedom, Eliot was striving to give life to the
faith he displayed in his inaugural:

In spite of the familiar picture of the moral dangers which environ
the student, there is no place so safe as a good college during the
critical passage from boyhood to manhood. Its public opinion,
though easily led astray, is still high in the main. Its scholarly
tastes and habits, its eager friendships and quick hatreds, its
keen debates, its frank discussions of character and of deep
political and religious questions, all are safeguards against
sloth, vulgarity, and depravity. Its society, and, not less, its
solitudes are full of teaching. Shams, conceit, and fictitious
distinctions get no mercy.170

169 Eliot to JHU Trustees, as quoted by Hawkins, "Three Univer-

170 Eliot, "Inaugural Address," in Neilson, I, p. 16.
CHAPTER VI

A PATERNAL PROGRESSIVE: JAMES BURRILL ANGELL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
(1871-1909)

The Tappan Legacy

James Burrill Angell is deserving of his place among the select company of university presidents who in combination forged a new conception of American higher education in the late nineteenth century. Angell presided over the University of Michigan's fortunes almost concurrently with Eliot's administration of Harvard, from 1871 through 1909. The greatness of Angell, like that of Eliot, is in part due to the longevity of his tenure in office; much can be, and much was, accomplished over a period of thirty-eight years. In less than two decades at Cornell, White was able to make his mark on higher education, while at Johns Hopkins, Gilman accomplished his work in twenty-five years. But Gilman and White were builders, able to design and construct their universities without first removing obsolete traditions. Founded in 1837, the University of Michigan had traditions,

1The University's founding can be traced to the act establishing the "Catholepistemiad, or University, of Michigan" of August 26, 1817. The 1837 date marks the beginning of the University in Ann Arbor under the governance of a Board of Regents. On Michigan's early history see Frank E. Robbins, ed., Records of the University of Michigan, 1817-1837 (Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1935; Burke A. Hinsdale, History of the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1906); Elizabeth M. Farrand, History of the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor: Register Publishing House, 1885); and Andrew Ten Brock, American State Universities: Their Origin and Progress (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke and Co., 1875).
even though much less firmly rooted than those with which Eliot had to
wrestle at Harvard.

The parallel suggested by the fact that Angell, like Eliot, had to take into account past customs and expectations cannot be
carried very far, however. In Eliot's case, the old was largely a
hindrance to the new. With Angell, however, many of the ideals and
to some degree the realities of the University of Michigan dating
from the administration of Henry Philip Tappan (1852-1863) were pro-
gressive measures already planted and awaiting cultivation and harvest-
ing. When Angell left his post as president of the University of
Vermont to become the fourth president of the University of Michigan,
he had no set program of reform in mind.² His work and no small degree
of his fame at Michigan were determined by his successful advancement
of many ideals earlier envisioned by the University's first president,
Dr. Tappan. That such was the case in no serious was detracts from
Angell's accomplishments, for his personality and diplomacy, his
sympathy with many of Tappan's ideals,³ and his administrative

²Angell carefully appraised himself of the "Michigan way" and en-
deavored to fit into rather than significantly alter the system. See
James B. Angell, The Reminiscences of James Burrill Angell (New York:
"The Administration of James Burrill Angell," in Wilfred B. Shaw, ed.,
The University of Michigan: An Encyclopedic Survey, I (Ann Arbor: Uni-
versity of Michigan, 1941), p. 63.

³A graduate of Brown University in 1849, Angell was also influ-
enced by the reform notions of Francis Wayland, President of Brown. Al-
though not in harmony on all particulars, Tappan and Wayland stand as
two significant critics of the traditional collegiate system before the
men under consideration here initiated reforms at their respective uni-
versities. See Francis Wayland, Thoughts on the Present Collegiate Sys-
tem in the United States (Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 1842)
and Wayland, Report to the Corporation of Brown University on Changes in
the System of Collegiate Education (Providence: G. H. Whitney, 1850).
ability—as well as a position later in history—enabled him to put
into practice that which Tappan could only theorize. But one wonders
what the history of the University would have been, and indeed, what
the effect would have been on the subsequent history of American higher
education in general, had Tappan been allowed a longer term of office.

It would divert us from our main concern to review here the
aspirations and accomplishments of President Tappan, but some general
comments as to his educational philosophy are essential in order to
appreciate properly Angell's contributions to university education.²
Tappan saw the ideal university as a community of scholars, a collec-
tion of masters and students joined in the search for truth. While he
recognized the value of vocational and professional training, he held
the primary function of the university to be the cultivation of
originality and genius, the unfolding of one's capacities. It was
essential to Tappan that the "ideal" university be unhampered by
gymnasial or "preparatory" work. Collegial instruction and concerns
should have no place, Tappan theorized, for, as in the Prussian system,
young men entering the university should be prepared for self-initiated
study. While students in preparatory institutions might reasonably
expect to be restrained and guided, those admitted to the university—
the "executive" level of education—should be free from all controls
save their responsibility to God, conscience, and truth. At the core of
Tappan's philosophy was a deep faith in reason and in the unlimited
perfectibility of man.

²For convenience, a fuller sketch of Tappan's fundamental ideas
and administrative actions, with reference to sources, is attached as
Appendix C, p. 276.
It was Tappan's intention to bring the University of Michigan, and thereby the entire educational system of the state, into closer harmony with his philosophical ideal. But, neither his ideals nor his aristocratic personality were appreciated by many in a state not far removed from frontier conditions. Nonetheless, Tappan was able to imbed in the University structure many of his ideals which under later presidents, especially Angell, were to be more completely realized. And, in spite of many failures and frustrations, Tappan himself effected several significant changes during his twelve years as president.

Tappan felt, as did Angell later, that education properly conceived included spiritual and moral as well as intellectual development. He took an active interest in campus religious activities, but at the same time strongly favored the nonsectarian nature of the University. Requirements pertaining to compulsory chapel were altered only slightly during his administration, but he did put an end to the practice of balancing faculty appointments among the leading denominations of the state. Being an ordained minister, Tappan was definitely concerned with the moral integrity of his professors and encouraged them to exert a religious influence over the students; but, in considering men for faculty positions, the President asserted that the primary qualification should be their scholarly competence.

In his efforts to allocate scarce resources to the greatest advantage and to create a scholarly environment at Michigan, Tappan caused the dormitories already in existence to be converted into academic buildings and thereby turned the University into a
nonresidential institution. Michigan thus moved a step closer to Tappan's ideal university as the institution accentuated its scholarly functions and depreciated its collegial responsibilities.

In several other notable ways Tappan set the University on a course leading to higher academic excellence. The traditional curriculum was challenged as new courses and additional degree programs were introduced; the Medical School was strengthened and the Law School began operating in 1859. A "university course" which gradually evolved into the Graduate School was initiated in 1853-54. Paralleling these progressive measures were improvements in the library and museum collections, the erection of an astronomical observatory, and the strengthening of the faculty both qualitatively and quantitatively. Thus, although Tappan left office in 1863 with only an embryo of a university in operation, the beginnings he made largely charted the future directions of the University.

An Interlude

Two administrations separated the Tappan and Angell years. Erastus O. Haven succeeded Tappan as president, and, while not as powerful or liberal as Tappan, he proved to be a satisfactory administrator. Haven's main concerns were with restoring peace in a university community divided over the abrupt firing of Tappan and in caring for immediate affairs rather than the problems of future development. During his term of office (1863-1869), the curriculum was further expanded and, following years of agitation, the decision to admit women to the privileges of the University was finally
made. When Haven resigned in 1869 to become President of Northwestern University, Henry Simmons Frieze, Professor of Latin at Michigan since 1854, accepted the presidency on a pro tempore basis. Seeing his position as only temporary, Frieze was a cautious but sincere administrator. He was able to secure much needed funds for the erection and improvements of University buildings and was effective in his attempts to raise scholastic standards. Perhaps the most significant innovation to emerge from the Frieze years was the initiation of the policy of admitting to the University, without entrance examinations, graduates of those Michigan high schools which met standards determined by the University. Frieze felt, as had Tappan, that the University should be at the apex of a continuous educational process supported by the state. The plan of admitting by certificate or diploma graduates from high schools approved by the University examiners was to him an important step in the development of an integrated system of state education. Frieze was in agreement with Tappan too in his view that this procedure might serve to raise requirements in secondary schools, thereby relieving the University of the more elementary instruction which it was then forced to give. Thus, by strengthening the secondary level of education, yet another

---

step toward making more distinct the difference between the preparatory and executive levels of education was initiated.  

When James Burrill Angell began his career as president of the University of Michigan, his task was thus largely one of expanding reforms already in progress. In spite of its troubles, the University Angell inherited in 1871 was already one of the most progressive and largest in the country. Andrew D. White wrote to Angell in 1869: "The man who goes there [Michigan] now will find the important battles fought. His main work will be to perfect the institution, to gradually raise its scholarship which is already good, to interest the state more and more to make it tell on the state." To a large degree, the Angell years reflected White's charge. With practical idealism and diplomacy, Angell sought to improve academic standards and to harmonize the advanced ideals of the University with the slower progress of the Commonwealth. His son, himself to become a university president, said of his father's aim:

He saw at once that his commanding duty, as well as his dramatic opportunity, was not to be found solely in the wise and effective administration of the University, which he conscientiously sought and achieved, but quite as much in the development within the commonwealth of Michigan, and through her in the entire Mississippi

---


7 Letter from Andrew D. White to James B. Angell, September 13, 1869, MS (James B. Angell Papers, Michigan Historical Collections, Rackham Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan).

8 Shaw, p. 65.
Valley and the West beyond, of an ineradicable resolution to foster and protect the invaluable blessings of sound education, and especially in the creation among the people of an imperative demand for universities of the highest quality.  

Recognizing this aim as compatible with the plans already laid, Angell was successful in lessening the residue of distrust and suspicion which had clouded the University since the Tappan era. Under his guidance, Michigan emerged as the leading western state university in the late nineteenth century.

The Emergence of the University under Angell

In his inaugural address, Angell took note of the impulsive forces then at work in the world of higher education. The time, he said, was one of change, of challenge. Angell observed that during the present generation there had been "more discussion of the problems of collegiate and university training than had been known since before the planting of the New England colonies," and he challenged that the "public mind is now in a plastic, impressible state, and every vigorous college, nay, every capable worker, may help to shape its decisions upon education." Angell in effect acknowledged that he had no


philosophical plan he wished to impose on the University, but at the same time he expressed an enthusiastic faith in future:

Perhaps the element of highest value in this movement has been the wellnigh universal avowal of the belief that there is something yet to be learned concerning the aims and methods of higher education. This expectant, receptive, hopeful attitude of the guides of academic work has been itself a prophecy and a guaranty of improvement. Stolid complacency in a stereotyped system is the one insuperable barrier to advance. Such epochs of nascent, formative life, what the Germans would call eras of becoming, of development, are always the most intensely interesting in history.\(^{12}\)

Michigan's new President proved willing enough to continue the progressive currents already in evidence at the University. The admission of high school graduates by certificate rather than examination and the admission of women were seen by him as measures worthy of the pioneering spirit of Michigan. Of the leading universities of the period, only Cornell dared stand with Michigan in defense of co-education. Angell not only accepted his inheritance with optimism, but became over the years a leading spokesman for the integration of the sexes in university classrooms. On many occasions he echoed the sentiments expressed in his annual report of 1872: "Their [women's] presence has not called for the enactment of a single new law, or for the slightest change in our methods of government or grade of work. If we are asked still to regard the reception of women into our classes as an experiment, it must certainly be deemed a most

\(^{12}\)Ibid.
hopeful experiment." It was not until 1896 that Angell felt it necessary to create the post of dean of women.\footnote{13}

Granting students a choice among different courses of study and expanding the curriculum were also considered by Angell as steps in the right direction. In increasing elective privileges himself, however, Angell cautiously adhered to his principle that to be a success a college president should "grow antennae, not horns."\footnote{15} The move toward Tappan's ideal of genuine self-directed study was slowly and only partially realized under Angell. Freedom to elect a program of studies was in practice at Michigan before Angell's arrival, and during the first several years of his administration only minor alterations in procedure were introduced. Prior to 1878-79, election within a program of study was a privilege reserved for upper classmen only. In 1874 Angell explained the rationale underlying the Michigan system of partial election and in so doing revealed his understanding of the elective systems at other universities:

While most of our American colleges now open some choice of studies to undergraduates, there is still much discussion of the questions, how much liberty of choice shall be granted the student, and what is the best method of providing the choice. Most of the older and stronger colleges require preparatory work in classical studies,


\footnote{14}{See John Edward Shay, Jr., "Residence Halls in the Age of the University: Their Development at Harvard and Michigan, 1850-1930" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School, University of Michigan, 1966), p. 76.}

and allow a limited choice in the Senior year. Harvard, requiring the classical preparation, opens an almost unlimited choice after the Freshman year. Cornell, not demanding a classical preparation, allows an almost unrestricted choice, from the beginning of the course. Yale, insisting on the classical preparation, leaves little choice anywhere in the course. Harvard proceeds on the theory, that having a thorough classical preparation, the undergraduate may after a year be left to determine his course; Cornell, on the theory that he may at the outset, even if he has had no such training; Yale, that he had best be required to take the path which has been found to lead to good results. Our plan differs from all these, and seems to us to secure pretty well the desired steadiness of aim on the part of the student, and such liberty of action as he can wisely use. The average age of our students on entering college is about nineteen and a half years. We assume that they may, as a rule, be trusted to decide whether they wish to take a classical course, a course embracing Latin, but omitting Greek, or a Scientific course, leading by one of its branches to Engineering studies. When the student has chosen his course, we hold him through the disciplinary and fundamental studies belonging to his course. Our Freshman and Sophomore years are charged heavily with rigorous work, especially in the languages and mathematics. Those, who cannot carry successfully that kind of work, are sifted out and dropped. Those, who can, have by the end of the Junior year or earlier laid the foundations of knowledge in all the various departments of thought. They can therefore, it is presumed, wisely choose in what direction they will push their last year's studies.\textsuperscript{16}

In 1878-79, the elective principle was expanded in all programs of study, and students pursuing a four year program could, after that year, elect almost half of their subjects.\textsuperscript{17} No provision was made for a formal adviser program at Michigan, but students were expected to secure the advice of the faculty as well as that of "judicious friends" when selecting their courses of study.\textsuperscript{18} Prerequisites for some courses partially limited freedom of election, as did the requirements specifying certain courses which had to be successfully

\textsuperscript{16} Angell, President's Report, 1874, pp. 7-8.

