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SECTION ONE

THE STUDY AND TEACHING OF HISTORY PRIOR TO THE FOUNDING

OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
Colonial Beginnings

While interest in history is not constant, an awareness of its existence is as old as man's cognizance of himself. Works describing early explorations of this continent are the first known historical accounts of America. The Norse saga of Eric the Red was oral history prior to the invention of printing. After Columbus' voyages, Hakluyt and Peter Martyr were quick to record and publish these adventures. With the settlement of British North America, writings appeared discussing how to reach the New World and cataloguing purported treasures. Works such as these were solely descriptive narratives containing little or no analysis and few attempts to place information into any perspective. The Italian philosopher Giambatista Vico (1668-1744) looked with disfavor upon such writings and was the articulate representative of a group of scholars determined to transform history into a serious discipline. These men challenged historians to describe the essence of a society, to evaluate the totality of man's progress or lack of it and to formulate a scientific method for discovering the truth, a philosophy which inspired the founding of German seminars in the early nineteenth century and also their American counterparts some fifty years later.

American historians found the road to respectability especially long and hazardous and the journey far from complete in 1884. The long dominance of the English philosophy of education proved a
considerable obstacle as its curriculum stressed an unalterable bill of fare and made no provision for the study of history. Such institutions, despite their narrowness, educated a high percentage of America's Revolutionary War leadership and thus established themselves as vital to this nation's development. Consequently the existing colleges, unlike most institutions identified with the old British administration, emerged from the war intact.

Academic freedom was virtually unknown in the colonial period. Harvard's President Mather demanded tutors teach as he directed and in 1697 accepted the resignation of two who refused. The Revolutionary War resulted in numerous dismissals since a considerable part of the professors were pro Tory and consequently unable to take the loyalty oaths required in colonial controlled areas. Such purges continued regularly during the next two centuries of American higher education causing one authority to conclude:

... the evidence available shows no sign that anything quite like modern notions of intellectual freedom had yet been formulated. ... the only appeal was to the correctness of the individual's deviant opinion, not his right to have one.²

History as we know it was probably never taught in the colonial era. King's College, renamed Columbia following the Revolution, advertised the subject as part of the curriculum but no one is known to have taught it. History courses began appearing with some frequency after America's independence when identification with England's heritage weakened and the necessity of creating a national identity became
paramount. The war itself provided a convenient framework for describing the new nation and served as a major theme in historical writing for over a century. With few exceptions the conflict was portrayed as a great moral crusade conducted by persons of justice, sobriety and purity against a mad king and his unsavory henchmen. This type of history, although extremely popular, was neither scholarly nor professional. Amateurs like George Bancroft, Washington Irving and John Lothrop Motley dominated the discipline due to a belief that history could be mastered without specialized graduate training. Despite an increasing number of college and university courses the subject continued to be regarded as an interesting hobby roughly equivalent to philately.

Undergraduate Education in America Prior to 1884

An unusual exception to the rule was history taught at South Carolina by Francis Lieber beginning in the mid 1830's. A man who arrived in this country to direct a Boston athletic club, Lieber was soon enamored with America and became determined to utilize his German training to study and teach its history. This dynamic lecturer and thorough scholar spared no pains to make each class as interesting as possible. At a time when nearly every other history teacher instructed by rote recitation from a text, Lieber was lecturing and utilizing a wide variety of teaching aids including extensive bibliographies of
suggested readings which accompanied each lecture. Despite being underpaid and overworked at South Carolina, Lieber refused a succession of European offers including a particularly attractive one from Berlin because he wished to remain in America.

Although Lieber's course was probably the best in America during the twenty years he remained at South Carolina, other examples of quality instruction can be cited. From 1784 to 1795 Reverend John Gross of Columbia taught sophomores "A Description of the Globe in Respect of all General Matters" concentrating on ancient history and geography and concluding with an analysis of the present, a course praised by Herbert Baxter Adams as outstanding and unique for this early period. The subject was then abandoned at Columbia until 1817 when Reverend John McVickar began teaching American history, European history and political science with considerable success. Both he and his contemporary Francis Bowen of Harvard employed the lecture method while concentrating upon stimulating student enthusiasm and disavowing the prevailing practice of learning through rote memorization.

Another Columbia pioneer was Charles Anthon who taught Greek and Roman history from 1820 until his death in 1876. A man who exerted a nationwide influence in his field while exemplifying the highest standards of teaching excellence, Anthon wielded considerable power and was instrumental in convincing President Charles King to seek an American historian for Columbia. The resulting search culminated in the hiring of Francis Lieber who joined the staff in 1857 following three years of negotiations and only after obtaining an eleven hour rather than the standard twenty hour teaching load, an exemption from
instructing freshmen and one of the highest salaries then paid an American professor. Lieber's hard bargaining had won him an American position comparable in salary and working conditions to his European offers and also established a valuable precedent for other universities seeking to attract top men.

History was introduced at the University of Pennsylvania by a Professor Cooper who taught first at Dickinson College and then at the University of Pennsylvania during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. The trustees were exceedingly progressive at that time and suggested several innovations including a graduate school and a chair of history. As funds could not be found to finance this new chair the post remained unfilled until 1849 when alumnus William B. Reed delivered a speech on the necessity of adding history to the curriculum, and the trustees responded by electing him professor of American history at no salary. Reed accepted this challenge and became an enthusiastic and effective teacher of a variety of courses until being appointed United States Minister to China in 1854.

By the early 1820's Harvard was locked in the grip of hidebound conservatism despite the combined efforts of several faculty members and overseers to move the school closer to continental institutions. A student riot in 1823 sparked a series of reforms which included authorizing the faculty to alter the course of study, provided students were consulted regarding these changes, thus freeing Harvard from the tyranny of a lock step curriculum. Consequently it became possible in 1839 to establish the McLean Professorship of Ancient and Modern History and to name Jared Sparks as the initial incumbent of America's
first separate history chair. This promising beginning proved unfortu-
nately brief as Sparks became increasingly concerned with adminis-
trative duties and later accepted the Harvard presidency. Soon there-
after Francis Bowen abandoned his history courses in order to accept
the chairmanship of the philosophy department. Times apparently were
not ripe for teaching history at Harvard despite the existence of the
McLean Chair whose occupants excluding Sparks were undistinguished un-
til well into the nineteenth century.

Thomas Jefferson's University of Virginia included a radically
modern curriculum which by 1825 featured a freer and more extensive
system of electives than Eliot's Harvard in 1875. This remarkable de-
velopment rendered Virginia virtually unique in an era when American
colleges and universities rarely offered electives, and a student gen-
erally obtained a diploma by taking the entire curriculum of a given
school. Jefferson's wish to hire a professor of history and English
was thwarted by an unavailability of candidates, and it was seven years
before George Tucker was elected to the position. Virginia's founder
was especially determined that his university be free from the sectar-
ian influences which had convulsed and crippled American institutions
since colonial days, and he succeeded so thoroughly that no school nor
professorship of divinity was established.

After Jefferson's death, however, conservative elements reas-
serted themselves by launching crusades against wayward elements of
the faculty an example of which was a purge of "wine bibers" in the mid
1840's resulting in several dismissals. This conservative counterat-
tack reflected the national mood from 1820 to 1870, a period
characterized as the triumph of reaction at the expense of previously inaugurated reforms:

... the reformers were so successfully routed that for almost fifty years the American college was necessarily put beyond the sympathy and understanding of the American people. Stagnation rather than dynamism became the order of the day. Self-satisfaction overtook the American college... The college year was not lengthened nor was the range of subjects narrowed. Instead, everything became more and more superficial, more and more a matter of daily recitations on elementary material, more and more deadly and deadening.6

Indeed 1850 to 1870 probably marked the nadir of American higher education. People called historians thought in terms of national and racial stereotypes, showed contempt for non-Protestant religions and portrayed Americans as chosen people under God's direct patronage. Those few undertaking research in the modern sense were branded heretics by their colleagues who believed that the truth had already been discovered. The teacher's mission therefore was to discipline students' minds to accept large undigested masses of information and then to furnish those minds with timeless truths by constant repetition. As a consequence students were receptacles and teachers dispensers who poured measured doses from textbooks via the recitation method.