\textsuperscript{17} Calendar of the University of Michigan, 1878-79 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1879), p. 28ff.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 29.
completed in each of the degree programs. Even as the elective policy was more liberally modified in later years, the tendency to hold some studies as essentials during the first two years continued. The conclusion gradually reached by Eliot that freshmen should enjoy the same liberties as seniors was not shared by Angell. Given the quality of students the University then served, Angell held with Tappan that a distinction was necessary between preparatory and executive study. To Angell, students in the first two years of study were still in the preparatory stage. Justifying the University's position in 1883, he reasoned:

For the last few years we have in our policy recognized a sharp line of demarcation between the work of the first two years and that of subsequent years. The former we have treated as gymnasial or academic; the latter we have aimed to shape in the large and free spirit of university work. The question has often been asked us why we do not altogether drop the former and confine ourselves to the latter, which our title of University seems to call us to prosecute. For myself, I wish that we might do so. If the high schools or the several colleges of the State could relieve us of the labor of the first two years, and send us the students as well prepared as they now are at the beginning of the third year, I should esteem it a good fortune to the University to be able to take them at that stage and carry them on through the advanced courses in literature and science, or through the Professional Schools. But the high schools would find it impracticable to perform that duty, and the colleges could hardly be expected to part with their students at the end of the second year. The necessity therefore seems to rest on us of furnishing the gymnasial preparation as well as attempting to do all we can of the higher work.19

Election tempered with prescription at Michigan was thus a policy based on Angell's interpretation of the realities of the situation. Although the percentage of public high school graduates entering Harvard

19 Angell, President's Report, 1883, p. 12.
was increasing in the latter third of the nineteenth century, Michigan's enrollment was almost entirely drawn from public secondary schools. Harvard students may have enjoyed more freedom in their selection of studies than those at Michigan, but even the strongest supporters of the state University would have had to admit that, with exceptions to be sure, Michigan students typically entered the freshman year with a less firm foundation than those who enrolled at Harvard. Neither Angell, Gilman nor White felt that they could open the doors of election quite as widely as did Eliot. Acknowledgment of this fact, however, should not blind one from appreciating the progressiveness of the elective systems at Michigan, Johns Hopkins and Cornell when compared to the traditional pattern of studies even then being followed at a great many other colleges.

There were other ways in which Angell, during his thirty-eight years at Michigan, guided the University to the front ranks of American institutions of higher learning. When he began his duties in 1871, the University had only three departments--literary, medical, and law; when he retired in 1909 seven divisions were in operation. Enrollment had increased from 1207 to 5223; the faculty had grown from thirty-five to four hundred. Library holdings, buildings, the endowment and similar tangible aspects of university enterprises had in like fashion undergone enormous increases. But most significantly, Michigan was by the twentieth century a university in spirit as well as in form. Angell began his administration at a critical period in the life of the University and ended it leaving the institution not only strong and stable,
but "the pride of the state, known, respected, and honored throughout the world."\textsuperscript{20}

To make such a university, satisfaction with the past had to yield to a commitment to the future. President Angell often found occasion to compare the old collegiate system with the emerging state universities and saw as one of the most promising features of the latter its democratic nature. Traditional assumptions were cast aside as Angell praised state universities "in which wealth and birth pass for so little and brains and character for so much."\textsuperscript{21} At the same time, Angell adhered to the Tappan ideal of making the University of Michigan a citadel of scholarship. The new university on the rise in Ann Arbor called for new types of men in both the students' seats and in the professors' chairs, he claimed. The university could no longer be a sanctuary for preachers who had tired of writing sermons; the growth of the elective system and graduate work required that professors now be "learned specialists, who have pushed their studies well up to the remotest frontier of knowledge in their respective fields, and are constantly striving to explore beyond the frontier."\textsuperscript{22}

No longer should students passively accept the pronouncements of others; mature university students should learn to question. Angell


\textsuperscript{22}James B. Angell, "The Old College and the New University," in ibid., p. 143.
asserted that the new type of scholar questions "every belief which
asks for his assent until it is proved to be sound." Angell reached
the highest notes of the prophets of the university system when in his
inaugural address he called for "Platos as professors and Aristotles
as pupils." Angell himself learned that the executive officer of a university
had to acquire new coloration if he hoped to survive. His description
of the new administrator seems far removed indeed from the typical
profile of the old-time college president:

The conduct of a university has become, from one point of view, a
great business transaction. On this account, as well as by reason
of the important changes in the organization of the work, the
duties of the president of such an institution have been consider­
ably modified. The qualifications for success in the executive
office are different from those which were formerly regarded as
sufficient. It used to be thought that a clergyman of imposing
appearance, who could make a good impression in the pulpits of his
denomination, who could teach intellectual and moral philosophy
from text-books and show some tack in managing unruly students,
and who had received the degree Doctor of Divinity, possessed the
essential qualities needed for a college president. But intelligent
trustees of a university, who are seeking a president, now look for
a man with administrative talent, with some familiarity with
business methods, with a knowledge of men, with judgment in choosing
and tact in leading the many teachers now required in a great
faculty. He is of course expected to have scholarly attainments
in some branch of learning, and to be familiar with the best thought
on educational problems.

Just as the old college was failing to meet the demands of an increasing­
ly secularized, industrial and business-oriented society, so too were

---

23James B. Angell, The Old and the New Ideal of Scholars, a
Baccalaureate Address delivered June 18, 1905 (Ann Arbor: The Univer-

24Angell, "Inaugural Address," in Selected Addresses, p. 16.

25Angell, "The Old College and the New University," in ibid.,
pp. 144-145, italics added.
the qualifications of university leadership being altered. Not ministers, but academicians with executive abilities were now looked to for leadership. Angell, Eliot, White and Gilman were symbols of the dawning of a new age.\textsuperscript{26}

Thus at Michigan, as at other universities deserving of the name, a transformation was clearly underway. Universities in their adolescence were straining at the confines established for them by their colonial parents as innovation eroded tradition. But change at the University of Michigan was not so drastic, so sudden, so complete as it might at first seem. Despite the innovative trends at work at Michigan, despite the rhetoric of change and progress, there yet remained in Angell and in the University community at large a restraining influence. Birth and wealth might count for nothing in the University Angell was building; brains might well be adorned with glory; the President might indeed see himself as an executive, but Angell was by no means prepared to abandon the collegiate tradition of concern for the character of students. That this may have in time occurred must be charged to forces other than intent, at least as judged by the administration of Angell at Michigan.

\textbf{A Commitment to Paternalism}

Angell's experiences as first a student and later a professor at Brown University had predisposed him to much inherent in the collegiate way. Although he became a leading advocate of university

reform, he could nonetheless look fondly back to his undergraduate days at Brown and recall that he and his classmates "believed that there was no better teaching in any college than in ours." 27 Like many another graduate of the old-time college, he had been greatly impressed by personal contact with his teachers; Angell especially admired Brown's president, Francis Wayland, and remarked late in life: "To nearly every student the most important event in his college life in those days was the contact with the vigorous and suggestive mind of Dr. Wayland, in the senior classroom, and especially during the study of moral philosophy." With increasing adoration he added further:

I have met in my day not a few distinguished men; but I recall none who have so impressed me with their power of personality, none who have uttered so many wise words which I recall every week to my advantage and help in the duties of my daily life. He was a very inapt pupil who passed from under Dr. Wayland's instruction without catching something of his catholic spirit, his passionate love of soul-liberty, and his earnest Christian principle. 28

To Angell, Wayland's concern for religious morality was even more vital than his devotion to the intellect. Angell reminisced that the old President was never so impressive to the students as when:

... Standing in the midst of them in the old chapel, and resting one foot on a seat and his arm on the raised knee, he looked into their faces with those piercing eyes and spoke with fatherly tenderness of the divine love. With what pathos he repeated the parable of the Prodigal Son. 29

To one so impressed with the atmosphere of the college, the shift to the university setting could be neither clean nor automatic. The history of Angell's administration at Michigan reveals not only

27 Angell, Reminiscences, 37.
28 Ibid., pp. 30-31.
29 Ibid., p. 34.
the growth of a University, but the growth of its President's educational philosophy as well. Before accepting the position at Michigan, Angell pondered long over the nature of the University fathered by Tappan as compared to the New England collegiate tradition with which he was so familiar. A former colleague at Brown, William Gammell, warned Angell that at Michigan "there is no moral supervision over the students either in theory or practice."30 Herman Lincoln Wayland, son of President Wayland and then a professor at Kalamazoo College, cautioned Angell that at Michigan he would find less opportunity for close, personal moral and religious influence than at Vermont. Wayland wrote:

The young men at A.A. [Ann Arbor] are left to themselves very much, with no dormitories, and but two rules, 1 'be present at the recitations, 2 get your lessons.' Your care too, and anxiety would be more extensive, but less particular and personal, than now.31

30Letter from William Gammell to James B. Angell, September 11, 1869 in Wilfred B. Shaw, ed., From Vermont to Michigan: Correspondence of James Burrill Angell, 1869-1871 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1938), p. 96. Gammell's warning does not coincide with the rules in force at Michigan during this time, however. Card playing, gambling, attendance at "gaming or drinking saloons," leaving town without permission, using profane language, keeping the company of persons of "ill repute," or engaging in "any other known vice" were all officially prohibited. Moreover, students were forbidden to present grievances to the authorities in the form of petitions and could not invite speakers to the University "until the name of the proposed lecturer shall have been laid before the President, and the President has given them permission to extend the invitation." Attendance at church and daily prayers was also still required. See Constitutional Provisions, Laws and By-Laws of the University of Michigan, Revised Edition, Adopted February 16, 1864 (Michigan Historical Collections).

Angell's obvious concern over the lack of supervision at Michigan prompted the interim president, Henry Frieze, to write:

Do not be solicitous about the spirit of the students here. I think you have been misled in your impressions by some unfounded rumors about the University. There are some wrong traditions among them, but they will be easily reformed. I have erred, perhaps, but I did not think a government ad interim the best for pushing reforms too strenuously.32

When a few months later reports reached the East that a large number of Michigan students had been suspended for instantly and noisily abandoning their classes in favor of a circus caravan passing nearby, Frieze again felt the urgency of reassuring Angell that satisfactory conduct at the University was a possibility:

Dont [sic] give yourself the least anxiety about the reports in regard to our measure of discipline in the case of the 'bolt' a few weeks ago. Although I would have gladly, on my account, avoided any such issue, I think it will be one of the best things for your administration that could have happened. The government here for years has been timid and temporizing, and I have been almost sure that the question 'who rules?' was to be brought to an issue sooner or later. The Faculty has been slandered by outsiders and one or two of the papers, owing in part, I am afraid, to the imprudence of one of the Professors. But with that one exception, the Faculty is strong, and decided on this matter. However, I have never liked the system of Faculty discipline, especially in serious cases, and most, if not all, agree with me, that we had better adopt a more exclusive, and concentrated, or autocratic method. This will depend on your judgment and preference. This present system, which has always prevailed here, has been a weak point in the government.33

Whatever may have been his anxieties regarding student conduct before coming to Michigan, Angell soon found (as had Tappan earlier) that a good measure of success could be attained by following the


33 Letter from Henry S. Frieze to James B. Angell, June 8, 1871, in ibid., pp. 280-281. Reference to the "bolt" is in Shaw, p. 180 and Smith, pp. 105-106.
paternalistic technique of the personal appeal. During the first few years of his administration, before a mature and responsible student attitude toward the University acquired some semblance of tradition, rather violent forms of hazing and other disturbances occasionally swept the campus. Angell adopted the policy of calling in a few of the leading students, explaining to them the serious injury that such behavior might bring to the good name of their University, and asking for their co-operation. One of Michigan’s historians has recorded: "Those he trusted never failed him. They could accomplish more than all the faculties combined."

Angell had occasion to test his theory of personal discipline during his first week on the University grounds. With no small degree of pride over the outcome of his initial confrontation with the students, Angell wrote to his brother-in-law back in Vermont of his success:

My dear Collier,

I had so much talk with you about my anticipated difficulties here, that you may be interested in hearing of my first week's experiences. It has of course been a week of fearful solicitude, but has come out thus far so well that I think I ought to be satisfied.

You know that it has been the custom to be very disorderly here, before and after, not to say during, chapel exercises, and especially the first few days of the year chapel becomes a bedlam. For 20 years the custom has been growing, and no President had been able to put it down, though the officers were so disgusted that they did not come to prayers, or but rarely.

On the 20th, the first day, they began as usual, singing, throwing missiles, etc—before we went in. I did not officiate. After prayers I made a brief address (not referring to the disorder) which

---


35 Professor Peter Collier of the University of Vermont.
was well received. But on going out, the boisterousness was resumed. The next morning I went in early. Soon some Sophs got ready to throw nuts at the Freshmen. I immediately, kindly, but firmly, requested them to desist. They did so, and that was the last of that. The janitor afterwards picked up a large quantity of missiles under the seats. I did not attempt that morning to stop the shouting, only the missiles, but there was not much shouting. The next morning there was not a particle of disorder of any kind, the exercises were as orderly and beautiful as could be (they have a capital choir). At the close I took occasion to make some remarks on the general subject of this old disorder which were taken in the best spirit. And from that time till now the service has been as quiet as yours at [urlington]. I even wonder that 500 can go down one long staircase with so little friction—indeed with none at all yet. The professors seem surprised and gratified, and nearly all come to prayers every day. The whole bearing of the students to me has been all I could ask. Of course, this reform may not last, but so far it is very encouraging. The Sophs, I hear, had got ready to rush the Freshmen the first or second morning, but I had continued to detain the Freshmen in chapel and so the chance was lost. Now the Freshmen class is so big that the Sophs, I think, dare not pitch in.

Certainly one of less imposing personality could have hardly expected or received the co-operation accorded Angell in this instance. Angell was a member of that rare breed of men who inherently possess a certain magnetic mastery over people; the quiet persuasiveness of his presence and the charm of his personality enabled him to accomplish with a few words what others could not through either appeals or force. Shaw has said of Angell:

Merely by rising he could bring absolute stillness upon a cheering throng of students or alumni, and with a few words, quiet but distinct, he could rouse to a remarkable pitch that sentiment known

as college spirit. His whole figure was expressive of a benign
goodness, illuminated most humanly by the worldly wisdom of an
old diplomat.\textsuperscript{37}

Although President Angell proved to be no supporter of \textit{in loco}
parentis in any narrow sense, he repeatedly demonstrated his belief that
enough control should be maintained over the students to bring them through
the college years "with a vigorous body, a mind well-disciplined and
stored with knowledge, and a pure, strong and manly character."\textsuperscript{38} He felt
as had Tappan, that this could be accomplished without reliance on
long lists of rules which were impossible to enforce. Authority must
reside with the officers of the institution, he maintained, but the
aim of cultivating manly character within the students would be de­
feated if such authority were too overtly displayed. The fact that
students in colleges and universities were of diverse ages complicated
standards regarding disciplinary procedures, Angell reasoned, but he
felt that in the main students in the late nineteenth century began
college at an advanced enough age to warrant a lessening of restrictions
and an increased reliance on their mature judgment.\textsuperscript{39}

In a baccalaureate address delivered in 1899, Angell expressed
most emphatically his distaste for the excessive use of authority. In
describing the concept of \textit{in loco parentis} he asserted:

\textit{This expression had come down from the days when the President in­}
flicted corporal punishment on recalcitrant pupils. Under cover

\textsuperscript{37}Shaw, p. 75.