Historians writing for popular consumption echoed this philosophy to the extent that footnotes were seldom used save to substantiate what was already believed, and known facts were frequently ignored in order to square narratives with popular legend or to make a more readable story. Jared Sparks, despite his German Ph.D., saw nothing wrong with editing quotes of George Washington in order to improve grammar, spelling and composition. Historians of the mid nineteenth century were
frequently as arrogant as they were inaccurate and generally judged other nations and civilizations by current American standards:

The historian must not suffer himself to be bullied by kings and empires and not deny his conviction that he is the court... If England or Egypt have anything to say to him he will try the case, if not let them forever be silent.7

American higher education was further weakened by the proliferation of small sectarian colleges resulting in a shameless scramble for students and fueling the tendency to charge such low tuitions that realistic maintenance of these institutions was impossible. State schools were considered unfair competition for available students, and ministers often considered it their duty to denounce them from the pulpit. Any deviations from the standard curricula were ruthlessly attacked by denominational interests who lacked the resources to innovate and were left with little option but to attack progressive institutions.

Even during this retrogressive era there were critics challenging the status quo by depicting the shocking contrast between American and continental institutions. Following his dismissal from New York University in 1838, Henry Tappan became one of the most persistent and articulate of these critics. His assessment of American higher education and his crusade to establish a great university in New York City as well as his hopes for this institution are all candidly outlined in University Education published in 1851:

We have greatly enlarged the number of our colleges to one hundred and twenty... We have enlarged greatly the number of college studies. We have cheapened education—we have reduced it in cost—we have even given it away... And yet,... we have lowered rather than elevated the character of our scholarship.8
Dr. Tappan requested $450,000 to establish a great university, but contributions to higher education were not yet fashionable, and Tappan's abrasive personality frequently alienated the very people he wished to impress.

Meanwhile the struggling, remote and faction-ridden University of Michigan was seeking an administrator willing to live beyond the periphery of civilization and become its first full-time president. Easterners, who then made little distinction between Ann Arbor and Borneo, were quick to recommend Tappan for the post which was offered him in 1852, despite rumors that he had once consulted a homeopathic physician and was definitely known to drink wine.

Although Tappan was partial to New York City and was invited to reclaim his old chair at New York University, he accepted the offer with the zeal of a missionary bent on converting the heathen, and spent part of his first day in office penning a futile request for a library building and the funds to stock it adequately. Although the regents had recently ordered that all history courses be abandoned, Tappan ignored this mandate and hired Andrew Dickson White as a history specialist. The president also ended by fiat the prevailing policy of dividing appointments equally between Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist and Episcopal ministers, declaring that 'there is no safe guide in the appointment of professors save in the qualifications of the candidate,' a statement considered radical in 1900 and positively heretical in 1852.

Professor White, quite possibly the best teacher and scholar Tappan ever hired, fulfilled the president's desire for an outstanding
history program. An idealist who had spurned a Yale offer largely because he opposed the recitation method, White chose to work where he could develop his own teaching style while following the leadership of a president he admired. Endowed with a keen appreciation of the abilities and needs of his students, White met them outside the classroom by sponsoring fortnightly meetings at his home after which he invited "the more attractive young women of the city" to join his students for a social hour. This teacher's sensitivity enabled him to recognize latent genius in a shy, plodding student so ignorant of the most elementary social graces that his peers dubbed him "farmer Adams."

Charles Kendall Adams would soon be professor of history at Michigan and later president of Cornell and the University of Wisconsin.

Tappan was characteristically a difficult man to deal with, and this tendency coupled with his radical educational policies along with his repeated embroilment in petty faculty feuds led to his dismissal and decision to retire to Switzerland in 1863. Despite the president's personal drawbacks he was exceedingly effective with students and unusually persuasive in convincing them to enter politics and see to it that the university was handsomely supported. Students followed his advice and within two decades were in firm control of the state legislature and thoroughly committed to making Michigan a world renowned institution. As early as 1866 F. W. Hedge described this university as the model which all schools should emulate:

In twenty-five years, in a country five hundred miles from the seaboard,—a country which fifty years ago was known only to the fur trade,—a university has sprung up, to which students flock from all parts of the land, and which offers to thousands, free of expense, the best
education this continent affords. Such is the difference between public and private patronage, between individual effort and the action of the state.10

Hedge then contrasted Michigan with Harvard, the latter being described as "certainly no university" where the recitation method reigned supreme, the curriculum was inflexible and the quality of instruction hardly better than the public high schools. President Eliot would not arrive until 1869, and conservatism was the watchword.

Although history as we know it was rarely taught prior to 1884 there was considerable amateur interest in the discipline both on and off the campus. College students seeking to remedy what the curriculum lacked, often took the initiative in forming debating clubs and literary societies and occasionally building up reference collections surpassing their respective college libraries in number of volumes. Such efforts were often continued by students after they had graduated and returned home to participate in the founding and expansion of historical societies throughout the country of which there were over 100 by 1860. These societies became extremely popular organizations frequently containing prominent citizens and enjoying sizeable incomes used for the acquisition and care of documents, the publication of historical works and occasionally the production of a scholarly journal. In addition, some of these bodies including Lyman Draper's Wisconsin Historical Society proved invaluable to nearby universities.11

Occasionally too many such organizations would be founded in a given state thus spreading resources too thin and precipitating cutthroat competition for members. Ohio was such a state, and by 1887 its
citizens groaned under the weight of appeals from four separate organizations.

Civil wars often precipitate a national reassessment, and America proved no exception. Citizens from both sections of the republic labored to reinterpret its heritage and discover a method of binding the nation's wounds. Popular enthusiasm for history quickened and was further accelerated by the American Centennial occurring in 1876. As was true in the past much of this interest was rooted in the public's desire to document what was already believed. Consequently a ready market existed for any author who glorified the union cause, but it was virtually impossible to publish and sell a balanced interpretation of our history.

This national reassessment extended to American educational institutions which an ever increasing number of individuals felt were totally inadequate. Beginning in 1848 Vermont Congressman Justin Smith Morrill advocated introducing electives and courses of practical value as a supplement and possible replacement for the classical curriculum. After failing to convince existing institutions of the merit of such reforms Morrill began in 1857 drafting and introducing legislation in an attempt to found Land-Grant institutions and aided in passing the Morrill Act in 1862 which stressed "education for the industrial classes" rather than the traditional curricula which was designed almost exclusively for future ministers and lawyers. This act provided for one university and in each state to be financed by the sale of government land. Ohio, for example, received 630,000 acres to be sold on behalf of the proposed Ohio State University.
The Morrill Act's educational philosophy was to prove far more important than the money it provided. As was typical in most states, Ohio's 630,000 acres were sold immediately on a glutted market, and an average of 54¢ per acre being realized. It consequently became necessary for individual states to assume ever increasing obligations to support these institutions, and this was possible only because of public enthusiasm for Land-Grant schools. Americans increasingly believed that education was the golden road which they and their children must travel to obtain their share of the national wealth, and students increasingly considered themselves the future leaders. The very first issue of Ohio State's newspaper the Lantern reflects this intense popular optimism, a philosophy recognized as bigotry today, but which nevertheless served as one of the mightiest engines powering the nation's development:

Paganism, mohometanism, Catholicism have each flourished and each has contributed its mite to the more civilizing, liberal, and cultured Protestantism. . . . We represent the flower of the race.12

This intense enthusiasm for America was rooted in more than mere rhetoric. While real per capita incomes rose, middle class employment opportunities expanded and princely fortunes were accumulated. Johns Hopkins, one of many railroad millionaires, was first in a series of prominent industrialists donating considerable sums to found new institutions or improve existing ones. Although Henry Tappan had found the times unfavorable for establishing a quality private university, twenty five years later Daniel Gilman was offered precisely this opportunity when in 1876 the Hopkins fortune was willed to build a new
university. Like Tappan, Gilman had accepted the presidency of a remote state institution, the University of California, and as was true of Michigan's distinguished president, Gilman had experienced continual attacks from agriculturalists desiring mechanical arts, from religious figures lamenting the nonsectarian nature of the institution and from hostile legislators searching for financial and moral corruption. Unlike Tappan, however, Gilman now received the chance to create a new institution, an opportunity he seized with gusto. In addition to being a master administrator Gilman was dedicated to graduate education and interested in history as evidenced by an address he delivered in 1876 at the official opening of Hopkins:

"History and political science has come to the front and it is no longer enough to learn from a text-book long lists of names and dates; reference must be made to original sources of information, ... many books must be consulted in order to understand the progress of human society."

Gilman's genius coupled with enlightened trustees and a distinguished faculty resulted in the creation of the environment, the salaries and the facilities necessary to realize Tappan's dream for America. Even more important the Hopkins spirit influenced other institutions including Harvard which was then convulsed in feuds and controversies questioning Eliot's right to remain in office. Although this champion of the elective system had assumed Harvard's presidency in 1869 intending to overhaul the institution completely, Eliot made little progress towards his goal until the example of Hopkins vividly pointed out the merits of what he was seeking to accomplish. Far from considering Gilman an opponent or even a competitor, Eliot repeatedly
acknowledged a debt to the Baltimore institution which had instantly set the standard for American graduate education. Eliot also evinced an interest in history which he demonstrated in a more tangible fashion than did Gilman by gradually expanding his faculty in this discipline as qualified instructors became available. History at Hopkins, on the other hand, remained a one man department despite Herbert Baxter Adams' strident attempts to enlarge his staff.