\textsuperscript{38}James B. Angell, "Discipline in American Colleges," North

\textsuperscript{39}Ibid., passim.
of it stern executives, in a spirit sometimes not lacking in arbitrariness, laid a great variety of penalties, including pecuniary fines, upon the youths who were subject to their parental care. Bearded men were kept under a minute surveillance night and day, such as is practised now only in boarding schools for small boys.40

Angell's contempt for the nature of this type of control stemmed from his feeling that too close supervision served to widen the gap between the students and the faculty while at the same time it failed to accomplish its ends. He contended that "the distance which separated the students from members of the Faculty in their personal and social intercourse was greater than that which now exists in most colleges and universities."41 Apparently laying aside for the moment his favorable experiences at Brown, the President asserted that "all who can remember the college life of a half century ago will agree that the conditions were less friendly than the present to the maintenance of pleasant and profitable relations between teacher and pupil and to the growth of manliness and serious purpose in the student."42 Thus to Angell, the repressive nature of the old in loco parentis pattern should cease on the grounds that it disrupted unity and harmony of purpose and worked against the creation of gentlemanly character.

The codes of conduct which governed Michigan students reflected only partially Angell's public philosophy. Hoping to encourage self-responsibility while at the same time disengaging the University from

\[40\text{Angell, "The Old College and the New University," in Selected Addresses, pp. 138-139.}\]

\[41\text{Ibid., p. 139.}\]

\[42\text{Ibid., p. 140.}\]
the enforcement of civil laws, Angell urged the local authorities to increase their vigilance over student conduct in town.\textsuperscript{43} A ruling by the Board of Regents warned students that the University would grant no special protection to those found guilty of infraction of civil laws. Beginning with the 1871-72 issue, successive editions of the Calendar carried the notice:

\begin{quote}
Students are temporary residents of the city, and, like all other residents, are amenable to the laws. Whenever guilty of disorder or crime, they are liable to arrest, fine, and imprisonment, and can claim no peculiar exemption from public disgrace and legal penalties.\textsuperscript{44}
\end{quote}

The University's reputation and its orderly functioning apparently began to weigh heavier on the Regents' minds than their hope of excusing themselves from regulartory activities, however, for, beginning with the 1891-92 issue of the Calendar, the foregoing statement was revised. No more concerned about double jeopardy than White at Cornell, the Regents appended a sentence informing students that, if arrested or convicted by civil authorities, they would be cited to appear before the Faculty of the department in which they were matriculated, "and shall be liable to suspension or expulsion."\textsuperscript{45} While the University disavowed the protective role of a parental surrogate, it asserted its right to be a party to discipline.


\textsuperscript{44}See, for example, Calendar of the University of Michigan, 1876-77, p. 24.

\textsuperscript{45}Calendar of the University of Michigan, 1891-92, pp. 29-30.
The long lists of rules against which Angell spoke may be said to have been absent from the Michigan codes, but, although perhaps short when compared to earlier listings, rules nonetheless remained. A revised statement of the University rules issued in 1883 reveals very little change from earlier pronouncements. The revised codes carried the notice that evidence of general morality was expected of all students and duplicated earlier regulations outlawing specifically such offences as drinking, gambling, and profanity. Invited speakers could address the student societies only if approved in advance by the President. A prohibition against petitions—dating from 1864, following student protests against Tappan's dismissal—was still in effect. Evidence of student expression which lessened the Regents' trust in student judgment was indicated too by the addition of a new rule in the 1883 code:

The publication by any student, or students, of any book, pamphlet, periodical, chart, or other production, bearing the name of the University, or purporting to emanate from it, is forbidden, unless the publication is previously approved by the President.46

Inasmuch as the rules were officially determined by the Regents, Angell cannot be made to carry the full responsibility for such regulations. But, since Angell, by virtue of his office and his personality, was undoubtedly in a commanding position, one is led to suspect that these provisions met with his approval.

Angell was far from being naive and knew from experience that there were some in any student body who would, on occasion, be "tempted

46 Constitutional Provisions, Laws and By-Laws of the University of Michigan, July 18, 1883 (Ann Arbor: The University, 1883), p. 23 (Michigan Historical Collections).
into youthful indiscretions." While he advocated that rules be few and simple as possible, he was equally strong in insisting that "it must, indeed, be made plain to students . . . that the faculty, and not the students govern the college." Following a hazing episode in the spring of 1874, Angell was forced to remind a large number of students the truth of his simple maxim. When three sophomores were caught wet-handed holding three freshmen under a pump spout—an "old custom" done "entirely in the spirit of sport" as one student informed Angell—all six were suspended. Resenting this action, over a hundred of their fellows, sensing strength in numbers, informed the faculty via petitions from both classes that "in the affair for which three of our number have been suspended, we are equally implicated with them, and protest against the injustice of suspending three of us only." The President and the faculty allowed five days to lapse before taking action, making the petitions available to those who upon reflection saw the wisdom of removing their names from the lists. At the end of the grace period, those who held to their original convictions were suspended—thirty-nine sophomores and forty-five freshmen.


49 Letter from William C. White to James B. Angell, April 30, 1874, MS (James B. Angell Papers).

50 Petition from the Freshman Class to the Faculty of the University of Michigan, April 27, 1874, MS (James B. Angell Papers).

Angell's impressive use of authority in this episode provoked considerable praise from many quarters. Letters commending the action of the University came from state officials and the general public alike. Even some parents felt that it would be a good thing for their sons to learn respect for law and order. One mother, saddened by her son's suspension, nonetheless endorsed Angell's stand and reassured him that parents expected the University authorities to uphold proper standards of conduct. She wrote to Angell:

When we send our boys from home to get their education we expect their Instructors to exercise some parental watchfulness over them, and prepare them to become men. After all our self-sacrifice to give our Son the advantages of an education, it would be the most severe trial of my life, to have these privileges prove his ruin, it would be poor encouragement to parents to send their sons where their morals are perverted and their good manners blasted.52

While most parents seemingly were in agreement with such sentiments, at least one father, a Baptist preacher, condemned Angell's action as unjust and lectured him that "any government that has not the consent of the governed is a tyranny." Probably more honest as to his deep objection to Angell's action was his charge that "by this act you prevent the cherished purpose of a fond father and a dutiful son and deprive me of privileges that I have spent my life's labor to secure."53

The press gave favorable coverage to the Michigan controversy, and as the news spread, numerous college presidents applauded Angell's determined stand. Andrew D. White's reaction to these events is most

52 Letter from Mrs. J. Sandford Smith to James B. Angell, May, 1874, MS (James B. Angell Papers).

53 Letter from P. Van Winkle to James B. Angell, May 12, 1874, MS (James B. Angell Papers).
revealing not only as to his philosophy, but as well to the solidarity which existed among several of the leading university presidents. As soon as White read of the original suspensions, he wrote to Angell:

The newspapers this morning inform us that your Faculty have had to suspend a number of young men for 'hazing.' Will you be so kind, if you think there is any possibility of their coming Eastward, as to send us a list of their names. I should feel greatly ashamed to have our institution entrapped in this case as in one once before for want of knowing the precise status of some young men who applied to us after a performance of this kind at another institution.  

When the newspapers announced the mass expulsions the following week, White bypassed the mails and telegraphed Angell: "Accept congratulations of our Trustees and faculty on determined stand of your University against hazing. Please send full list." The presidents of Oberlin, Swarthmore, Minnesota, Dartmouth, and Union were among others who joined with White in supporting Angell's stand.  

Exercise of a paternal but firm disciplinary policy was only one approach used by President Angell to develop students possessed of manly character. Throughout his career at Michigan, the President always taught two classes. He became a Lecturer on Economics and International Law in 1871, and at the time of his retirement in 1909 was giving his two well-known courses, one each semester, on International Law and The Theory of Treaties. Angell once wrote to Charles Kendall  

54 Letter from Andrew D. White to James B. Angell, April 28, 1874, MS (James B. Angell Papers).  

55 Western Union Telegram from Andrew D. White to James B. Angell, May 5, 1874 (James B. Angell Papers).  

56 See correspondence for 1874 in James B. Angell Papers.  

57 Shaw, ed., From Vermont to Michigan, p. 249n.
Adams when the latter was president of Cornell: "I see you have given up teaching. I think I had rather give up something else." Angell's desire to teach was rooted in the same soil that produced the Dwights, Notts, and Waylands of the earlier period. Before coming to Michigan in the fall of 1871, Angell wrote to the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents:

You recall correctly my expression of a desire to come into personal relations to the undergraduates in the classroom. I still desire to do so, if I can without trespassing on anyone. I think it very desirable that the President work, if at all, in some department, which tends very directly to give broad intellectual and high moral training. He should impress himself as strongly as possible on the minds and characters of the Senior Class, and should neglect no opportunity to reach the other students. The Philosophical and the Historical are the two courses best fitted to accomplish this result.

Angell's faith in the value of personal contact with students prompted him not only to teach and to deal personally with the principals

---

58 As quoted by Smith, p. 355.

59 Letter from James B. Angell to E. C. Walker, February 14, 1871 in Shaw, ed., From Vermont to Michigan, p. 250. Cf. Angell, "The Old College and the New University," in Selected Addresses, pp. 129-151. In this 1889 address Angell recalled teachers of the earlier period who could mold the minds of the whole student body and questioned the assumption that such power was "an indisputable advantage." On p. 141 Angell asserted: "... it is perhaps open to dispute whether it is better for a whole body of students to be thus dominated by the doctrines of any one man, however eminent, than to have the more catholic discipline which flows from contact with excellent teachers of various attainments and temperaments. The great scholars of Germany habitually follow the practice of going from one university to another, to sit at the feet of more great masters than one." This observation, I would contend, is more an acknowledgment that the day of the small college had passed than a refutal of his own desire to be an influence. As president of Michigan, Angell could not hope to reach all the students as could Wayland at Brown earlier, but Angell was still determined to make his presence felt in every way possible.
in disciplinary cases, but to register students as well. One student so treated in 1893 recalled:

He seemed personally pleased that I had come,--but when he was through with his pleasant words to me, he turned to the next in line with the same air of satisfaction with which he had greeted me. It wasn't glad-handling for effect--he wasn't a candidate for any office--it was real.60

With romantic pride Angell recorded in his Reminiscences his satisfaction with student contact even to the extent of having students come to him with requests for excused absences. Angell's distance from an administrator like Eliot is underscored by his boast that "I knew every student in the academic department and could call him by name up to the time of my departure for China in 1880."61 Continued growth of the University and mounting administrative tasks gradually doomed this reality, but the desire lingered on.

In yet another respect did Angell manifest a sincere commitment for the character development of his students. It was his belief that the University should provide strong inducement for every student to place himself within reach of wholesome religious influences.62 Although it was early in his administration that compulsory chapel ended at

---

60Smith, p. 352.

61Angell, Reminiscences, p. 242. Angell took leave of his duties at Michigan from June, 1880 to February, 1882 to serve as Minister to China.

Michigan—owing as much to lack of room as to faith in the principle of voluntarism—Angell went to great lengths to maintain a religious atmosphere in the University and to convince the public that Michigan, although nonsectarian, was far from godless. He repeatedly attacked the "more or less widespread notion" that the conditions in state universities "are to some extent unfriendly to the development of a religious character in the students." The Michigan President counseled that parents who prefer to have their sons and daughters "surrounded by influences which are helpful rather than hurtful to their religious life" need have no fear of state universities. Angell contended that the regents of a state university typically represent "the better sentiment of the State in regard to morals and religion;" as for professors, men of higher Christian principles were not to be found. On the moral worth of faculties, he claimed:

... It may be said without fear of contradiction that they are as a rule composed of men of exemplary life and reverent spirit. Men of a different make do not generally incline to teaching as a permanent calling. If they do, they are rarely chosen to professorships in our higher institutions of learning. A large proportion of the teachers in the State universities with which I am familiar... are always actively engaged in work in church and Sunday school and in the religious meetings of students.

---

63 The exact date is uncertain. Since the Tappan period chapel had been voluntary for all except undergraduates, primarily because of insufficient accommodations. Angell did not mention when chapel became completely voluntary in his President's Reports. Martin L. D'Ooge, "Introduction," in Students' Christian Association, Religious Thought at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor: Register Publishing Co., 1893), p. ix, gives 1871 as the date while Charles K. Adams claims 1875 in his "The Part of the University of Michigan in the Work of Higher Education," reprint from the Chronicle, 1885, as cited by Wilbee, p. 179.
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Angell was not hesitant to admit that he disapproved of the pre-
Tappan policy of distributing professorships among the several denomi-
nations. He further made it clear in his inaugural address that at
the University of Michigan professors were to be under no "undue re-
straints," and declared that "no man worthy to hold a chair here will
work in fetters." But securing able professors and providing for
their intellectual freedom did not in Angell's mind necessitate a
 lax attitude regarding their moral bearing or a lack of concern for
their influence on students. Conformity to sect or party was not at
issue, but of great concern was the selecting of "gifted, earnest,
reverent men, whose mental and moral qualities will fit them to pre-
pare their pupils for manly and womanly work in promoting our
Christian civilization." Angell's concern for the moral worth of
professors was completely in accord with his estimate of priorities.
"After all," he said, "we are not primarily scholars. Our highest
state is that we are children of the common Father, heirs of God and
joint heirs with Christ." The President felt not only a responsibili-
ty to the students, but was sensitive to their parent's expectations
as well. He saw no need for a secular university to become great at

66James B. Angell, "Commemorative Oration," in ibid., p. 82.
68Ibid., italics added. Cf. Martin L. D'Ooge, "President Angell's
69James B. Angell, "The New Era in Higher Education," The Uni-
70See, for example, samples from Angell's correspondence with
parents in Appendix D, p. 296.
the expense of Christianity. With exception being made for compulsory chapel, Angell argued that "I know of no kind of legitimate religious influence exercised on students by professors in any college which devout professors in our state universities may not and do not exercise." 71

To further impress upon the public mind the religious opportunities at state universities and at Michigan in particular, Angell inserted a section on "Aids to Moral and Religious Culture" in the Calendar beginning in the year 1888-89. The several paragraphs devoted to this theme noted that religious exercises on a voluntary basis were regularly held in the University Chapel and that several religious associations were a functioning part of campus life. It was pointed out moreover that the various churches in the city of Ann Arbor were "cordially thrown open to the students, whose interests are largely consulted by the pastors in their pulpit instruction and in their plans of work." 72

Angell apparently accepted the absence of dormitories at Michigan approvingly, 73 but he saw the creation of "religious dormitories" or guilds by local churches as a valuable asset to the spiritual life of the University. In one of his reports he explained:

I desire to make grateful mention in this report of the efforts which Christian churches are making for the spiritual culture of


72See Calendar of the University of Michigan, 1888-89, pp. 29-30.

our students. The churches in this city have always manifested the warmest interest in the welfare of the students, and have spared no pains to make this place a home, in which wholesome and helpful, social and moral influences should be extended upon the great company of young men and young women who gather under our roof. But recently there have been manifestations of a wider and deeper interest in them. Large-hearted communicants of the Protestant Episcopal church have erected a fine building to serve as a special religious home for students and have provided for courses of lectures on religious themes by eminent men. The Presbyterians are making arrangements for occupying with a similar end in view a commodious house, which a generous woman has placed at their disposal. There is also good ground to hope that the efforts to secure the funds for the erection and endowment of a suitable building for the Students' Christian Association are soon to be crowned with success. While we believe we are right in not compelling the attendance of students on religious services, we are profoundly appreciative of all the assistance we receive in furnishing them with the means of spiritual culture, which is the crown of all culture. The conditions of life here now are, as we think, most friendly to the moral and spiritual growth of all connected with the University. 74

No doubt such assurances were made not only to calm concerned parents but to secure the financial well-being of the University as well. Angell understood well the necessity of keeping a happy public. The same President who implored graduating seniors to spread "some good word for the dear mother" in order to create that "public pride in the university which is the best guarantee that it shall have the means of healthy growth" 75 also knew that charges of irreligion could endanger the University's prosperity. 76

But Angell's concern with the University's environment, with the character and conduct of students, and with Christian principles went much deeper than administrative expediency. He was himself a sincere

74 Angell, President's Report, 1887, pp. 21-22.
76 Ibid., p. 106.
Christian, and, while not evidencing any active interest in theology in a professional sense, he did not hesitate to display his firm belief in Christianity as a pattern for successful living. Angell was particularly interested in the campus Students' Christian Association and often gave its annual opening address. With his active counsel and encouragement, the Association in 1892 and 1893 sponsored a series of lectures with the specific purpose of presenting the religious aspects of various fields of knowledge. For many years Angell led morning chapel services and, when chapel was discontinued in 1894, he initiated and conducted evening vespers in the auditorium of University Hall. And, after a fashion not far removed from the practices of the old-time presidents, Angell regularly gave a final "sermon" to departing seniors. The titles of some of the baccalaureate addresses

77Smith, p. 338. Angell had as a youth considered the ministry, but a delicate throat led him to conclude that in another field he might be more successful. See Jesse Siddall Reeves, "James Burrill Angell," Dictionary of American Biography, Allen Johnson, ed., I (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946), p. 305.