With the appointment of Frederick Barnard to Columbia's presidency in 1864, the school's early promise faded considerably. A staunch advocate of instruction by rote, the new president objected strenuously to classroom lectures, charged Francis Lieber with teaching courses of 'very little educational benefit,' and in 1865 succeeded in transferring him to the school of law. Consequently from 1865 to 1876 Columbia's history instruction was entrusted to Dr. Quackenbas who taught his students by having them stand at the blackboard writing down names and dates throughout the class period.

In 1877 Columbia's chair of history was revived, this time in conjunction with political science, and Amherst professor John W. Burgess was hired to fill it. While at Amherst Burgess had attempted to depart from the classical framework by introducing electives and establishing graduate courses in history and political science. Although not fired from his position, Burgess endured continual harassment from his colleagues who questioned the value of research, maintaining that the truth had already been found. At Columbia Burgess established himself as the dynamic teacher who inspired many students to study under Droysen in Berlin as well as an effective chairman.
capable of eliminating the recitation courses in his department. Burgess also gained the confidence of university administrators permitting him to hire additional staff members beginning in 1877 and in 1881 to open the School of Political Science specializing in graduate instruction.

Burgess was not the only chairman demonstrating the ability to enlarge history offerings. Wisconsin's William Frederick Allen managed over the course of a long career to become exclusively a history specialist and in 1880 succeeded in making his university the first known to require American history of all students. While conducting no seminars in the formal sense Allen encouraged his juniors and seniors to do "laboratory work" on special topics in Wisconsin history. In addition the 1860's and 1870's witnessed successful faculty efforts to upgrade the school's standards and to establish liberal definitions of tenure and academic freedom. Also by defining themselves as employees of the university instead of the regents, professors gained protection from arbitrary dismissals and the withholding of salary payments. The faculty was also responsible for thwarting denominational interests seeking a share of the proceeds from land sold under the Morrill Act.

Land-Grant institutions demonstrated particular interest in history due to popular enthusiasm for the subject coupled with a widespread belief that it was of value in training citizens. Despite legislative resolutions that the school confine itself to horticulture, agriculture and the mechanical arts, history courses appeared in 1870 during Illinois' second year of operation although initial enrollments
were small, and the classes taught by professors specializing in other areas. As the weekly teaching load averaged nineteen hours during the university's first decade, history was probably taught by the recitation method. This situation changed in 1881 with the appointment of James C. Crawford as professor of history and librarian by President John M. Gregory who during thirteen years in office sought to improve salaries, to lessen the workloads of his professors and to introduce more liberal arts courses. A stimulating lecturer who rejected the recitation system and encouraged students to pursue individually designed research projects, Crawford was 40 years ahead of his time in emphasizing social and cultural history.

Ohio State University, like its counterpart in Illinois, had no history specialist during its early years and according to the 1875 Annual Report simply divided these courses among existing faculty members:

No department of history has yet been established, but temporary provision has been made for giving elementary instruction in it within the limits of the present Faculty. The President gives instruction in General History, the Professor of Modern Languages furnishes a resume of French and German history and the Professor of Latin teaches in his classes Grecian and Roman History.1

It is likely that history instruction at Ohio was undistinguished prior to 1879 since there was no specialist in the discipline, and faculty members carried exceedingly heavy schedules. President Edward Orton, for example, taught seven courses a year while acting as state geologist and performing executive duties. Joseph Millikin, professor of English and modern languages, taught thirty five class hours per week while also serving as librarian. Such heavy teaching schedules were
partly attributable to the professors themselves who frequently taught additional courses without compensation and often divided larger classes into smaller components for more effective instruction.

A determined search for a trained historian culminated in 1879 when John T. Short was appointed assistant professor of history and philosophy. A Leipsig Ph.D. who proved a popular and dynamic lecturer as well as an excellent scholar, Short was promoted to full professor at triple his former salary after but one year of service. Although teaching no seminars, he instructed in a manner similar to Wisconsin's William Frederick Allen by supervising the preparation of undergraduate theses from a selected list of topics designed to familiarize students with university, state and city library resources.

By the time Ohio State's history professor was 31 in 1881 he was corresponding with Daniel Gilman, George Bancroft, Herbert B. Adams and others concerning a proposed journal of history and political science, and in December of that year suggested to Adams that such a publication be sponsored by Johns Hopkins:

Your esteemed favor of the 5th inst. interests me greatly. I believe you are on the right track. . . . I sincerely trust that you may speedily accomplish your project for the Anglo-American journal, under the editorship of Green;15 and will add that you must allow me to enlarge your plan to the extent of insisting that you become the American editor. This I can do, and shall take occasion to do in the most efficient way of which I am capable, by writing to our English friends and to the publishers when the proper time arrives.

Please then, my dear Sir, go forward without delay, and inform me of what I can do to further your excellent plan.16
Short's leadership of Ohio's history program ended suddenly and tragically by death from a cold which worsened into pneumonia in 1882. Shocked grief was expressed by students, faculty, trustees, administrators and Dr. Washington Gladden who preached in his honor a memorial sermon later published by the university.

Following Short's death the trustees considered themselves extremely fortunate to secure Ohio University professor Cynthia V. Weld in mid year. Taking the place of a revered teacher is seldom easy, and Weld also faced discrimination because of her sex and opposition due to her adherence to the recitation method. Students demanded her dismissal almost as soon as she arrived on campus, but the trustees retained her, feeling she deserved a fair trial and being somewhat embarrassed at having enticed her into such a predicament. Students viewed Weld's retention as a studied insult and responded by boycotting her courses and substantially reducing history enrollments. Consequently the future of this discipline was most uncertain on the eve of the founding of the American Historical Association.

Ohio State faced other problems some of which remained unresolved in 1884. The first president Edward Orton endured sectarian criticism coupled with a heated controversy between "broad gaugers" favoring a comprehensive curriculum and "narrow gaugers" desiring that offerings be limited to agricultural subjects. Orton opted for the former philosophy and allied himself with trustee Joseph Sullivant and Ohio State Journal editor James Comly to lead the fight for a "broad gauge" institution modeled after New York's Cornell University.
Trustee Norton Townsend led the agricultural forces aided by Springfield, Ohio's *Farm and Fireside* magazine. When the school finally opened in 1873, three years after its founding, the *Journal* exalted:

> The friends of this institution . . . have fallen naturally into two general divisions. . . the "narrow Gauge" people who look upon the college chiefly as a means for the development of bull calves, and . . . the "Broad Gauge" educators who advocate the establishment of an institution of learning upon the broadest and most liberal foundation. The Bull Calf People have struggled to make the College faculty a sort of asylum for decayed agriculturists . . . It is with unalloyed satisfaction that we announce the victory of the Broad Gauge idea and the selection of such a faculty as would honor any institution of learning in the country.¹⁷

Despite such optimistic pronouncements the controversy continued and even intensified when Norton Townsend resigned from the board, helped himself to the professorship of agriculture and continued his "narrow gauge" crusade from inside the institution. As a consequence the direction Ohio State would ultimately follow remained an unsettled issue.

By 1883 the University of Pennsylvania was overcoming many of the obstacles continuing to plague Ohio State and had succeeded in outbidding a number of first rank institutions to secure the services of John Bach McMaster, author of volume I of the best selling *History of the United States*. A quiet, withdrawn man with no graduate training, McMaster had sought to describe American life by emulating Thomas B. Macaulay's *History of England*. The first volume had been difficult. Saddled with an engineering instructorship at Princeton paying $350 per year and afflicted with such shyness that even librarians at historical societies where he worked were ignorant of his project,
publishers snubbed him repeatedly until Daniel Appleton personally read the manuscript and ordered its publication against the advice of his "experts." Although McMaster soon became the most famous history professor in the country he retained his withdrawn personality and never seriously considered leaving the University of Pennsylvania.

If Horatio Alger had chosen to describe a professor who "made it" despite incredible odds he might have selected McMaster who in the year he transferred from Princeton to Pennsylvania experienced an 800 percent increase in salary while his teaching load decreased from 35 to 9 hours per week and publishing royalties began pouring in. Like the vast majority of American and college university teachers, McMaster while at Princeton was locked into the recitation system, confronted with a poor campus library, hamstrung by a low salary coupled with a heavy teaching load and shackled with a myriad of required non-teaching duties. A John Bach McMaster appears perhaps once in a generation. It was simply unrealistic to expect aspiring historians to make the superhuman effort required to surmount such obstacles and achieve success in their profession. The rules of the game would have to be changed before college and university teaching could be considered an attractive occupation.