78In all twenty lectures were given in this series and published by the Students' Christian Association as Religious Thought at the University of Michigan. Among the lectures were: H. C. Adams, "Christianity as a Social Force;" A. B. Prescott, "Religious Studies in Chemical Science;" V. M. Spalding, "How Has Biological Research Modified Christian Conceptions;" and John Dewey, "Christianity and Democracy."

79See Whitney, "The Administration of James Burrill Angell," in Encyclopedic Survey, I, p. 70 and Bald, "Chapel Services," in ibid., IX, pp. 1771-1772. Whitney notes that "the crowded programs of work, both morning and afternoon, eventually rendered the continuance of these [chapel] exercises impracticable, and they were abandoned," Wilbee, pp. 179-180, notes that vespers ceased to be held in 1901 or 1902, but could find no specific reason for their discontinuance.

80Several of these addresses have been printed separately as pamphlets. See the James B. Angell Papers.
in themselves suggest the nature of the advice the President tendered to the graduating classes:

Honor in Public and Private Life, 1876, 1889
The Reproductive Power of Goodness, 1883
The Search after Moral and Spiritual Truth, 1884
Stir up the Gift of God Which is in Thee, 1886
The Heroic Spirit in Life, 1890
The Cultivation of Character, 1894
Ambitions and Ideals, 1897
Lessons Suggested by Christ's Life to the Scholar, 1903
Honesty, 1906.

In a 1904 address which must have appealed to popular prejudices if not to the seniors, Angell warned against the folly of confusing knowledge with wisdom. "Wisdom," he declared, "consists in a right temper of heart towards God and in the discharge of our duty towards Him. For this no great intellectual powers are required, no long years filled up with weary days and tedious nights of painful study."81 Four years later he cautioned that there is no demand for the sly, unscrupulous man in any worthwhile business or calling. There is only one way to acquire true success and happiness, he advised: to live according to "the life and teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ." No president of an earlier day could appeal more strongly to the religious values of his students than Angell who concluded this same address with the plea: "In this age of quickened conscience, may you with the help of the divine spirit yield yourselves up completely to His gracious influence and find in Him your guide, your exemplar, and your Savior."82

81 James B. Angell, Knowledge and Wisdom, a Baccalaureate Discourse Delivered June 19, 1904 (Ann Arbor: The University, 1904?), p. 10.

82 James B. Angell, The Age of Quickened Conscience, a Baccalaureate Address Delivered June 14, 1908 (Ann Arbor: The University, 1908), p. 10.
Angell, the obligations of the president still included a genuine concern for the souls as well as the minds of students.

However, it would not be correct to conclude that Angell took it upon himself or directed his faculty to impose a particular brand of Christianity upon the students. As he was sincere in his Christian beliefs and practices, so too was he sincere in his opposition to sectarianism. Although his reputation as "an earnest Christian" and his assertion that Christianity was far superior to other religions caused a Senate committee to investigate charges of sectarianism in 1873, the acquittal was quite in line with Angell's own feelings. The Senators concluded:

We are unanimously of the opinion that the general charge of sectarianism is a mistaken one. The teachings of the University are those of a liberal and enlightened Christianity, in the general, highest and best use of the term. This is not, in our opinion, sectarian. If it is, we would not have it changed. A school, a society, a nation, devoid of Christianity is not a pleasant spectacle to contemplate. We cannot believe the people of Michigan would denude this great University of its fair, liberal, and honorable Christian character, as it exists today.

To men of a later day, the attitude of the Michigan Senators might be as unacceptable as that of the University's President, but for the large majority of the inhabitants of Michigan in the last decades of the nineteenth century, the verdict was quite satisfactory.

83 James B. Angell, "Christianity and Other Religions Judged by Their Fruits," in Students' Christian Association, Religious Thought at the University of Michigan, p. 13.

Summary

James B. Angell's thirty-eight years as president of the University of Michigan can perhaps best be understood as a period during which circumstances more than presidential policy undermined much of the old collegiate pattern of in loco parentis. Angell inherited a University committed to progressive ideas: curricular reform, graduate study, coeducation, nonsectarianism, and the abolition of dormitories were among the issues already settled when he took office. It is in his favor that he was able to continue and accelerate many of the innovative trends started by his predecessors, but credit for initially challenging the old system belongs largely to Henry P. Tappan. Angell saw only harmful effects resulting from a too rigid system of rules and penalties; he favored a policy of fewer restrictions on the students on the grounds that they were mature in years and therefore would act as gentlemen if treated accordingly. Authority, he felt, should reside in the officers of the institution, but should be temperately displayed; professors should be seen as friends, not as spies as in former years.85 It was Angell's belief that if the faculty made clear their expectation that students display manly character, the students would conform to proper standards. With respect to the elective system as well as to decorum, Angell's first impulse was to place confidence in the students. In 1901 he reasoned:

The great mass of our students are here with an earnest purpose and aim to secure the best results from their college course. The

regulations may wisely be made to further their ends. The few who lack such purpose will not accomplish much under any restrictive rules. At any rate, it is not fair to the earnest students to hamper them with rules devised, and generally in vain, to get profitable work out of the indolent and wayward. These last, if retained at all, may properly receive special treatment. College discipline deemed needful for these has too often been more applicable to those who not only do not need it, but are hinged by it from reaping the best fruitage from their college life.\(^{86}\)

While Angell felt that the majority of students could properly manage their affairs with little outside governance, he nonetheless displayed great concern for the character development of students and showed greater hesitation than the other presidents of his rank in disavowing his and University's responsibility in this regard. His own efforts in the classroom and from other University platforms, his strong support of religious influences in the community, his private counseling of students and concerned letters to parents, and his firm enforcement of regulations when other approaches seemed inadequate all testify to his feeling of paternal responsibility. Diligence seemed especially important to Angell inasmuch as the University was of necessity conducting gymnasial as well as advanced studies.

As Angell moved the institution into the university arena, he still hoped to preserve the best in the collegiate tradition. But the growth of the University, its acceptance of the ideals of scholarship, research, and service as well as teaching (all of which Angell favored), eroded the personal spirit that its President sought to maintain. The size and competing functions of the emerging University compounded by secularizing and pluralistic pressures from within and without gradually

---

\(^{86}\)Angell, President's Report, 1901, pp. 7-8.
"freed" students from the supervision Angell would render. For all his attempts to stand in place of the parents in a wholesome fashion, the die was cast against him. A year before his retirement he perhaps unwittingly acknowledged the failure, unintentional though it was, of his paternalistic policy:

We are often criticized because we do not impart ethical and spiritual ideals with a compulsory force. But that is impossible with persons of the age of college students. We can effect them only by example and by personal persuasion and warning. Perhaps we do not employ those means enough. But really, when we come down to the hard facts, the shaping of the student's moral and spiritual ideal and purpose is his individual work, and in the last analysis can be done by none other than himself.87

Thus, "student freedom" under Angell did become a possibility, within limits, for two fundamental reasons: (1) his faith in mature students conducting themselves by gentlemanly standards and (2) the impossibility of continuing paternalistic protection and guidance given the nature of the emerging university. Yet through it all, Angell's concern for character never diminished. With warm pride he liked to boast: "If sound learning has been implanted here, we believe that we may yet more emphatically claim that manliness of character has always been developed in these halls."88


CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION: THE IDEAL OF THE GENTLEMAN AND THE SCHOLAR

From in Loco Parentis

Prior to the emergence of universities in the United States, institutions of higher learning rather uniformly assumed a role in loco parentis. In official declarations of purpose as well as in actual operation, college officials accepted responsibility for protecting and elevating student manners and morals. Typically seen as immature and impressionable, students were allowed little freedom of choice and were expected to submit themselves to the dictates of the faculty and administrative bodies. In a paternalistic fashion, college authorities offered students a standard curriculum and prescribed patterns of conduct designed to strengthen the students' mental and moral faculties. In essence, the student was expected to yield passively to the "character-forming" influences of the collegiate way of life.

College authorities in the ante-bellum period devised elaborate schemes in their efforts to convert immature youths into men of strong character. It was largely taken for granted that the traditional classical curriculum was unsurpassed as a mechanism for developing the mental faculties, but for the proper disciplining of the moral nature of the student, recourse to additional measures was deemed necessary. It was a prime concern, for example, to employ as professors
only men who themselves possessed sterling character. Inasmuch as sound character also implied sound religious views, applicants for faculty positions were often carefully examined as to their religious convictions as well as to their moral habits. Whether in employing professors or in establishing priorities as to the aims of education, those in charge of the old-time college generally exalted character over scholarship.

With presidents drawn from the ministry and with professors of acceptable moral and religious inclinations, the initial prerequisites of the desirable collegiate environment were met. But to many advocates of the collegiate tradition, it was equally important that the physical environment contribute to character development. A few voices extolled the merits of an urban environment, but the dominant forces held that only in a rural setting could the college hope to find success as a protector and molder of student character. A necessary attribute of the country location was the residential pattern of living which required students to spend their college years under the close supervision of college officials. In theory it was asserted that communal living in a pastoral environment would regenerate the spiritual and moral sensitivities of youth, but in actuality dormitory living and close surveillance of students by the faculty often caused students to adopt patterns of action quite the contrary to those intended.

Officials of the denominational colleges and even the large majority of those in state universities felt it their duty to saturate the collegiate atmosphere with religious influences. Required attendance at morning and evening prayer services and Sunday church became
normal features of the old-time college. Professors of almost any subject may have found occasion to digress into moral and religious themes, but in the presidents' moral philosophy classes, sermonizing was a standard practice. From early morning until evening, in chapel and in class, students in the old-time college were constantly reminded of their duties and responsibilities as young Christian gentlemen.

When the more positive aspects of the collegiate environment failed to produce the desired outcomes, college authorities could always turn to rules and regulations. At some colleges rules covered almost every conceivable move a student might make, such as when to rise and when to retire, when to study and when to rest. In some instances regulations defined rules of courtesy, as when Princeton students were informed of the proper time to tip their hats to passing professors. The amount of money students might spend on amusements, and even more especially, the types of activities in which students might engage, were choices determined not by the students themselves but by official codes of conduct. Matters governed by legislation varied from college to college, but almost everywhere rules were of such a nature as to prevent students from exercising any appreciable degree of free choice.

A point of pride among some ante-bellum Southern colleges was their claim to treat students as gentlemen, but a closer examination of actual conditions than has been attempted here might well reveal practices which would give to that boast a sadly hollow ring. Nonetheless, in the North and South alike, a tendency toward breaking away from restrictive rules and exacting penalties was in evidence several decades before the Civil War. Presidents like Timothy Dwight,
Stephen Olin, Mark Hopkins, Eliphalet Nott and Francis Wayland were hopeful that by de-emphasizing rules and penalties they might better accomplish the desired end of promoting gentlemanly character. Implicit in the shift away from detailed regulation of student conduct was the belief that maturity can only come through the acceptance of responsibility. As these presidents acted on this premise, a step toward student freedom was taken, however slight. The further expansion of student freedom in the last third of the nineteenth century was in large measure founded upon a firmer commitment to this belief.

The ante-bellum presidents who advocated the treatment of students as young gentlemen were far from disclaiming responsibility for student character, however. The shift from legalism to paternalism was one involving tactics, not objectives. Fatherly advice and wise counsel may have replaced rules; friendly professors may have replaced spying tutors, but the goal of developing character remained firm. The status of the student in reality changed only marginally. He was still restrained, still seen as raw material to be shaped into a rather standardized product—the Christian gentleman. Still intact was the conviction that the college authorities should manipulate the environment so as to protect and shape the character of students.

The educators who began laying the foundation for the American university following the War thus inherited a paradoxical legacy. Students should be treated as gentlemen, ran the avant garde logic, but at the same time they must be kept on the right path by the authorities. Rather than genuine freedom, an "illusion of freedom" was to prevail. If Nott, Hopkins and the others would have cringed:
at this allegation, they could not in conscience deny its accuracy. And, although the later university presidents took bold steps to close the gap between the real and the ideal, their policies and promises were not fully joined.

From College to University

With the emergence of the American university following the Civil War, the purposes and nature of higher education underwent significant changes. The War was not responsible for the death of the old-time college, but the social, political, and economic changes which sparked, accompanied, and followed the conflict did contribute to its decline. New currents of thought, new ideals, and new needs had threatened the old-time college long before universities began their emergence. Demands for agricultural and mechanical instruction had been largely ignored by the traditional colleges as had been the appeals of presidents like Henry P. Tappan for greater attention to advanced research and scholarship. Praise of foreign institutions and dissatisfaction with our own—even if for contradictory reasons—were reinforced by social and economic change to lend an air of urgency to collegiate reform. It was thus in an America of change, in an America seeking new directions that reform-minded critics began to recast institutions of higher learning.