**Graduate Education in America Prior to 1884**

Just as some historians believe no history was taught prior to the founding of the American Historical Association in 1884, many educators maintain that American graduate education was nonexistent prior to Hopkins' founding in 1876. Without discounting the contribution of
this school, available evidence identifies its founding as the culmination of a long evolution as much as it was the beginning of a new era. Early graduate degrees were awarded by the English method and simply stipulated three years of residency beyond the B.A. with no course or grade point requirements. Standards were dubious; surviving records indicate a Harvard student with no B.A. received an A.M. simply by paying the necessary fees. Columbia (King's College) was also a pioneer in graduate education awarding its first A.M. in 1758.

Jefferson originally intended his University of Virginia to be the capstone of a state educational system and serve mainly as a graduate institution. Consequently beginning in 1833 the M.A. was granted to any student completing the university's entire curriculum. Graduate education was also of Congressional interest during this period and in 1835, the date of James Smithson's will, there was sentiment favoring the use of this money for a national university to be largely or exclusively a graduate institution.

The mid nineteenth century witnessed increasing interest in advanced instruction which gathered momentum until being seriously crippled by the Civil War. Western Reserve formulated a Ph.D. program in the late 1840's based on the German model, but financial difficulties and a severe academic feud rendered the program inoperative. In 1852 a Pennsylvania trustee Alonzo Potter proposed establishing a graduate school and also suggested that professors prepare themselves for offering advanced work in their specialities. The hail of criticism assail­ing this plan included Professor Henry Voethoke's assertion that a lack of employment opportunities for advanced degree holders made graduate
study unattractive in a nation stressing material success. Voethoke also believed that low teaching salaries caused such a rapid instructor turnover that professors could not be found possessing the qualifications necessary for offering advanced instruction.

In 1854 yet another trustee attempted to transform his college into a university. Columbia’s Samuel B. Ruggles, who was also interested in a proposed state university at Albany, hoped to secure funding for a graduate school by moving Columbia to the suburbs and then renting or selling the land on which it originally stood. Although Ruggles met such determined opposition that he decided to concentrate on the Albany project, by 1857 the process of moving had begun with provisions for graduate study in letters, science and law at the new location. As the department of jurisprudence also included advanced work in history and political science Francis Lieber was hired and began pressing immediately for a comprehensive program of scholarships and fellowships. Like Pennsylvania’s Henry Voethoke, Lieber believed American students should be awarded ample fellowships. The suggestion was ignored and true to Lieber’s prediction all advanced offerings except those of the law division were soon moribund.

President Tappan’s dedication to graduate instruction has already been mentioned. Upon arriving at Michigan in 1858 he expanded M.A. and M.S. requirements to include a year’s residence beyond the baccalaureate, examination before the faculty in at least three fields and presentation of an acceptable thesis. For a time these new requirements ran concurrently with the old thus giving students the option of earning the degree without postgraduate study. Following Tappan’s dismissal in
1863 and despite charges that the university was Germanic in spirit and hence un-American, graduate programs continued to increase in number and importance.

The University of the South opened at Sewanee, Tennessee in 1860 and included plans for America's most comprehensive graduate program complete with provisions for free living quarters and assistantships with cash stipends for advanced students. Yale adopted the Germanic Ph.D. the same year and in so doing launched America's first enduring program of systematic study for the degree.

Consequently enthusiasm for American graduate education was increasing although the number of programs was small, and serious obstacles continued, preventing the existence of universities in the best European tradition. First, lack of funds for higher education made professors' salaries and working conditions unacceptable to top flight men with professional credentials. Second, the American penchant for constructing buildings rarely applied to libraries with the result that meaningful research was impossible on most university campuses. Third, graduate students need financial support, and almost no money was made available for this purpose. Fourth, while a European Ph.D. opened the door to a wide variety of continental jobs, opportunities were few in America where many employers expressed open hostility towards the highly educated.

The American Civil War disrupted and even nearly destroyed universities but in the aftermath a renewed national identity, purpose and sense of greatness was urgently sought, and neither the English nor the French systems of higher education offered the systematic and
scientific study of history many considered necessary to reunite the nation. Consequently Americans emulated the German Confederation which beginning in the early nineteenth century had achieved a unity and pride in intellectual matters previously unobtainable by other means. The Germans had leaned heavily upon Giambatista Vico's advice to study history scientifically and thus remove it from the realm of sorcery. Although rejected by his contemporaries, Vico exerted a considerable influence upon the early German historians, particularly Leopold von Ranke who introduced the scientific study of human society by inaugurating the West's first historical seminar in 1825.

Americans began studying science and medicine in German graduate schools before the Revolution but students interested in history did not arrive before 1850. After 1865 the trickle of American students became a flood, and collectively they gained such a reputation for industry, intelligence and zeal that German professors often took them into their homes exhibiting a degree of hospitality seldom associated with Teutonic faculty members. Deep mutual respect developed between German historians and their Yankee understudies who often became giants of American education like Daniel Coit Gilman who would later return to Germany seeking Von Holst's advice and inviting him to lecture at the new Johns Hopkins University. Gilman of Hopkins, Eliot of Harvard, Tappan of Michigan, Burgess of Columbia and White of Cornell were all contemporary university presidents who succeeded to an astonishing degree in transplanting the Teutonic philosophy to American soil.

German trained faculty members also dominated the major universities. When Hopkins opened in 1876 nearly the entire 53 man staff had
Teutonic degrees with Herbert Baxter Adams possessing a brand new Heidelberg Ph.D. Such men combined missionary zeal with a penchant for hard work reflected by a determination to expand the frontiers of knowledge by their own research. They pressed hard for greatly increased library facilities and like their German counterparts, were often active in civic affairs. Collectively they changed the course of American higher education.

Not everyone accepted Germans uncritically. William James (1842-1910) accused them of creating an educational monster called the "Ph.D. octopus" and further charged that research activities coupled with excessive specialization were worsening not improving the character of higher education. Others such as Michigan education professor Burke A. Hinsdale found imperfections in the German system:

The supervising authority makes the number of facts to be taught, and even the particular facts, as definite as possible--it would seem too definite. For example, in the elementary schools of Berlin one hundred and sixteen particular dates are required to be memorized.

Such criticism prompted a more objective assessment of the Teutonic model and encouraged several changes which better suited American requirements.

Henry Adams, another vigorous advocate of German education, introduced Harvard's first historical seminar upon joining the faculty in 1870 thereby rekindling an interest in graduate education. Whenever possible Adams published the results of student research such as _Essays in Anglo-Saxon Law_ which he edited in 1876, but then discontinued teaching in 1877. John Fiske's appointment soon after the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences was established in 1872 permitted further
expansion of advanced work in American history. His contract was not renewed, however, due to his alleged radical leanings.

As previously stated graduate study at Columbia was revitalized when German trained John W. Burgess arrived in 1873 as professor of history and political science. At Columbia he received every encouragement to establish a graduate school of political science which was founded in 1881 to provide training in history, economics, public law and political philosophy. In addition a few fellowships were offered affording doctoral candidates the opportunity of lecturing on their dissertations. Contrary to established practices students were not required to attend courses, and history majors were free to take any subjects they wished. In order to stimulate research interests Burgess established the Academy of Political Science where members in good standing read at least one original paper per year. The Political Science Quarterly soon followed as a natural outgrowth of this academy's activities.

The generosity of Johns Hopkins permitted the establishment of the first American university comparable in quality to the best German schools. Although Hopkins gained instant renown, many Baltimore citizens were irritated with the school as enrollment remained small and resources were devoted to teachers' salaries, laboratory supplies and books rather than ostentatious buildings. The university continued in this fashion throughout the nineteenth century, and visitors were constantly amazed to find this mighty institution housed in a motley collection of aging homes in one of begrimed sections of the city. President Gilman embraced medieval tradition by viewing his university as a
community of scholars, and chose "men-not bricks and mortar" as his modus vivendi.

"Men" to President Gilman signified his university's mission to aid professors in carrying on their own research while training future scholars. This philosophy assigned highest priorities to matters such as financial aid to graduate students, the purchase of any materials facilitating research, the payment of adequate salaries, and the maintenance of light teaching loads. In addition Gilman saw himself as a buffer between faculty and trustees as well as a bulwark for academic freedom. When Assistant Professor Richard T. Ely spoke out against the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad which was the basis of the Hopkins' fortune, he was rescued from probable dismissal by Gilman's diplomatic prowess. The president also countered repeated charges that his non-denominational school was godless and he served as an effective lubricant when faculty feuds threatened to grind the university to pieces.