The new aims and programs announced by Daniel C. Gilman of Johns Hopkins, Andrew D. White of Cornell, Charles W. Eliot of Harvard, and James B. Angell of Michigan—the four leading nineteenth century university presidents—in many respects were direct challenges to the traditional order. Each of their universities developed its own
distinctive characteristics, but all four presidents in some measure lauded the idea of providing educational experiences supportive of the requirements of a changing social and economic order. Young men of a definite scholarly bent might find the Hopkins environment the most rewarding just as those motivated by utilitarian goals might see Cornell as the mecca of opportunity. But research and utility also had their place at Harvard and Michigan, and at all the cultural ideal was to be advanced. Whatever the real and supposed distinctions which marked these universities in their formative years, by the 1890's they were merging into a rather common pattern. A tendency to "blend and reconcile" blurred differences so that by the time Eliot and Angell retired in 1909, references to "the university" evoked images almost as clear as those associated with the concept of the "old-time college."

The student could not but be affected by the new objectives and structural changes accompanying the rise of the university. At least three important and related questions had to be resolved by presidents Gilman, White, Eliot, and Angell regarding the status of the undergraduate student in the new university environment. To begin with, these presidents had to determine whether the undergraduate student was to be considered as a mature and responsible individual or as an immature being in need of careful guidance. Secondly, they had to decide whether the student was to display initiative and involvement in the learning process or whether his role was merely to be one of

---

1 See Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), Chapter VI.
absorbing information distilled from the lectures of his professors. And thirdly, they had to determine whether or not—or at least to what degree—the university should assume responsibility for protecting and molding student character. The answers to these questions were inextricably bound up with the larger aims the leading university presidents championed in the last third of the nineteenth century.

This investigation into the attitudes and actions of these four presidents reveals that, with uneven forcefulness, each tended to depict the student as mature and responsible and as an active participant in the scholarly endeavors of the university. However, even though these presidents generally felt inclined to discount the university's role as a guardian of character, and even though they idealized the principle of Lernfreiheit, they nonetheless proved reluctant to act fully on their pronouncements. Student freedom definitely made an advance during this period, but the trend toward the emancipation of the student was compromised by a less than total faith in the maturity of undergraduate students, by pressure from within and without the university which forced the authorities to stand at least partially in loco parentis, and by a continuance of the notion that, after all, the university environment must be conducive to the development of character as well as scholarship.

**Toward Lernfreiheit**

The Promise.--It would seem from the rhetoric and even largely from the intentions and actions of the architects of the American university that student freedom was to be realized in the institutions in Baltimore, Ithaca, Cambridge, and Ann Arbor. Daniel C. Gilman
declared that at Johns Hopkins the freedom of the "university" and not the restrictions of the "college" would prevail. "If we would maintain a university," he announced at his inauguration, "great freedom must be allowed to both teachers and scholars." No less emphatic were Andrew D. White's pronouncements at Cornell. Students who came to Ithaca, he claimed, would be treated "not as boys, but as young men, held to the duties and responsibilities of men." White denounced the stagnant features of the traditional colleges and repeatedly attacked their paternal atmosphere. It was his intention that at Cornell professors would not stand in place of the parent and that rules would be as few and as brief as possible. "The policy pursued in the relations of the faculty towards the students is to abstain from governing too much," White advised, and "to allow a good degree of liberty. . . ." No president was a more consistent champion of a broad interpretation of Lernfreiheit than Charles W. Eliot. "We believe in freedom," the Harvard President asserted; "it is impossible with the ideas of freedom which exist in England and this country

---


5Andrew D. White, "Annual Report to the Board of Trustees," June 27, 1873, p. 80, M3S (Andrew D. White Papers, Collection of Regional History and University Archives, Cornell University, Library, Ithaca, New York).
to enforce upon young men of 19 to 25 rigid rules of conduct.\textsuperscript{6} When Eliot defined academic freedom, he did not ignore the rights of students. He contended that "the student ought to find himself free to determine the method of his daily life with no more restrictions than the habits and customs of civilized society necessarily impose." Eliot felt that the student should be allowed to "regulate his own life wisely by self-control in liberty."\textsuperscript{7} And at the University of Michigan, James B. Angell decried the old in loco parentis policies which had done little for character and much to create ill feelings between students and their professors. It should be enough, Angell insisted, to let the students know that proper conduct is expected.\textsuperscript{8} Judging from these and many similar statements, it would appear indeed that student academic freedom was to be a natural outgrowth of the emerging university.

\textbf{Degrees of Commitment}.—Although each of these presidents at least rhetorically sided with the forces of liberty as opposed to restriction, they did so with varying degrees of intensity. Angell was clearly the most cautious of the four in his statements, and in practice was governed by the idea that students in the first two years

\textsuperscript{6}Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of Johns Hopkins University, June 4, 1874, as quoted in Hugh D. Hawkins, "Three University Presidents Testify," American Quarterly, XI (Summer, 1959), p. 106. Henceforth cited as Eliot to JHU Trustees.


of undergraduate study were in greater need of supervision and restraint than those in the upper classes. Angell encouraged student freedom as an ideal, but his hope that students would act responsibly was tempered by his awareness that such would not always be the case. While he argued with conviction for less restriction than was traditional, he nevertheless felt it necessary to advise that students be made to understand beyond any doubt that not they, but the faculty governed the college. Of the four presidents here studied, Angell had the greatest difficulty in reconciling university aspirations with collegiate expectations.

Gilman also found it necessary to qualify his libertarian ideals by nothing that he expected university students to be prepared for freedom "by the discipline of a lower school." The "early" Gilman held that the college "theoretically stands in loco parentis; it does not afford a very wide scope; it gives a liberal and substantial foundation on which the university instruction may be wisely built." Gilman condoned the restrictive policies of the college, but hoped that Hopkins might be free from such responsibilities. He anticipated that Hopkins, by catering to "the highest class of youthful minds," might exist in a climate of freedom. As the character of Johns Hopkins changed with the growth of the undergraduate division, however, Gilman

---


10Gilman, University Problems, pp. 13-14.

was forced to modify his earlier distinctions between collegiate and graduate work. He endeavored and largely succeeded in making the atmosphere of the university predominant, but he was unable to avoid admitting in time that even at Hopkins some guidance and supervision were necessary. Lernfreiheit could not be total at Hopkins, for, as Gilman contended, "human nature, especially young nature, is such, that the easiest path is likely to be chosen without strict regard to the point it leads to."\(^\text{12}\)

White and Eliot emerge as the most outspoken advocates of student freedom. White rejected the idea that because a student "is not a perfect judge regarding his complete wants, therefore he is no judge at all. . . ."\(^\text{13}\) Very critical of the collegiate way, White theorized that students were mature enough to govern their own actions with a minimum of direction from above. It was also White, however, who asserted that "one of the main difficulties in our colleges and universities . . . is a want of a thorough appreciation of the necessity of discipline, obedience to law and submission to order."\(^\text{14}\) It remained for President Eliot to stand as the most enthusiastic and least hesitant champion of the merits of student freedom. Eliot not only belittled the supposed distinctions between the first and last years of undergraduate maturity, but argued as well that student freedom need


\(^{13}\)Andrew D. White, Report of the Committee on Organization (Albany: C. Van Benthuysen and Sons' Printing House, 1867), p. 9.

not be limited to graduate and professional students. His aim at Harvard was to diminish the differences in the sets of expectations accorded undergraduate and advanced students. With more tenacity than was displayed by his colleagues, Eliot held to his belief that a young man's character is largely formed by the time he is eighteen years old and that "he will probably never be fit for freedom unless he is then fit."\(^{15}\)

Moves toward Lernfreiheit.--The variations reflected in the statements of these presidents are revealed as well in their actions. Circumstances at each university as well as the outlook of the presidents prevented anything like uniform progression toward student freedom, however. Harvard's elective system was certainly much more liberal than those at the other three universities, but compulsory chapel continued at Harvard long after it had become voluntary at Michigan, Cornell, and Hopkins. Michigan and Johns Hopkins totally disclaimed responsibility for student housing and its accompanying supervision, but Angell's paternalistic policies and Gilman's insistence on an adviser system worked to limit student freedom in other ways. And if White's many pronouncements about trusting the manliness of students would seem to place him to the left of Angell or even Gilman, then his early recourse to military rules and restrictions on women would clearly confound the issue. Perhaps the safest generalization that can be made

is that, in general, Harvard tended to be the most progressive in the movement toward student freedom, with Michigan generally assuming a posture somewhat more conservative than Hopkins or Cornell.

Of much greater significance, however, is the fact that the presidents of all four universities championed the idea of freedom and initiated or accelerated procedures at their institutions which were positive steps toward Lernfreiheit. An avoidance of petty rules, non-compulsory chapel, and some form of an elective system became features common to all four universities. At Harvard the right of students to petition against grievances was acknowledged, and Eliot publicly asserted that students should not be forced to incriminate themselves or others. A policy of voluntary class attendance was tried at Harvard, although reactionary procedures in time were instituted to limit its abuse. Opposition to the parietal atmosphere associated with residential living led all four presidents to criticize dormitories. Michigan and Johns Hopkins were able (during these years) to avoid dormitories; Cornell and Harvard found them necessary, but they were clearly not desired for paternalistic or in loco parentis motives. It is true that White imposed restrictions on dormitory students at Cornell, but it was for this very reason that he had initially hoped to avoid campus housing. White had no desire to stand in loco parentis and felt that if dormitories did exist, increased vigilance on the part of university officials would be expected and necessary. It is revealing as to the differences between the two men that Eliot, unlike White, did not react to the presence of dormitories by increasing regulations, however. Even so, both men clearly
had no sympathy for the traditional justifications of the dormitory system. White emphatically held that "the theory that the dormitory system protects the morals of the student is utterly exploded."16

The Logic of Lernfreiheit

Advancing Age of Students.—Differing as they did regarding the amount of freedom they felt students should be allowed, these presidents nonetheless shared common motives in their advocacy of less student regulation. The fact that the average age of the undergraduate population was increasing in the late nineteenth century certainly contributed to the desire of these administrators to move away from traditional collegiate practices. Although Angell was the most reluctant to abandon paternalistic policies, even he acknowledged the futility of trying "to exercise excessive control of students" whose average age at Michigan was twenty-one.17 Eliot advised the Hopkins trustees that students were then (1874) beginning college studies "at the average age of eighteen or nineteen years, some older, some younger, at a time when young men had better be thrown on their own responsibility. . . ."18 Thus White, in rejecting the application of a boy he thought too young, stated that "the fundamental idea of government is to treat the students


as young men and not to watch and regulate their conduct in trivial particulars as boys. . . ."19

Failure of in Loco Parentis.--Dissatisfaction with rules and penalties which motivated a few ante-bellum presidents to de-emphasize close supervision gained momentum in the last third of the nineteenth century. Artificial restraints and minute rules were increasingly seen as barriers rather than as aids to the development of self-discipline. Eliot described the rules concerning decorum so characteristic of many traditional colleges as petty and warned that "the manners of a community cannot be improved by main force any more than its morals."20 Angell argued that rules should be "as few and simple as possible, and only such as can be reasonably enforced."21 Similarly, White asserted that Cornell was not a reform school and insisted that the faculty would not "waste their strength in trying to bolster up weak characters or to reform the vicious ones."22

Institutional Forces.--The nature of the university itself was unmistakably a force contributing to the liberation of students. Each step toward student freedom was further recognition of the fact that the relationship between the student and the university was changing.

19Reply by White on back of letter from Joseph H. Kuhns to Andrew D. White, September 12, 1870, MS (Andrew D. White Papers).


Growing enrollments, the mounting complexity of administrative responsibilities, acceptance of diverse aims as reflected in an expanded curriculum and elective studies, a pronounced stress on scholarship which tended to overshadow the former concern for character, as well as recognition of the failure of in loco parentis policies made impossible and undesirable the traditional paternalistic atmosphere. The unity romantically attributed to the old-time college was lost with the rise of the university. Unlike the old-time college student, the university undergraduate was of necessity compelled to display more initiative and to accept a larger responsibility for his actions.

The Student Seen as a Gentleman.--Practical considerations working for increased student freedom were supported by ideological conceptions. Again drawing from a faith held by a few ante-bellum reformers, Eliot, Gilman, White and Angell expressed their belief that sound character and self-discipline were the outcomes of freedom to make decisions and the acceptance of the responsibility for one's actions. Eliot advised that the students' lives "should more closely resemble the professional life or business life they are soon to lead, and their leading motives should resemble the motives of adults, rather than those of school boys. . . ." Closely allied with this stance was the shared belief of these four presidents that if students were treated with respect and made to feel that gentlemanly conduct were the expected norm, then they would abide by accepted standards of decorum. "A young man is much affected by the expectations which his

23 Letter from Charles W. Eliot to Edwin H. Abbot, February 8, 1889, as quoted in James, II, p. 49.
elders entertain of him," Eliot wrote. "If they expect him to behave like a child, his lingering childishness will oftener rule his actions; if they expect him to behave like a man, his incipient manhood will oftener assert itself." Resort to authority should be unnecessary, Angell suggested, if a manly and earnest spirit is made to permeate the academic community. Michigan's President advised that the student "should be made to understand that a decent and manly life is expected of him always and everywhere." White adequately expressed the faith common to all four when he informed his trustees that "much is trusted to the manliness of the students." Whatever may have been their reservations and in spite of some actions to the contrary, these presidents were defining the status of the student as that of a mature and responsible individual. At least in theory, the student was to be seen and treated as a gentleman.

The Student Seen as a Scholar.--The status of the student was being redefined in yet another particular which aided the move toward increased freedom. Each president felt that as the university realized its aims, students would turn from their boyish ways and would enter enthusiastically into the scholarly enterprise. The emerging view held that students should become active participants in the learning process. Gilman claimed that at Johns Hopkins there were "masters and


26White, Report of the Committee on Organization, p. 36.
pupils, not two bodies, but one body, a union for the purpose of acquiring and advancing knowledge." While he acknowledged that students and professors could not enjoy identical status, he contended that "there were no diversities of interest, no divergent efforts." While expressed basically the same view when he informed Cornell students that "you are not here to receive an education but to educate yourselves." The elective system, increased course offerings, seminars, well stocked laboratories and libraries, and the presence of professors of scholarly reputation were among the measures seen by these presidents as increasing the attractiveness of university education. Further, the encouragement of student societies and activities, scholarly and non-academic alike, were in effect concessions to student interests. Feeling that the university offered all that any serious student could desire, these administrators were naturally reluctant to display much patience with students who abused their freedom or shirked their responsibilities. They considered university education a privilege and sought to extend its benefits to young scholars with the ability and desire to profit from the experience. Johns Hopkins came closest to sustaining an atmosphere of a societas magistorum et discipulorum, but each of these presidents hoped that such a climate might characterize their universities as well. Like their professors,


students were expected to be not only gentlemen but also scholars. Slowly, unevenly, and far from completely, faith in the ideal of the gentleman and the scholar served as a major force in advancing the concept of student academic freedom prior to the twentieth century.

The German Ideal of Lernfreiheit.—It is most difficult to determine the influence the German ideal of Lernfreiheit had on the American version of student academic freedom as it was being formulated in the late nineteenth century. Gilman, White, Eliot, and Angell were aware of the freedom enjoyed by German students and each in his own way evoked the German ideal in support of some of his policies. But none of them wished to adopt totally the laissez-faire approach which properly characterized the ideal. Indeed, by the twentieth century, the ideal of Lernfreiheit was being conceived of in very narrow terms; many academic leaders who succeeded these presidents apparently felt that once the battle over electives had been won, Lernfreiheit—the freedom to learn—was an accomplished fact.29 It would seem that the German practice of Lernfreiheit provided support and encouragement for the execution of policies which were interwoven with more comprehensive university demands and aspirations. Certainly the growth of student academic freedom in this country was a consequence of much stronger forces than the desire to create a Germanized student environment.

Thus, an awareness of the German ideal of Lernfreiheit reinforced the recognition of the impossibility and undesirability of continuing traditional collegiate customs in the universities emerging in the last third of the nineteenth century. But the rationale giving direction to the statements and actions of the four leading presidents found its expression in the ideal of the gentleman and the scholar. The nature and degree of liberty accorded students at Johns Hopkins, Cornell, Harvard, and Michigan are measures of the depth of the confidence each president had in the possibility of realizing this ideal at his university.

Reservations about Lernfreiheit

The goal of self-responsibility and the advocacy of Lernfreiheit for young gentlemen and scholars did have limits, however. There still remained a gap between the rhetoric of freedom and university practices. The "illusion of freedom" inherited from the progressive ante-bellum colleges had by no means been dispelled. Students were no longer subject to as many overt pressures as in former years, but neither were they intentionally abandoned by the university. The presidents' idealistic commitment to the concept of a community of gentlemen and scholars was compromised by a pragmatic awareness of the difficulty of its attainment. Although Angell's deep concern for character and his fondness of paternalistic policies and White's fear of anarchy led them to contradict their pronouncements more openly than Gilman or Eliot, all pursued some policies which clashed with their professed commitment to student self-discipline. Their own appreciation of gentlemanly conduct and their concern for character, their reservations
as to the ability of the students to handle freedom, and pressures—both internal and external—prevented each president, although certainly not to the same degree, from acting fully on his liberal pronouncements.

Concern for Character. — Guided by the ideal of the gentleman and scholar, these presidents all agreed, at least in theory, that character formation was the individual student's, not the university's, responsibility. But if they rejected many of the burdensome and anti-intellectual policies once felt necessary for character formation, they were still far from suggesting that the years spent in college were without influence on character. And to a man they agreed that sound character was still the main end of education.30

Each of these presidents believed that the university environment itself was beneficial to character. Eliot held that "there is no place so safe as a good college during the critical passage from boyhood to manhood." He noted further that the scholarly tastes and habits of the college or university community, the debates and discussions on character, religion, and politics are all "safeguards


Rhetoric on the importance of character underwent no appreciable change with the rise of the university. Still elusively defined, it remained high on the list of outcomes desired of collegiate training. See Leonard V. Koos and C. C. Crawford, "College Aims Past and Present," School and Society, XIV (December 3, 1921), pp. 499-509.
against sloth, vulgarity, and depravity,"\(^{31}\) Gilman pictured the scholarly life as a spiritualizing influence, one "favorable to the growth of spiritual life, to the development of uprightness, unselfishness, and faith. . . .\(^{32}\) But neither of these two presidents, and certainly not White or Angell, felt that the university's responsibility ended with the creation of a scholarly atmosphere. The influence which athletics and student activities had on the character of the undergraduates was a matter of concern to these presidents; they still gave consideration to the moral fiber and habits of their professors and expected them to set an example worthy of student emulation; and, by their own attempts at exemplary conduct and in their numerous speeches to students, these presidents tried to impress upon students the importance of developing and preserving sound character. It is significant too that although all four of these universities were nonsectarian, each of the presidents felt it necessary to continue—or in the case of White and Gilman, to initiate—chapel services. While attendance became voluntary at all four universities, chapel itself was still deemed a necessary attribute of undergraduate life, and no one praised its worth more than the presidents. Thus, these presidents were genuine in their reactions against the demeaning restraints associated with an \textit{in loco parentis} philosophy, but they did not interpret \textit{Lernfreiheit} as a total abandonment of concern for student character.

\(^{31}\)Eliot, "Inaugural Address," in Neilson, I, p. 16.

\(^{32}\)Gilman, \textit{University Problems}, p. 56.
The Gap between the Student World and University Ideals.--It must be granted that part of the reluctance of these presidents to extend student freedom farther than they did was their awareness that not all students were accepting their new roles as gentlemen and scholars. No matter how much these presidents or various professors may have glamorized the scholarly life, not a few students had different ideas as to the purpose of the undergraduate years. Athletics, social life, learning to beat the system, improving one's status, making contracts which might be helpful in their anticipated business careers--these and similar concerns attracted the attention of many undergraduates more frequently than did the lure of the library or laboratory.33 Obviously there were notable exceptions, but, for all the talk about a society of masters and students sharing common ideals and motives, the gap between the undergraduate world and the scholarly world was not significantly narrowed.34

External and Internal Pressures.--Working against a more complete acceptance of Lernfreihiet too was general public distrust of the idea. However often Gilman, White, Eliot or Angell might point out that they were not running reform schools, that they expected

33See, for example, [Herbert Croly?], "The Undergraduate," New Republic, IV (September 25, 1915), pp. 197-198. Presidents too were becoming divorced from scholarly concerns; see [E. L. Godkin], "College Presidents," The Nation, XLI (July 16, 1885), pp. 47-48.

students to act maturely and to discipline themselves, or that they could not stand in loco parentis, these presidents found that parents, concerned citizens, alumni, and even some colleagues refused to let them revoke their inherited responsibilities without a battle. Some parents still felt that the faculty was obligated to take every step necessary to stand in loco parentis. Gilman was forced to admit that "college faculties will be held responsible by the public for the influence they exert upon the moral lives of those whose intellectual training they have undertaken to direct." Angell found this pressure hardest to escape, but even Eliot for many years resisted attempts to abolish compulsory chapel because of his concern for public opinion. Each of these administrators felt it necessary to point out repeatedly that, although their universities were nonsectarian and attendance at chapel and other religious services was on a voluntary basis, they were still very definitely "Christian" institutions. In annual reports, articles and public addresses, each president stressed that religious influences were not merely tolerated but encouraged in the university community. Not all went as far as Angell in supporting and advertising religious activities, but each endeavored to refute accusations of "godlessness." Their own liberal Christian beliefs, concern for the moral integrity of students, as well as an awareness of public sentiment prevented any other stance.


Restrictions on Lernfreiheit

By the 1890's it was becoming apparent that the movement toward Lernfreiheit had passed its zenith. The attention of the reforming presidents was in the main diverted from further expansion of student freedom to holding onto the gains already made. Mounting attacks against the elective system, the moral laxity of students, and the impersonalization of the university forced these leaders to reconsider their positions. At Harvard, for example, an adviser program for freshmen and tighter controls on class attendance were instituted by 1890. By the same time, the Hopkins adviser system had been strengthened by the addition of a dean. By 1884 White had yielded to demands calling for closer restrictions on women and an increase in the regulatory duties of the "lady principal." Michigan found it necessary to create the post of Dean of Women in 1896. Even these safeguards did not placate all critics of the libertarian university atmosphere, however.

Many felt as did Edwin E. Slosson who in 1909 affirmed that "almost every educator, if asked what the main fault of our large colleges, would . . . [reply] that it was the loss of personal relationship between instructor and student." That close personal relationships even in the old-time college had been more of an ideal than a reality was lost on those who saw the undergraduate as abandoned in the impersonal university. These were the feelings, however, which began to give rise to the student personnel movement in the United States, a

chapter in educational history which goes beyond the immediate concerns of this study.\textsuperscript{38}

By no means were all the attacks on the pacesetting universities from "outsiders" who through ignorance failed to appreciate the nature of the new institution. Dean L. B. R. Briggs of Harvard publicly acknowledged that he had "Some Old-Fashioned Doubts about New-Fashioned Education,"\textsuperscript{39} and called for more prescription in the undergraduate curriculum. Briggs had no desire to return to the old-time college, but he did approve of more paternal direction than was then customary at Harvard and longed for a spirit of community in the university which he felt was lacking.\textsuperscript{40} Abbott Lawrence Lowell shared Briggs' sentiments, and, when he succeeded Eliot as president of Harvard in 1909, he deliberately curtailed the election of studies and turned

\textsuperscript{38}See W. H. Cowley, "Some History and a Venture in Prophecy," in E. G. Williamson, ed., \textit{Trends in Student Personnel Work} (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949), pp. 12-27. In his "European Influences upon American Higher Education," \textit{Educational Record}, XX (April, 1939), p. 184, Cowley asserts that "the paternalism of the past thus gave way to almost complete indifference." While it is true that the moves toward learning were interpreted by many as "complete indifference," the actions as well as the expressions of these four presidents indicate a continuing concern for the well-being of students.

\textsuperscript{39}LeBaron Russell Briggs, "Some Old-Fashioned Doubts about New-Fashioned Education," \textit{Atlantic Monthly}, LXXXVI (October, 1900), pp. 463-470.

\textsuperscript{40}See, for example, his comments in his "Report of the Dean of Harvard College," \textit{Annual Reports of the President and Treasurer of Harvard College}, 1894-95, p. 93; 1896-97, pp. 118-119; 1897-98, p. 118.
Harvard on a course which promised to recapture "intellectual and social cohesion."

By the closing years of the nineteenth and opening years of the twentieth century then, the world of higher education was once again in search of new directions. Feeling that universities had grown too big, complex, and impersonal, a new generation of reformers—Woodrow Wilson, A. Lawrence Lowell, William R. Harper, Arthur T. Hadley, and Nicholas Murray Butler, among others—emerged with plans to halt the "drift" which they and others felt had overtaken the university. Interest in residential housing plans, advisory and tutorial systems, deans, closer supervision of student extra-curricular activities and more careful attention to curriculum planning were among the trends which marked their counter-reformation. But here again we are tempted to tread into new territory.

As it has been the purpose of this dissertation to show, there was indeed a commitment on the part of Daniel G. Gilman, Andrew D. White, Charles W. Eliot, and to a lesser degree, James B. Angell, to advance the ideal of Lernfreiheit during their administrations. While various factors contributed to the partial realization of this ideal, the primary justification for liberating undergraduate students was the faith that, if given more responsibility for their own actions in the new university environment, the students would conduct themselves as gentlemen and scholars. Yet, although these university presidents

---

encouraged student self-discipline and were inclined to disavow the university's responsibility for the character of students, they found themselves unable and unwilling to reject totally policies of protection. The desire to protect the university's as well as the student's character and reputation worked against a broad application of Lernfreiheit. The drive toward student freedom was losing momentum by the last decade of the nineteenth century, and as the twentieth century opened, the ideal which defined the status of the student as that of a responsible gentleman and scholar still remained more of a fiction than a reality.
APPENDIX A

THE LAWS, LIBERTIES, AND ORDERS OF HARVARD COLLEGE,
CONFIRMED BY THE OVERSEERS AND PRESIDENT OF THE
COLLEGE IN THE YEARS 1642, 1643, 1645, AND
1646, AND PUBLISHED TO THE SCHOLARS
FOR THE PERPETUAL PRESERVATION OF
THEIR WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT.

1. When any scholar is able to read Tully, or such like classical Latin author extempore, and make and speak true Latin in verse and prose suo (ut aiunt) Marte, and decline perfectly the paradigms of nouns and verbs in the Greek tongue, then may he be admitted into the College, nor shall any claim admission before such qualifications.

2. Every one shall consider the main end of his life and studies, to know God and Jesus Christ, which is eternal life; John xvii. 3.

3. Seeing the Lord giveth wisdom, every one shall seriously, by prayer in secret, seek wisdom of Him; Proverbs ii. 2, 3, & c.

4. Every one shall so exercise himself in reading the Scriptures twice a day, that they be ready to give an account of their proficiency therein, both in theoretical observations of language and logic, and in practical and spiritual truths, as their Tutor shall require, according to their several abilities respectively, seeing the entrance of the word giveth light, & c.; Psalm cxix. 130.

5. In the public church assembly, they shall carefully shun all gestures that show any contempt or neglect of God's ordinances, and be ready to give an account to their Tutors of their profiting, and to use the helps of storing themselves with knowledge, as their Tutors shall direct them. And all Sophisters and Bachelors (until themselves make common place) shall publicly repeat sermons in the Hall, whenever they are called forth.

6. They shall eschew all profanation of God's holy name, attributes, word, ordinances, and times of worship; and study, with reverence and love, carefully to retain God and his truth in their minds.

7. They shall honor as their parents, magistrates, elders, tutors, and aged persons, by being silent in their presence (except

---

they be called on to answer), not gainsaying; showing all those laudable expressions of honor and reverence in their presence that are in use, as bowing before them, standing uncovered, or the like.

8. They shall be slow to speak, and eschew not only oaths, lies, and uncertain rumors, but likewise all idle, foolish, bitter scoffing, frothy, wanton words, and offensive gestures.

9. None shall pragmatically intrude or intermeddle in other men's affairs.

10. During their residence they shall studiously redeem their time, observe the general hours appointed for all the scholars, and the special hour for their own lecture, and then diligently attend the lectures, without any disturbance by word or gesture; and, if of any thing they doubt, they shall inquire of their fellows, or in case of non-resolution, modestly of their Tutors.

11. None shall, under any pretence whatsoever, frequent the company and society of such men as lead an ungirt and dissolute life. Neither shall any, without license of the Overseers of the College, be of the artillery or trainband. Nor shall any, without the license of the Overseers of the College, his Tutor's leave, or, in his absence, the call of parents or guardians, go out to another town.

12. No scholar shall buy, sell, or exchange any thing, to the value of sixpence, without the allowance of his parents, guardians, or Tutors; and whosoever is found to have sold or bought any such things without acquainting their tutors or parents, shall forfeit the value of the commodity, or the restoring of it, according to the discretion of the President.

13. The scholars shall never use their mother tongue, except that in public exercises of oratory, or such like, they be called to make them in English.

14. If any scholar, being in health, shall be absent from prayers or lectures, except in case of urgent necessity, or by the leave of his Tutor, he shall be liable to admonition (or such punishment as the President shall think meet), if he offend above once a week.

15. Every scholar shall be called by his surname only, till he be invested with his first degree, except he be a fellow commoner, or knight's eldest son, or of superior nobility.

16. No scholar shall, under any pretence of recreation or other cause whatever (unless foreshowed and allowed by the President or his Tutor), be absent from his studies or appointed exercises, above and hour at morning bever, half an hour at afternoon bever, an hour and a half at dinner, and so long at supper.
17. If any scholar shall transgress any of the laws of God, or the House, out of perverseness, or apparent negligence, after twice admonition, he shall be liable, if not adultus, to correction; if adultus, his name shall be given up to the Overseers of the College, that he may be publicly dealt with after the desert of his fault; but in greater offences such gradual proceeding shall not be exercised.