Despite Hopkins' dedication to German scholarship the university remained different from Teutonic institutions which stressed rigid organization and highly visible administrative machinery. At Hopkins a student could enroll in several courses meeting simultaneously as registration in the normal sense did not exist, and class schedules tended to be informal. A full professor might lecture one hour and then hurry off to hear an advanced student discuss a topic of current interest. No one wishing to start a new course was frustrated as President Gilman blessed any endeavor capable of attracting one or more participants. A given course began on a date convenient to everyone and ended whenever the teacher felt he had finished his discussion. Classes were
held in professors' homes, in cafes or in other convenient locations. H. B. Adams once conducted a seminar during his daily walk through the parks of Baltimore. This lack of structure appears to have facilitated extraordinary accomplishments. Six scholarly journals including *Studies in History and Political Science* were founded during the school's first five years. Students frequently worked around the clock; the individual who transcribed a 600 page dissertation in a fortnight by allowing himself two hours' sleep per day was not especially unusual. Phenomenal faculty productivity inspired similar accomplishments in students causing graduates to be in such demand that for two decades about half of all the Ph.D.'s produced in America were Hopkins trained.

A single forceful genius who battled administrative indifference with indefatigable zeal created Hopkins' history program. Herbert Baxter Adams arrived in 1876 on a postdoctoral grant because of rumors that Von Holst himself was coming to Baltimore. Unfortunately enthusiasm for recruiting top individuals in science and mathematics so depleted resources that no funds remained to hire a historian. Consequently Adams the student was instantly transformed into Adams the professor with the annoying provision that his salary remain unchanged. Thus began Adams' unremitting and strident campaign to increase his salary and obtain funds for additional personnel. He soon became the acknowledged leader of American historians and a prize star in the Hopkins firmament although always considerably underpaid. Woodrow
Wilson took his colonial history course and offered these comments concerning an examination:

. . . a very fair, sensible examination it was, Adams gave out five topics and told us to choose, each man for himself, one from the number and write an informal essay about it. That's the sort of examination I like. But it wasn't the sort I had expected; and I went in crammed with one or two hundred dates and one or two thousand minute particulars . . . 22

Although Adams threatened to go elsewhere the lure of working with students like Charles Homer Haskins, Frederick Jackson Turner, J. Franklin Jameson and Woodrow Wilson always proved overwhelming. In addition Adams took satisfaction in the excellent history and political science seminar library housed in a commodious 51 x 20 foot room. Each seminar member had his own place and drawer at a large table, access to over 8,000 volumes plus the use of John Casper Bluntschli's private library and Francis Lieber's personal papers. Lecture halls, offices and even a lavatory branched off from the main reading room. Almost immediately Harvard, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Nebraska and California established similar but less opulent facilities.

In 1869 Andrew Dickson White introduced the historical seminar to Michigan's undergraduate and pre-law students. A decade later Charles Kendall Adams supervised advanced history offerings and served as adviser to George Wells Knight, later at Ohio State, and Lucy M. Salmon, the first doctoral applicants. Adams also founded the Political Science Association which he described as, " . . . a monthly public session of the Historical seminary much the same as the 'Academy of Political Science' at Columbia." 23 Graduate study was further strengthened with the founding of the School of Political Science in 1881 supported
by an unknown benefactor who donated $2,500 for a seminar library with the promise of more funds as needed. Thus Michigan became the first Midwestern institution to devote sufficient resources to maintain a quality history program.

Though Ohio State had ongoing graduate programs in science and agriculture prior to the turn of the century, the history Ph.D. was awarded only sporadically until the 1920's. During the school's fourth year of operation in 1877 it hosted a meeting of presidents and other delegates from eighteen state universities who reached a consensus on several degrees including an M.A. earned in the German tradition instead of given "in course" as was done in England.

By 1879 Ohio State's committee on advanced degrees was active in a variety of tasks ranging from refining degree requirements to advertising for students. Ph.D. applicants were to spend two years in residence, pass a general examination in a minimum of two university departments, and write a dissertation of 50 or more pages, "embodying the results of an original investigation, the subject of which has been announced to the faculty at least six months in advance." Two alumni requested the Ph.D. in 1883, the first of whom submitted a completed thesis although he had neither been in residence nor in contact with any professors since his B.A. in 1879. A few months later another alumnus applied for the doctorate which he apparently thought would be awarded "in course" as he indicated no interest in any particular field and expressed no willingness to satisfy formal requirements.

M.A. and M.S. students were more numerous in the school's early years. Most of them supported themselves by serving as tutors and
assistant instructors. Those studying history received added encouragement in 1884 when the Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society agreed to locate on the Ohio State campus. Records are extremely sketchy concerning these students, but proof of a graduate assistant in history as early as 1883 can be documented. Payroll records show Edwin Earl Sparks, soon to be a professor at the University of Chicago and later president of Penn State, receiving from $25 to $32 per month as an assistant, an amount considered generous for the times and comparable to that paid advanced students at Hopkins.

Overivew of Incomes and Facilities

Since colonial times and particularly from 1850 to 1875 American higher education was in desperate financial straits. A rapid proliferation of colleges after 1850 prompted fierce competition for students making necessary the imposition of low or even nonexistent tuitions in order to attract them. Few men of means were willing to support higher education, and those wishing financial success found little cause for attending college. Even this country's most noted institution occasionally faced collapse despite continual aid from the state legislature. Harvard habitually tottered on the brink of disaster during its first century and frequently liquidated gifts earmarked for specific purposes in order to meet current expenses. The school was able to obtain America's first printing press only by virtue of President Dunster marrying the original owner's widow. By the time of the Revolution many English professors received a larger annual income than the proceeds from the entire Harvard endowment, and state support became
ever more crucial reaching $60,000 annually by the 1850's when less than two dozen instate undergraduates were in attendance. Following the passage of the Land-Grant Act in 1862 Massachusetts ceased its support of Harvard prompting President Eliot to discover the virtue of self-reliance. Ignoring two centuries of Massachusetts tradition this president campaigned vigorously against state aid to public universities thus seeking to deny them what his own school had so long re­quired.

The Harvard library, although always America's largest, failed to meet continental standards until late in the nineteenth century when many individuals had become familiar with German facilities. Jared Sparks, who received a Gottingen Ph.D. in 1820 some 50 years before this became popular, pioneered in stressing the importance of a good working library and as McLean Professor of History and president of Harvard advocated achieving this goal through regular appropriations earmarked for the purchase of books and manuscripts. The decline of the recitation system and the steady growth of faculty research interests encouraged the development of this and other libraries.

Jefferson's meticulously formulated plans for the University of Virginia provided each professor with a base salary of $1,000 plus a percentage of his students' tuition, but as teachers were unwilling to accept such an arrangement the plan was never implemented at Virginia or any other major institution. The university barely survived the Civil War, and extreme sacrifices were made to keep it open when the average professor's real salary sank to 60 cents a week and the student body consisted of a few wounded veterans and teenagers. After 1865
tight budgets caused the school to slip further and further behind the major Northern institutions, and by 1885 Virginia's golden age was past and her role in the development of higher education only peripheral.

The University of Wisconsin gave little hint of future greatness during its earliest years when the school was barely distinguishable from the typical denominational college. Nonetheless research materials worthy of a great history department were being amassed through private efforts led by Lyman Draper who as president of the Wisconsin Historical Society from 1840 to 1865 collected a rich trove of primary sources. The state, however, showed little interest in its university short of legislating regulations such as an 1872 mandate prohibiting professors from earning any outside income to supplement annual salaries ranging from a few hundred dollars to a legal ceiling of two thousand dollars.

Ohio State opened auspiciously in 1873 housed in a new building and paying a liberal $2,500 to each professor. Salaries soon declined, however, and all received a 10 percent pay cut several years later. By 1885 $2,250 was the legal maximum, and new faculty members were being hired for less than half that amount as state aid failed to meet expectations despite fervent pleas from several quarters:

The Trustees believe that an appropriation of fifty thousand dollars, judiciously expended now, will place the College in such a position of efficiency and usefulness that there will be no need for a long time to come, if ever, to apply for more State aid, . . .25

Despite unattractive salaries the hiring of faculty and staff proved easy once state assistance began in 1879. Since Ohio was far wealthier than Michigan or Wisconsin, the possibility of its state
university becoming pre-eminent in the Midwest long remained a potent factor in recruitment. Professor John Short reflected this belief by requesting that his history classes be equipped with the most modern teaching aids. In 1882 he petitioned the trustees to purchase an oil lantern for showing slides to his classes in a room where he had already installed window shutters at his own expense. Necessary funds were promptly appropriated, and since the school already owned such a lantern the new one was expressly reserved for Professor Short. This teacher also requested that history classrooms be clean and attractive and introduced an 1883 faculty resolution calling for improved maintenance of University Hall.

Throughout this period Ohio's library was housed in a single room despite constant efforts by the faculty, administration, students and some trustees to better the situation. It proved virtually impossible for many students to use this facility which by 1884 was open less than ten hours a week. As was true in many other institutions, the library remained a stepchild which did not improve at the same rate as the university's other physical facilities. In 1881 for example when Ohio's legislature appropriated more money to its university than did Wisconsin's, the library's share of this bounty totaled $2,000.

The University of Illinois received tax dollars from the beginning, and by the 1870's its well-equipped facilities prompted Ohio State president Edward Orton to escort a board member through the Urbana campus. Illinois president John M. Gregory pressed vigorously to improve the library, selecting many volumes personally while traveling extensively in Europe and by 1873 was providing the staff necessary to
keep it open eight hours a day. Faculty salaries were poor, however, and remained so until well into the twentieth century. As late as the 1890's full professors received from $1,600 to $2,000, a situation which hampered the recruitment of qualified individuals.

For twenty six years the University of Michigan received no state funds despite strenuous appeals from presidents beginning with Henry Tappan. Later President James Burrill Angell would brand the initial 1867 appropriation as inconsequential and simply a cheap bid by legislators to claim credit for an institution already possessing a fine reputation. Upon taking office in 1871 Angell immediately identified himself with Tappan's philosophy and vowed his determination to spend whatever was necessary to create a university second to none. As was true of Harvard's Eliot, Angell ignored repeated invitations to resign and during his first eight years in office took the risk of being replaced whenever going on vacation or embarking on a lecture tour. In 1873 President Angell put Michigan on a firm financial basis by obtaining passage of a special mill tax for the university. Like Tappan, Angell campaigned ceaselessly for a good library, and with his reputation established and other institutions proferring tempting offers, the legislature assured his continuing at Michigan by providing funds for a new library. Faculty salaries at Michigan were almost identical to Ohio State's with full professors making $2,500 in 1871, $2,200 in 1878, and $2,500 once again in the late 1880's.

Hopkins' Daniel Gilman practiced constant frugality as he had no legislature to lean on, and the initial bequest long remained the only substantial donation. Library expenditures were restricted to books
and documents not available in the vicinity plus materials professors wanted on hand for classes to read. Salaries too reflected careful budgeting, and Gilman varied these greatly at a time when schools generally paid all professors the same amount. While a few big names received $6,000 which was four times the national average, many teachers accepted a small stipend or far less than the going rate elsewhere in order to be associated with an outstanding school. The salary of H. B. Adams was long frozen at $2,250, and Gilman knew full well that his historian would never leave. When Adams received an attractive offer from Smith his Biblical paraphrase, 'I would rather be a doorkeeper in the house of Science than to dwell in a woman's college,' does much to explain the school's ability to attract and retain outstanding individuals with limited funds. Gilman also provided benefits many scholars considered more important than their salaries. Anyone needing funds or materials for research received them regardless of the budgetary situation. In an era when graduate fellowships were almost unheard of Gilman assured the support of all worthy students by providing twenty generous fellowships each fall plus ten more in mid year to accommodate strong students previously unrecognized.

For over one hundred years the University of Pennsylvania was little more than an academy or boarding school for students in their mid teens. Attempts to make the institution a university in fact as well as name were unsuccessful until the late nineteenth century largely because of financial problems of such gravity that on at least one occasion the school was unable to borrow money without its trustees co-signing the loan, and salaries promised employees were rarely paid
in full. Although friends of the institution were unsuccessful in obtaining Land-Grant funds, they then rallied around Provost Charles J. Steele who moved to a new campus, greatly increased the faculty and by 1880 had expanded enrollment tenfold to 1,000 students. The time was finally ripe for Philadelphians to support this institution which they had ignored or taken for granted since the colonial era.

Columbia first came into its own during the 1875-1885 decade while accomplishing the giant leap from local prep school to reputable university. The turning point in Columbia's fortunes occurred when far-sighted trustees led by Samuel B. Ruggles decided to spend the school's huge surplus rather than let it pile up year after year as had been the custom. Ruggles paid special attention to the library then administered by the Reverend Beverly R. Betts who habitually returned half of the $1,500 appropriated annually for books while showing considerable reluctance to lend them out. Consequently the trustees asked John W. Burgess to create a special library for his School of Political Science giving him the funds to purchase some 15,000 volumes and to hire a full-time librarian to manage the collection. This willingness to spend large sums for research facilities added Columbia to a very select circle of universities and greatly enhanced the school's reputation.

Conclusions, An Analysis of Conditions in 1884

In 1884 despite rapid strides in higher education's growth and development, the discipline of history remained a struggling infant with a mere handful of full-time teachers, no professional
organizations and very few journals of more than local circulation.

Many years later J. Franklin Jameson described the situation as he remembered it:

No young woman intending to be a school teacher thought of such a thing as preparing to teach history. Any of the teachers in the school could do that, as an incident to her work in the more serious studies; it was only to hold the textbook and hear the class "recite." The textbooks were mostly wretched. Fewer than twenty American colleges had professors of history—good teachers almost all, but only five or six of them that could be called productive scholars.²⁷

That same year President Eliot was visited by two young men seeking advice on becoming history professors, and as he later recalled, "I was obliged to tell them, that under existing circumstances it would be the height of imprudence."²⁸ Eliot's advice might well have been the same had these men been interested in another field. Save in a few prestige institutions the life of a professor was extremely unattractive with average salaries hovering around the $1,000 mark and twenty to thirty hours per week being the standard class load. Consequently, few selected college teaching for a career save a handful called to the scholarly life and those of independent means. "Prof" all too often signified a superannuated missionary or an amateur without formal training or enthusiasm for his subject who looked constantly for alternate employment.

Numerous duties outside the classroom further compounded the unattractiveness of teaching. Lacking strong traditions of faculty self-government so evident in Europe, American professors often found themselves "on call" for any duty administrators wished them to perform including maintaining buildings, tending shrubbery, disciplining
students, supervising dormitories and attending daily chapel exercises. Ohio State's faculty regulations stipulated that:

Whenever in the opinion of any professor a student is neglecting his work to an extent which is likely to imperil his standing in the class, he shall immediately make a written report of the fact to the President, . . . and on second report of the same kind, the matter shall be laid before the faculty.29

As long as such conditions existed the evolution of history teaching into a recognized profession remained highly questionable. Only with the benefit of hindsight can one discern that a viable nucleus for a developing discipline was already in existence by 1884.
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SECTION TWO
THE STUDY AND TEACHING OF HISTORY
1884-1917
General Overview of the Period

When in 1903 England's Mosley Educational Commission sent the Honorable William Henry Jones to rank American colleges and universities, his findings underscored the vast changes taking place in higher education. Jones rated Wisconsin as the nation's best followed by Harvard, Cornell, Michigan and California. While one can certainly question the exclusion of schools such as Yale, Hopkins and Chicago the commission's general conclusion that the state universities were far superior to the old, established private colleges was widely quoted in contemporary sources and confirmed what many authorities already believed. The rise and development of these state schools was but one in a series of events, beginning ideologically with the American Revolution and institutionally under President Jefferson, which have led the United States away from aristocratic control. John Corbin, a Harvard graduate and author of the best selling college guide of the period cautioned his readers to separate facts from opinions when selecting a college:

So deep is the ignorance of our colleges in general, and so narrow are the prevailing prejudices, that most men, even when the facts are put before them, instinctively close their minds... Not once, but often, Eastern graduates have questioned my candor and accuracy because I have spoken highly of state universities of the Middle West. Men of this stamp are obviously very unsafe advisors.
Students of this era were constantly exposed to the changes which Yankee ingenuity had wrought upon the nation and the world. Individuals were still alive such as Ohio State's former president Edward Orton who addressed the students on his seventieth birthday in 1899 and attempted to encapsulate the changes he had witnessed. His description of America before telegraphs, railroads, electrical devices, daily newspapers and even gold mines filled students with awe and fired them with a determination to participate in the headlong rush of progress. This philosophy was shared by sufficient numbers of people that most universities became workshops where students learned to grapple with relevant problems and to train for what was immediately practical. Consequently history had to accommodate these trends if it was to share in the general expansion of education with the result that practical purposes and uses of the discipline were emphasized. History became crusading rather than contemplative and was converted into an indispensable and highly useful subject which would build better citizens by introducing them to what was "right" and "good" in American civilization:

Righteousness and goodness are the ideas that the Hebrew sacred writings have given to mankind as essential attributes of the Divine Being. . . .