18. Every scholar, that on proof is found able to read the original of the Old and New Testament into the Latin tongue, and to resolve them logically, withal being of honest life and conversation, and at any public act hath the approbation of the Overseers and Master of the College, may be invested with his first degree.

19. Every scholar, that giveth up in writing a synopsis or summary of Logic, Natural and Moral Philosophy, Arithmetic, Geometry, and Astronomy, and is ready to defend his theses or positions, withal skilled in the originals as aforesaid, and still continues honest and studious, at any public act after trial he shall be capable of the second degree, of Master of Arts."
"Gentlemanly conduct" was a phrase favored by all the presidents here under consideration, but, as contemporary advocates of student freedom continuously point out, the concept suffers from lack of specificity. Although students in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries may have raised similar objections on occasion, it is safe to assume that there was rather widespread agreement as to acceptable and unacceptable patterns of conduct. The following abridgment of a "student code" published in the Cornell Era in 1872 supports this contention by its satire on behavior just the opposite of that deemed desirable.

1- Always know your rights—assert freedom and independence though heaven falls.
2- There can be no freedom without noise, louder the noise the greater the freedom.
3- Rush thru halls to the loudest possible accompanient of tongue and feet.
4- Swear now and then—sounds manly.
5- Refer to professors by only last name—"Brown."
6- Never take off hat to professor.
7- Conversation should be slangy.

1From the Cornell Era, May 24, 1872, p. 438, as quoted in William David Zimmerman, "Andrew D. White and the Role of the University Concerning Student Life" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School, Cornell University, 1959), p. 82.
8. Get drunk at least three times a term.
9. If you drink--drink until blind drunk.
10. Lie a little to use all your resources.
11. Avoid study.
Henry Philip Tappan's personality and many of his ideas as to the nature of a university clashed sharply with the temper and desires of the inhabitants of Michigan at mid-nineteenth century. The state was still a region of woods and swamps broken occasionally by small clearings when Tappan was inaugurated as President of the University. Tappan, an aristocrat, cosmopolite, and Platonist in philosophical beliefs and educational theory, "was too remote from the go-getting spirit for the go-getters to accept him as one of them."^1

Frederick Jackson Turner's thesis that the frontier spirit shaped the values of American institutions and de Tocqueville's estimate that the currents of American democracy were ever tending toward equality have been largely borne out by the development of state universities.^2 But, although Michigan under Tappan yielded to democraticizing and utilitarian forces, Tappan himself was distinctly the exponent of a more philosophical idea of a university. His

---


interest, as Perry notes, "was not in a popularization of the University but in the creation of an institution that should cultivate originality and genius."³ Nowhere did Tappan make this clearer than in his University Education (1851). Labeling as "primitive" the idea that education is essentially "a preparation for the ordinary and necessary occasions of human life," Tappan in his opening paragraph refuted the argument that education should be merely practical:

This idea is the basis of what is strictly popular education. In its rudest state it presents merely, and in different degrees, mental invention, contrivance and adaptation, and physical skill—where instinct and spontaneous thought work together, and where the wonderful instrumentality of nature is perfected by use and ripened into habit. Thus we have unpolished men quick in calculation, and nice and skillful in mechanical works.⁴

In contrast to this form of education, as also to that preparing for the arts and professions solely, Tappan lauded the merits of an "ideal" or "philosophical" education. In this type of education, Tappan contended, the capacities of the mind are considered and the system of education is shaped simply for "education—leading forth—unfolding these capacities." Concern for the mere utilities of life, the demands of particular arts, the preparation for a particular profession, recede from focus as the primary object becomes man, what he is and what he is capable of becoming. Tappan was at one with the French philosophes when he claimed that upon investigating man:

We find him endowed with high powers of thought, observation and reasoning—with imagination and taste—with conscience and moral determination. And in all these he is capable of growing indefinitely—of becoming more and more intellectual, more and more beautiful

³Perry, p. 212.

⁴Henry P. Tappan, University Education (New York: George P. Putnam, 1851), pp. 5-6.
in his imaginative and tasteful functions,—more wise and good, without an assignable limit.\textsuperscript{5}

University education directly, and all levels of education indirectly, should then search for the laws and means of promoting and leading on this unlimited growth. When this is done, Tappan argued, other outcomes of education would not be slighted.

Philosophical or ideal education does not abstract itself from the pursuits and ends of our human life, or lose sight of any of the great interests of the social state; on the contrary, it embraces them all, and that, too, under the highest points of view. It contemplates every man as having some proper work to perform for the common weal; but that, in order to perform it well, he requires cultivation of all his faculties, while in the doing of his work, he shall ripen more and more.\textsuperscript{6}

Education so conceived, Tappan reasoned, must consist of two levels, the preparatory and the executive. The preparatory he defined as formal and scholastic, a stage of education directed to the cultivation of the mental faculties in general. After achieving "a true and cultivated soul dwelling in a sound and active body, prepared for all proper duties," the next concern is with the executive phase of education, or that learning which embraces the professional studies. Thus, beginning by cultivating and improving the natural capacities of man and ending by instructing him in "any course of life for which the individual may design himself," the philosophical or ideal pattern of education would, according to Tappan, produce "sound, disciplined, and amply-furnished men for the state and the church, and for all the arts, duties, and offices of life."\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{5}Ibid., pp. 10-11.
\textsuperscript{6}Ibid., pp. 11-12.
\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., pp. 12-13.
The Platonic substance of education advocated by Tappan had as its goal not the mere teaching of men a trade, an art, or a profession, "but that of quickening and informing souls with truths and knowledges, and giving them the power of using all the faculties aright in whatever direction they choose to exert them." In form too the Platonic ideal emerged, for as Tappan stated:

It seems, indeed, to belong only to the few who enjoy prolonged leisure for study, and a full supply of means and appliances to carry out this conception fully; but it contains a principle of universal application; for in even the lower grades of education, the true idea of education as the development of the soul in all its faculties, may be held up to view and acted upon.  

Convinced that this conception of education was the only one worth holding, Tappan presented the German system of education as the prime example of philosophical education in practice. His contention that "what we need most of all in our State, and in our country at large, is to follow the German system" became an oft-repeated and increasingly ill-received message. "The Universities of Protestant Germany stand forth as model institutions, if there be such to be found," he admonished in University Education, "and the whole system of education, from the Common School upward, exhibits an intellectual progress which commands our admiration." Such was his admiration that

---

8Tbid., pp. 13-14.


10Letter from Henry P. Tappan to the Graduating Class of the University of Michigan, July 13, 1853, as printed in the Detroit Free Press, August 10, 1853, p. 2. (Henry P. Tappan Papers, Michigan Historical Collections, Rackham Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.)

he advised a graduating class at Michigan to perfect themselves in the German language in order that they might be able to correspond with Germans and read books in that tongue.\textsuperscript{12}

Tappan had not accepted the German university as a model without examining the systems of other countries, but nowhere could he find a system "so enlarged, and made so liberal and thorough."\textsuperscript{13} Speaking with praise he felt "cannot well be-extravagant," Tappan alluded to the features of the German universities which Michigan would do well to emulate:

\begin{quote}
Their excellence consists in two things: first, they are purely Universities, without any admixture of collegial tuition. Secondly, they are complete as Universities, providing libraries and all other material of learning, and having professors of eminence to lecture on theology, law, and medicine, the philosophical, mathematical, natural, philological, and political sciences, on history and geography, on the history and principles of art, in fine, upon every branch of human knowledge. The professors are so numerous that a proper division of labor takes place, and every subject is thoroughly discussed. At the University every student selects the courses he is to attend. He is thrown upon his own responsibility and diligence. He is left free to pursue his studies; but, if he wishes to become a clergyman, a physician, a lawyer, a statesman, a professor, or a teacher in any superior school, he must go through the most rigid examinations, both oral and written.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

Tappan acknowledged that the "executive" phase of education so well provided for in the German universities was dependent upon the "preparatory" work of the gymnasiums. "The Gymnasia guard the entrance of the Universities," he noted. "Collegial tuition in the German Universities

\textsuperscript{12}Letter from Tappan to Graduating Class, July 13, 1853.

\textsuperscript{13}Tappan, \textit{University Education}, p. 39.

\textsuperscript{14}\textit{Tbid.}, pp. 43-44.
does not exist, because wholly unnecessary, the student being fully prepared at the Gymnasium before he is permitted to enter the University." The unity of this "noble" system was to Tappan the key to its strength. In praise he said:

Thorough in all its parts, consistent with itself, and vigorously sustained, it furnishes every department of life with educated men, and keeps up at the Universities themselves, in every branch of knowledge, a supply of erudite and elegant scholars and authors, for the benefit and glory of their country, and the good of mankind.

Such was the success of the German system, while in the United States "we have no Universities," declared Tappan. Institutions claiming to be colleges existed in large numbers, he observed, but these schools were frequently inferior to the German gymnasiums. And those pretentious establishments calling themselves universities could claim "neither libraries and material of learning, generally, nor the number of professors and courses of lectures, nor the large and free organization which go to make up Universities." Adding on courses according to popular demand, lowering entrance requirements, increasing the number of colleges without regard to demand or purpose—these measures had all worked against the creation of a true and useful system of education. "We have cheapened education," Tappan asserted; "we have reduced it to cost—we have put it below cost—we have even given it away." To Tappan, the salvation of the American system of education rested only with reform working from the top of the system down to the lowest

---

15 Ibid., p. 44.
16 Ibid., p. 45.
17 Ibid., p. 50.
18 Ibid., p. 54.
levels. "The establishment of Universities in our country will reform, and alone can reform our educational system," he stated. If the universities would gear themselves to the philosophic ideal of education, then the subordinate institutions would be reformed of necessity.

It was important to Tappan and later to Angell as well that the distinction between collegiate "preparatory" work and university "executive" work be recognized. Accompanying the first is the idea of an education imposed by tutors and governors; an education self-imposed is the mark of the second. "For the first period," he wrote, "various institutions have sprung up, from the most elementary schools to Gymnasia or Colleges. For the second period there is only one institution--the University." Standing at the apex of the educational system, the university Tappan envisioned would take in those few who had passed through the lower levels and who were at last ready to undertake the rigors of the higher learning. As Tappan stirringly challenged:

It is here alone that we can properly pursue the study of philosophy, which implies more than mere acquisition, and is the self-conscious growth of thought. It is here that we can become disciplined to independent scientific investigation, or lay broad and deep foundations of professional and political life. It is here, also, that teachers and professors can be prepared to the scientific and classical departments of our educational institutions, in general.

A climate of freedom would be an essential feature of Tappan's ideal university. In the true community of scholars, students and professors alike should be free to investigate, to question, to seek truth via reason. Tappan held that the only authorities directing the

---

19 Ibid., p. 63.
20 Ibid., pp. 82-83.
21 Ibid., p. 84.
scholar were his responsibility to God, to conscience and to truth.\(^22\)
"Freedom--this is the grand characteristic of University Education, as it is the essential attribute of manhood," he maintained. "Let us have the ailment of thought, but then leave us free to think."\(^23\)
Tappan's advocacy of self-imposed education and his faith in man's perfectability led him to theorize that in the ideal university environment, students in pursuit of knowledge would be in no need of supervision or restraint. The desire for truth and the stimulating academic environment would be sufficient, he reasoned, to guide young scholars in the proper direction.\(^24\)
Tappan held that the cultivation of man's inner life, which is the true concern of university work, should enable one to exert his power over himself--"in directing and cultivating his power of thinking and reasoning, in developing and regulating his emotions and passions, in disciplining himself in right principles and worthy designs, in gaining and ripening all virtues--courage, bravery, endurance, patience, modesty, truthfulness, benevolence, charity, the love of God and man."\(^25\)


These then were some of the ideals which Henry P. Tappan brought to Ann Arbor in 1852. A personal friend and admirer of Victor Cousin, Tappan took courage from the knowledge that the founders of the system of public education in Michigan had closely followed Cousin's directives in his Report on the State of Public Instruction in Prussia.\textsuperscript{26} Certainly aware that much elementary work had to be done, Tappan nonetheless came to Michigan with the intention of explaining to the citizens of the state his ideas on education, and of leading them towards a high ideal of university study.\textsuperscript{27}

The institution over which Tappan was made "President and Chancellor" in 1852 had, prior to his election, muddled along without a chief executive. Members of the faculty had assumed the role of the presidency on an annually rotating basis, but the actual governance of the University had been largely the responsibility of an appointive Board of Regents headed by the governor of the state. Recognizing the need for reform, the framers of the revised Constitution of 1850 provided for the popular election of the Regents for a term of six years and for the selection by the Regents of "a President of the University, who shall be ex-officio a member of their Board, with the privilege of speaking, but not of voting."\textsuperscript{28} After considering several men for the

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{26}M. Victor Cousin, Report on the State of Public Instruction in Prussia, translated by Sarah Austin (London: E. Wilson, 1834). On the structure of the Michigan system of education, see Ten Brook, chapters V through VIII and Farrand, chapters II through V.

\textsuperscript{27}Farrand, p. 112.

\end{footnotes}
for the post, including Henry Barnard and George Bancroft, the newly elected Board, following Bancroft's recommendation and much debate, settled on Tappan for the position.

Tappan's relations with the Board of Regents who served from 1852 through 1858 were for the most part tranquil, and in the main he was able to carry forward some of his progressive ideas with the Regents' assistance. He later remarked that "no question ever arose, or was dreamed of, respecting our separate constitutional rights and authorities. We acted together by a spontaneous, mutual, good understanding." Compared with the conflicts which followed the election of a new slate of Regents in 1858, Tappan's estimation of the first Board's cooperativeness was, if generous, at least understandable. It was during the first six years of his administration that Tappan was able to introduce several measures which pointed Michigan in the direction of the respected University she was later to become.