This Hebrew idea adopted into our civilization is the essence of history, because it is at once the cause of civilization and the measure of it. In proportion as a people organize institutions that realize righteousness and goodness . . . , they achieve civilization.

History is an account of this progress.
Consequently history became an instrument to further the development of the nation along traditional lines. Careful research into past civilizations as well as other contemporary nations would affirm the wisdom of the American way of life, and most professors in all honesty concluded this to be true. A history requirement at all educational levels would therefore aid in developing citizens who knew right from wrong, recognized their duty and stood ready to serve as instruments of continuity rather than agents of change. The importance of history was thereby elevated to first rank as thousands of new teaching positions were created, and what was formerly an obscure subject taught in a handful of schools became a ubiquitous requirement. What had begun humbly as a scholarly quest by a handful of the faithful had become transformed, much as a small family-owned enterprise becomes a giant corporation. From 1884 to 1917 the venture capital invested in the business of history increased annually and gave every evidence of continuing to do so as long as the social dividends it produced were deemed adequate.

The period 1884-1917 witnessed a great burst of enthusiasm for scholarship in the historical profession. The expansion of graduate education encouraged increasing specialization and a hunger for research. Professors reflected the growing uncertainties of a society convulsed by great changes, peopled by individuals who sought new answers to the fundamental questions and believed that the whole truth had not yet been found. These men often possessed an almost missionary zeal for their teaching and research, an enthusiasm which was reinforced by the constant expansion of opportunities in the field of
history. Dixon Ryan Fox of Columbia described the operation of this enthusiasm and dedication in his colleague Herbert Levi Osgood:

The concentration of his mind not infrequently disturbed his sleep and he would rise about two at night, set down some instant self-suggestion and write or study till morning. Watching him work... one could almost actually see the element of will pitilessly driving a poor body to the limit of its power... He had dedicated himself to a service as unrelenting as any monk.3

Yet this expansion of opportunities in history necessitated the rapid production of large numbers of scholars, thus imposing a certain standardization typical of organizational life upon the discipline of history. What had formerly been a quest for genius became by necessity the cultivation of competence in a standard mold. By the turn of the century people were beginning to lament that the standardized production of teachers and scholars resulted in competent, predictable individuals who performed satisfactorily but seldom brilliantly. A chronic shortage of history teachers had necessitated the production of a large, new generation of scholars. Yet to some, this group seemed markedly inferior when compared with pioneer historians like Turner, Beard, Channing, Andrews, Haskins, H. B. Adams, Cheyney, McMaster and others then passing from the scene.

The creation of new schools and the expansion of existing ones lent an aura of excitement to higher education during this period. America's new status as the world's leading industrial power brought with it a group of financial supermen who could often be persuaded to donate huge sums to higher education. Just as her factories, railroads and bonanza farms were the world's richest and most impressive America's great universities would become larger, wealthier and staffed
with higher salaried individuals than institutions anywhere else.

While the scholars often equated this vast outpouring of money with a popular enthusiasm for scholarship, another explanation is that it simply reflected the Yankee determination to have the biggest and best of everything. Since there were a number of schools aspiring to supremacy, scholars found the competition for their services to be brisk. Thus for the first time it became possible to earn a living, and occasionally even a very good living, by teaching and/or teaching and research. H. B. Adams, for example, turned down a number of positions which would have seemed financially attractive to most corporate executives. His most lucrative offer came from the fledgling University of Chicago which conducted the most impressive international raiding of intelligentsia ever witnessed on this planet. Led by the genius of William Rainey Harper and fed by the almost bottomless pit of Rockefeller millions the school became on opening day one of the world's greatest, and even contained America's largest library. For twenty years it was the automatic policy of the school to meet and beat any competing offer for any member of its faculty.

While the Chicago example is the most spectacular and the most often quoted, it is nonetheless illustrative of a trend to found new schools and expand existing ones. Such institutions often had an effect on neighboring schools which otherwise might have remained unchanged, two examples being the Universities of California and Illinois which were both jolted into a flurry of activity by the accomplishments of Stanford and Chicago respectively.
The process of specialization continued and accelerated with the University of Chicago taking the lead from the day that it opened with a history department of twelve members at a time when most schools considered themselves fortunate to have one professor of history who generally also taught something else. Consequently in more and more institutions a scholar was finding it possible to concentrate all of his energies upon history. The emphasis on teaching lessened in the bigger schools, and promotion became more and more tied to the volume of publications one produced. This situation encouraged professors to neglect students and to spend little time in furthering the development of the schools which employed them. Some historians who considered their professional organizations and fields of interest to be of prime importance became in effect academic itinerants who lent their reputations only to schools offering the most advantageous terms.

Many professors retained their great loyalties to the institutions for which they worked and continued to pour most of their energies into the teaching and counseling of students. The "better" schools rewarded this behavior rather curiously by paying these professors far less money than the itinerants and by loading them down with heavy schedules. The correlation between advancement and publication became firmly established, and the volume of monographs and articles rose dramatically.

A natural outgrowth of this specialization and emphasis on research was the development of more and larger graduate programs with the result that the flood of students to Europe gradually tapered off and almost stopped completely with the outbreak of war in 1914. As the
number of American graduate students increased it became less and less likely that a doctoral candidate would have the privilege of working side by side with his advisor. In addition some graduate professors viewed seminars as a master-disciple situation in which students were expected to come to the same conclusions as the teacher on any given historical topic. Consequently these "seminars" often became a glorified extension of the recitation system.

In addition some professors sought to impose personal standards of religion, character and morality upon their advisees. Since scholars lacking some semblance of conservative respectability found it difficult to secure employment, such an approach could be defended on pragmatic grounds though it often discouraged sensitive, creative, intelligent individuals. Also as most graduate schools continued adding more and more requirements, charges were leveled that these programs were becoming endurance contests. Though students and professors often lamented such tendencies, the attractions of large programs proved so overwhelming that individualized instruction became almost unknown. Critics increasingly maintained that through sheer force of numbers, a quest for excellence was degenerating into the fostering of competence in a standard mold.

College and university social life frequently revolved around a president who coordinated these activities in much the same fashion as the library centralized research. Sunday afternoon teas and open houses were the rule in good weather, and it was assumed that a new faculty member and his wife would be introduced in this fashion.
Picnics and potluck dinners were common as they provided good fellowship for about the same cost as eating at home.

By the turn of the century increased prosperity in the major universities permitted the establishment of faculty clubs. Most were modest in size, but Columbia's occupied an entire building where 150 men lunched daily. Ohio State struggled for years to form such an organization, and in 1916 several professors leased the third floor of a private residence. The venture failed, however, and permanent success was not realized until 1923 when 150 charter members secured spacious quarters on the third floor of the new Administration Building.

Professors were frequently interested in sports and the outdoors which had the virtue of providing exercise and a change in routine at minimum cost. Probably every college or university included a group which prided itself on meeting and conquering the elements. Ohio State's contingent included professors Spencer and McNeal who frequently participated in week-end canoe trips in the woods near Mansfield. This group had a reputation for being a bit mischievous, and faculty wives were shocked upon learning of their attempts to stick taffy to the living room ceiling during a pull hosted by a professor of physics and his wife.

Faculty members who traveled often stayed at the homes of other professors. This provided a pleasant and inexpensive way of keeping up with professional developments, and was seldom a burden to the host who nearly always lived in a commodious and rambling old house. Such contacts tended to fortify and strengthen men whose position in society was insecure and whose sensitive intelligence made them aware of the
fact that what they valued most tended to be either ignored or ridiculed by the average American. This powerful bond would gradually weaken in successive decades as professors began to gain the recognition and status which had so long eluded them.

The concept of what constitutes history changed so dramatically between 1886 and 1917 that McMaster, the pacesetter in 1886, found himself out of date and being superseded by others when the final volume of his History of the United States appeared in 1913. Charles A. Beard and James Harvey Robinson were the McMasters of this generation who together produced European history texts which vastly upgraded existing publication standards as well as the first documentary book of readings, thus making it possible for any student to become familiar with primary sources. Beard then authored his own texts on American history and politics.