In the first catalog issued under his administration, Tappan emphasized the correspondence between the system of education in Michigan and the German pattern and noted that "it is the cardinal object to make this correspondence as complete as possible." Keeping in mind his philosophic ideal as well as recognizing the needs of the moment, he announced a change in the traditional course of studies:

It is proposed to make the studies here pursued not only introductory to professional studies, and to studies in the higher branches of science and literature, but also to embrace such studies as are more particularly adapted to agriculture, the mechanic arts, and to the industrial arts generally. Accordingly, a distinct scientific course

---

has been added, running parallel to the classical course, extending through the same term of four years, and embracing the same number of classes with the same designations.30

Expressing sentiments which Ezra Cornell was later to make famous, Tappan announced that it was his purpose to structure the University so as "to make it possible for every student to study what he pleases, and to any extent he pleases."31

When Tappan began his duties at Michigan, the University could claim only a Department of Literature, Science and the Arts with six professors and fifty-seven students and a Department of Medicine and Surgery consisting of five professors and a hundred and fifty-seven students. In addition to introducing a course of study leading to the Bachelor of Science degree, Tappan caused provision to be made for courses in civil engineering, and by 1860 degrees were being awarded in that field. Under his guidance, Michigan became the first university to offer courses to special students who desired collegiate study but who did not plan to receive a degree.32 Tappan's hope of developing departments of military science and agriculture were not realized because of legislative objection on financial grounds, but he was able to strengthen the Medical School and to bring about the opening of the Law School in 1859. The germ of what was to become the Graduate School


32 Ibid., p. 47.
during Angell's administration was announced as the "university course" in the catalog of 1853-54. Although loosely structured for many years, advanced degrees upon examination were granted in 1859. Tappan was practical enough to realize that the collegiate course "with its schoolmaster methods and discipline" had to be retained for a time, but his aim was eventually to transfer preparatory work to the high school, thus gradually securing for the University "true university methods, free and manly habits of study and investigation." To this end courses were added and strengthened, capable professors were sought, library holdings were increased, an astronomical observatory was erected, and museum collections were expanded.

As noted, Tappan was an early advocate of the policy of student self-reliance and self-responsibility. Partly on these grounds, but more especially because he wanted to allocate scarce funds more wisely, one of Tappan's early moves at Michigan was the abolition of the dormitory system. In his inaugural address he gave an indication of things to come when he said: "In erecting Colleges we have uniformly begun with two things--the erection of dormitories and a commencement Exhibition: As if sleeping in cloisters, reciting poems and orations in public, and the conferring of degrees were essential to the Educational System." For Tappan, no doubt, it were reason enough to do away with

---


34 Shaw, p. 47.

35 Henry P. Tappan, A Discourse Delivered by Henry Philip Tappan at Ann Arbor, Michigan, on the Occasion of His Inauguration as Chancellor of the University of Michigan, December 21, 1852 (Detroit: Advertiser Power Presses, 1852), pp. 31-32.
such appendages merely on the grounds that they were not native to the Prussian way of doing things. "In Prussia they care of the great things and let the small things take care of themselves," he informed the Michiganites. "In Prussia the great aim is to provide libraries, museums, laboratories, observatories, and philosophical apparatus and a sufficient number of eminent professors." There could be but one solution to Tappan: "Why not let young men provide their own broad and lodging? Our colleges are not located in the wilderness, but in pleasant towns where accommodations are abundant." In his Report the following year, Tappan, further endeavored to show dormitories objectionable on two counts: moral and economic. He informed the Regents:

The dormitory system is objectionable in itself. By withdrawing young men from the influence of domestic circles and forming them into a separate community, they are often led to contract evil habits, and are prone to fall into disorderly conduct. The difficulties of maintaining a proper discipline are thus greatly increased. It is a mere remnant of the middle ages, still retained in England indeed, but banished from the Universities of Germany. Besides it is a very expensive system, to maintain which many American colleges have impoverished themselves. It is better to expend our funds for books, and apparatus, and for providing a full corps of professors, and to leave the students the responsibility of providing themselves with board and lodging. . . .

Tappan was thus able to rid Michigan of dormitories in 1856, and it was not until after Angell's retirement that the University reverted to its earlier policy of providing room and board for its students.

36 Ibid., p. 32.

37 Henry P. Tappan, Report to the Board of Regents of the University of Michigan, November 15, 1853 (Ann Arbor: Cole and Gardiner, Printers, 1853), p. 12.

38 See the articles by Peter A. Ostafin and Ruth Gjelsness on "Housing" in Encyclopedic Survey, IX, pp. 1786-1797. See also John Edward Shay, Jr., "Residence Halls in the Age of the University: Their Development at Harvard and Michigan, 1850-1930" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School, University of Michigan, 1966.)
As a state university, Michigan had been chartered as a non-sectarian institution, but as spokesmen of the University were fond of pointing out, this fact did not imply that it was not a Christian institution. Tappan himself held that religion played a vital role in education at the executive as well as the preparatory level. Tappan asserted that religion "emphatically forms character and character is the great end of education."\(^{39}\) He informed the Michigan Legislature that "I wish it understood that under this idea of education I comprehend moral and religious cultivation also, for Morals and Religion imply a certain use of our faculties under clear perceptions of duty."\(^{40}\)

Although Tappan was opposed to compulsion and indoctrination, he encouraged student religious societies and, in general, tried to maintain a religious atmosphere in the University.\(^{41}\) At the same time, he accepted as legitimate the rules which required attendance of students at morning and evening prayers and at Sunday services. Thus, the forced attendance of students at religious services which pre-dated Tappan's administration continued into Angell's term of office.\(^{42}\) The only deliberate change Tappan introduced in this procedure was the moving back of the morning prayer hour to seven forty-five from the earlier

---


\(^{40}\)Tappan, Public Education . . . , p. 10.

\(^{41}\)Wilbee, pp. 79-80.

time of five-thirty in the fall and spring and six-thirty in the winter. Having done away with dormitories, Tappan altered the hour as a concession to those who now had to walk some distance to the campus. Further relaxation of the rules resulted when students who had no early morning or late evening classes were excused from the chapel services. Poor attendance at the evening services led to their discontinuation, but morning services remained. Another abridgment of the compulsory attendance policy occurred in 1861 when, for lack of room, students in the departments of law and medicine were allowed to attend on a voluntary basis. Justifying his position on the grounds that the university was still engaged in preparatory work, Tappan made no real attempt to abolish compulsory chapel for the majority of undergraduates, however.

Since the 1840s, it had been the policy of the Regents to keep peace among the leading denominations of the state by balancing faculty appointments among them. Thus, when the need to appoint a professor of Latin arose in 1852, Tappan was informed that a Methodist should get the position. Erastus O. Haven qualified as a Latin scholar as well as a Methodist, and was duly awarded the post. This, however, was Tappan's first and last compromise with this policy. Denominational appointments, he held, are "both wrong in principle and productive of endless embarrassment." He assaulted the practice in a speech before the Christian Library Association in 1858, and in his "Review" written in the fall

---

44 Wilbee, pp. 110-111.
45 Tappan, The University, Its Constitution and Its Relations, Political and Religious.
of 1863 he summarized his main objections in a statement that Perry asserts might well be accepted as the University's Bill of Rights:

The University of Michigan is neither religious nor political in its character, but purely scientific and literary. It has no Theological Department. The constitution recognizes, in its organization, no religious denomination, and no political party. . . . It belongs not to political parties and religious sects as a field in which they may carry on their conflicts for predominance. It belongs simply to the people as the people, and to all the people, whether they belong to political parties or to none; whether they belong to religious sects or have no religious connections. Lying within the bosom of a Christian community, it, by no means, proclaims itself independent of Christian influences; but it courts these influences only as all educational institutions of the State, as State institutions generally court them—under those views and sentiments which are generally recognized, and which are not subject to fierce religious controversy. There is really no safe guide in the appointment of professors save the qualifications of the candidate.

So strongly did Tappan feel that the University should be free from political and ecclesiastical entanglements that he consciously avoided "all appearance of denominational partiality" and claimed never to have even cast a vote at any election. Although he was a clergyman of the Dutch Reformed Church and was affiliated with the Presbyterian Church in Ann Arbor, he attended other churches almost as frequently as his own. While the Baptists and Episcopalians welcomed him to their services, the Presbyterians were disturbed at Tappan's lack of loyalty. As happened frequently during his stay in Ann Arbor, an attempt to reconcile one group often led to hostility from another.

---
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49 See Ten Brook, p. 237 and Shaw, p. 53.
Tappan's faith in reason and his tolerance in religious matters led him on one occasion to accept a student at Michigan who had been expelled from a college in a neighboring state for displaying an unorthodox attitude toward religious dogmas. After listening to the student intently and drawing him out so as to gain some insight into the character of the young man, Tappan good-naturedly informed him: "I don't think you will do our students any harm, and I hope they may be able to convince you of the error of your views; you may be admitted to the University." There were, of course, many in Michigan who felt that just this sort of attitude was destroying the moral fiber of the University; Tappan was frequently criticized for what seemed to others to be a lax disciplinary policy. In the year 1857 two separate Methodist conferences passed resolutions expressing their concern over the lack of Christian influence and moral guidance in the University.

Conflict from within and without the University marked Tappan's administration. In general, the President was able to remain on cordial terms with the students, many of whom came to his defense when in 1863 he was abruptly and without warning relieved of his duties. Tappan's efforts at reform naturally caused resentment in some quarters, but more central to his difficulties was his aristocratic personality. His fine physique and stately, haughty bearing caused awe and admiration on the part of students, but the reaction of those whose friendship and cooperation it was essential to cultivate was more often than not unsympathetic.


51 See Ten Brook, pp. 223-224.
bitterly negative. Reflecting on the aristocratic element in Tappan's personality, Ten Brook explained:

This need not appear in his intercourse with students, for they were so evidently below him in place, that nothing in his manner toward them could be interpreted as an acknowledgement of equality. The general fact was much the same in regard to his intercourse with the public, whether on the platform or in social life; he felt himself in no danger from insuing into it all that kindliness which is so grateful when coming from an acknowledged superior, and which it was doubtless too, in his nature to show. He was paternal in his feelings and conduct, and would have been a kind father to all mankind; but he was deemed by many to lack the elements of a brother—an equal.52

Tappan's manner of noblesse oblige was less well received by some members of the faculty, regents, and state legislature, however. By virtue of his office, his natural ability and attainments, and in his own estimation, Tappan was their superior, and, as Ten Brook noted, "his manner was understood as a claim that his superiority must be acknowledged."53 Mrs. Tappan did little to enhance the chances of their acceptance when wide circulation was given to her alleged comment that she and Dr. Tappan considered themselves as "missionaries to the West."54

Opposition to Tappan the man and the President came from many different quarters and was expressed in numerous ways. Wilbur F. Storey, editor of the Detroit Free Press, came to the fore as one of his earliest and most searing critics, and the tone and nature of his barbs


53Ten Brook, p. 234.

serve well to indicate the gap separating Tappan from the Michigan populace. Storey pounced on Tappan's preference for the title of "Chancellor" rather than "President," and warned the "Prussianized professor" in the pages of the Free Press that "he had better drop that, if he ever expects to succeed in his office." To Storey, the title of Chancellor "is an assumption alike unwarrantable, ridiculous, and contemptible. It betrays a weakness and a vanity that is inexcusable."\(^{55}\) The next day Storey noted that what Tappan could not understand was what Michiganders had "just as much respect for a man who has not been 'absent in Europe' as for one who has,"\(^{56}\) and a few days following the editor further observed that Tappan seemed "to be in danger of forgetting that Michigan is not Prussia, and Ann Arbor not Berlin."\(^{57}\) The Lansing Journal was among more than a score of other papers in the state that picked up the theme, and in July, 1854, it announced: "Of all the imitations of English aristocracy, German mysticism, Prussian imperiousness, and Parisian nonsensities, he is altogether the most un-Americanized—the most completely foreignized specimen of an abnormal Yankee, we have ever seen."\(^{58}\) The strongest if not the last word must be credited to Storey, however, who asserted that Tappan's continued

\(^{55}\)Detroit Free Press, December 24, 1853, as cited in Perry, p. 199.

\(^{56}\)Detroit Free Press, December 25, 1853, in ibid., p. 200.

\(^{57}\)Detroit Free Press, December 28, 1853, in ibid.

use of the Chancellor's title showed him up "as a thorough and un-
mitigated ass." 59

With the election of a new slate of Regents in 1858, Tappan's critics were increasingly able to limit his powers and thereby his attempts at continued reform. Years of antagonism and turmoil came to a head following the commencement proceedings in 1863 when the Board with one abstention and no negative votes passed a resolution calling for Tappan's resignation. 60 Rejected and bitter, Tappan journeyed to Switzerland where he spent his remaining years, able to participate in Michigan's gradual fulfillment of many of his plans only vicariously. For, although the Prussianized professor was removed from the scene, many of his ideas remained imbedded in the framework of the University.

59Detroit Free Press, January 31, 1854, in ibid.

APPENDIX D

THREE LETTERS TO JAMES B. ANGELL

The three letters which follow have been selected as illustrative of the paternalistic tendencies of James B. Angell's Administration at Michigan. The first letter, a response to an earlier one from Angell, expresses rather movingly the concern of a parent for his son's conduct and indicates as well Angell's diligence. The second and third letters, from a different correspondent, reinforce these particulars while showing also Angell's determination to enforce University regulations.

February 16, 1874

Prof. J. B. Angell

Sir Your welcome note was eagerly pursued by anxious parent. Though it brought news that grieved us we are thankful it was nothing worse. If you Teachers only knew the Solicitude of Parents that send their Sons and daughters from home to qualify them for the care and duties of life You must feel the responsibility is great And perhaps you get hundreds of letters making similar requests to mine (Excuse us) We do wish you would at all times when practicable use your best means and influence to instill in his mind those qualities that make the man in the true sense of the term. We know your reputation and feel that you might help to form those principles so needed for the profession he intends to follow. Do excuse a fond parents anxiety if we have trespassed.

We were glad to hear that he does not neglect his studies when there but do not understand if placing him back in the calendar also

---

James B. Angell Papers, Michigan Historical Collections, Rackham Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
places him back of the Junior Class in the Sophmores'. With the
kindest consideration you have our best respects

Yours truly
(signed)

January 2, 1874

J. B. Angell Prest
Ann Arbor Mich.

D Sr

Your esteemed favor of the 26th inst reached me as I was leaving
home for this point two days ago, and I embrace the earliest leisure for
a reply. The information you give me as to the conduct & habits of my
Son, has caused me much pain and Solicitude. I have feared for some
time past that he was falling into bad habits from the amount of money
he was spending and from other reasons, that it is unnecessary here to
detail.

I thank you for having writen to me on this subject and the kind
tone of your letter.

I hope as you say that "he has not gone far astray, though head­
ing in the wrong direction.

I will write to him to night on the subject and hope with your
assistance to reclaim him. I bespeak a continuance of your good
offices in this direction.

Should there be no improvement in his habits and in his attend­
ance at class and progress in his studies by the end of this month, it
may be best for me to withdraw him from the University and try and see
if new associations may not be the best remedy for his reformation.

I shall be especially gratified to hear from you in relation to
my Son and hope our Joint efforts may inspire him with an ambition &
resolution to redeem himself.

Please accept my thanks for your kind letter and again request a
continuance of your good offices in behalf of my erring boy.

Gratefully & resply yours
(signed)
J. B. Angell Prest
Ann Arbor Mich

D Sr

I have your painful but considerate letter of the 19th inst asking me to recall my Son from the University.

I had hoped from a letter I received from him a day or two before yours that he intended to make an honest effort to right up, but with the habits he has contracted during the last session & the influences that he has surrounded himself with, it will be very difficult to do so.

I have written him by this mail to return home at once.

Thanking you for your efforts in behalf of my son & your kind expressions to me in communicating the unwelcome results I am

Very resply yours
(signed)
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