Appearing in 1912 Robinson's The New History refuted the scientific interpretation of history in favor of a relativistic one. This popularization of what was known to scholars had a considerable impact upon the teaching of history, particularly in the secondary schools. Both Robinson and Beard considered the economic interpretation of history to be a useful tool for explaining the past, much of which was seen as a struggle between the privileged and the underprivileged. The New History also popularized the notion that historical writing and teaching could aid the common man in his struggle to upgrade himself and was one of several influences that attracted liberals and even radicals to the discipline. This new element began to appear in classrooms and to echo Robinson's contention that traditional history is
elitist and a perpetrator of social injustice. Friction between liberals and conservatives was often heated with some history departments becoming veritable battlegrounds.

Robinson, Beard and others offered intellectual justification for the great increase in college and university enrollments which occurred between 1884 and 1917. A transformation in American educational philosophy was underway which established the belief that higher education was the birthright of the many rather than the privilege of a few, and which gave rise to a popular conviction that university greatness is directly proportional to the size of enrollment. Most of America's universities succumbed to this worship of numbers, relishing registration increases and winning seasons on the gridiron with equal intensity. This numerical stampede created a particular strain upon history departments since their enrollments often increased faster than did registration figures in other disciplines. At Ohio State, for example, the mean annual increase in history registrations for the period 1910 to 1916 exceeded 50 percent. Such conditions invited depersonalization and by 1917 professors in the largest schools were beginning to delegate more and more teaching duties to graduate students.

Departments increased in size, although almost never as rapidly as enrollments, thus permitting the trend towards greater specialization to continue. By 1917 a professor could confine his teaching duties to the field of history in all but the smallest colleges while areas of specialization within the discipline became ever narrower in the larger universities. The best of these specialists greatly expanded the total body of useful knowledge, but some criticized them as
inferior replacements for the "large souls" of a previous generation. The voices of dissent maintained that just as in business and industry, the technocrats were supplanting the innovators.

**Scholarly Activities and Achievements**

On September 10, 1884, forty one individuals with a keen enthusiasm for history met in Saratoga, New York and as only nine members of the group were professors, membership in the new organization was declared open to anyone with sufficient interest in history to pay the dues. Thus from the beginning the American Historical Association differed considerably from the selective academies of history then prevalent in Europe. The Association proved an immediate success and within one year there were approximately 400 members including nearly every college history teacher in the country. The organization was incorporated in the District of Columbia by an act of Congress in 1889 and the secretary instructed to "report annually to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution concerning its proceedings and the condition of historical study in America, and . . . communicate to Congress the whole of such reports, or such portions thereof as he should see fit." This incorporation was the work of secretary Herbert Baxter Adams who also stipulated that each annual meeting be held in Washington with the hope that reporting to Congress and meeting in the nation's capital would result in annual appropriations from the federal government.

Research interests were greatly stimulated because the organization's small size made it relatively easy to secure an invitation to
deliver a paper at the annual meeting. At the first convention, for instance, papers read included "Federal Land-grants for Education in the Old Northwest" by George Wells Knight then a doctoral candidate in history at the University of Michigan who attended the convention in hopes of finding a job. This informality was still present in 1895 when James Hulme Canfield moved from Lincoln, Nebraska to Columbus, Ohio. Soon after his arrival at Ohio State Dr. Canfield received a letter from Clarence Bowen, Treasurer of the American Historical Association which stated, "You did not ask to but I have changed your address from Lincoln, Nebraska to State University, Columbus, Ohio and have so notified Secretary Herbert Baxter Adams. If this is not correct please tell me so at once as the new list of members is now being printed."6

The American Historical Association's initial meeting in 1884 marked the first time in decades that historians from both the North and the South had met together on an organized basis. Adams' insistence that conventions be held in Washington no doubt aided this intellectual reconciliation since it eliminated the possibility of sectional interests feuding over the site of annual meetings and assured that they would be held in the one location which was neither Northern nor Southern.

One of the main concerns of the Association was the lack of funds available for printing scholarly works. All too often an author was expected to pay his own printing costs or become a salesman and solicit subscribers. H. B. Adams was keenly interested in the production of reference works and source books in specialized areas of American
history and corresponded with leading scholars urging them to write works which he hoped the Association would find the funds to publish. In the early 1890's, for example, Frederick Jackson Turner and Adams exchanged letters concerning the possibility of Turner writing and Adams editing something akin to Stubb's "Select Charters" (British) for United States constitutional and economic history. A Publication Committee of the Association was formed consisting of five university professors. The American Historical Association also sponsored an ever growing number of prizes in various fields which sometimes included a guarantee of publication for the winning paper or book. These awards were particularly important because even as late as 1917 only a handful of university presses were in existence.

Ohio State's contribution to the American Historical Association is worthy of mention. Professor George Wells Knight served on a number of committees including the Publication Committee previously discussed and continued to present papers regularly. In 1910 Knight was one of five professors selected to evaluate a work prepared by Professor James Robinson of Columbia entitled, "The Relation of History to the New Sciences of Mankind" which was the germ of The New History. Wilbur Siebert attended and participated in activities of the Association as a graduate student at Harvard and while still a student, delivered his first paper on the Underground Railroad which preceded his famous publications on the subject. Siebert continued to read papers before the Association, particularly concerning the Loyalists of the American Revolution, and served on a number of committees including the Committee on Bibliography.
When Homer Hockett joined Ohio State's staff in 1909, the institution gained Professor Turner's former secretary and the most sought after graduate student in the field of American history for that particular year. Professor Hockett lived up to his scholarly promise and began delivering periodic papers on the subjects of his research. When Turner became President of the Association in 1910 he was presented with a volume of original essays on American history written by some of his former students including Professor Hockett. He and other Ohio State professors were active not only in the American Historical Association but also in regional and local organizations such as the Ohio Archaelogical and Historical Society, the Ohio Valley Historical Society, the North Central History Teachers Association and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association.

The American Historical Association showed considerable interest in improving history teaching in the public schools. The Committee of Seven on the Teaching of History in Secondary Schools was established in 1896 and included Charles H. Haskins of Wisconsin who convinced his colleague Frederick Jackson Turner to offer a methods course for prospective secondary teachers. In 1899 this committee proposed sweeping changes in the teaching of history which were widely adopted and which greatly improved both the quality and the amount of preparation in history possessed by entering freshmen:

It called for a four-year history requirement in the college preparatory program, encompassing ancient history, medieval and modern Europe, English history and American history. The Committee also insisted on supplementing rote-learning in textbooks with collateral reading and other projects.  

Ohio State implemented and even anticipated the suggestions of this committee. Professor Knight began visiting Ohio high schools in 1885 and by 1899 all of Ohio State's history professors were participating in local professional meetings with high school teachers. Knight had been interested in teacher education since his undergraduate days and was the first to offer a historical methods course at Ohio State.

The Ohio History Teachers' Association was formed to establish a dialogue between college and public school teachers and to translate into action the determination of the American Historical Association to upgrade public school teaching. This organization depended heavily upon a few Ohio State professors who took the initiative in planning meetings and undertaking various publishing activities. The leadership of the organization revolved around Professor Siebert who later received a good deal of assistance from Professor Hockett when the latter joined Ohio State's staff. Noting that bibliographic aids prepared by the American Historical Association included little or nothing on state history, Professor Hockett prepared a volume of readings on the subject for public school use. Siebert was responsible for The Ohio History Teachers' Magazine which first appeared in 1915 and whose publication costs he subsidized. Other Ohio State professors attended the meetings of this organization but rendered very little practical assistance with the result that it declined and finally ceased to exist in the early 1920's.

The Mississippi Valley Historical Association compiled annotated bibliographies of recent books with the hope that high school teachers
would thus become better acquainted with the latest sources. By 1912 this organization was also sponsoring the History Teachers' Magazine, a monthly publication edited by W. J. Chase of Wisconsin containing book reviews which appeared as part of the annual Critical Bibliography of New History Books. Of Ohio State's professors Dr. Clarence E. Perkins took the most interest in this project and prepared a large number of reviews particularly in the fields of modern and medieval Europe. In addition Professors Siebert, Hockett and Schlesinger were occasional contributors.

All historical societies were vitally interested in cataloguing and preserving documents as American scholars increasingly made use of European archives and returned to press for similar facilities at home. By the turn of the century a vigorous lobby led by James Franklin Jameson was stressing the need for a United States national archives. In 1895 the American Historical Association appointed a Historical Manuscripts Commission which included Professor Knight and began the process of identifying existing federal records. By 1899 the commission had started concentrating on identifying and preserving state documents, a project which met with considerable success as by 1909 twenty-four states had made formal provision for the custody of their documents.

One of these states was Ohio which encountered the problem of deciding which of three competing societies would receive the state's official sanction. Proximity to Ohio State University gave the State Archaeological and Historical Society an advantage since Presidents Canfield and Thompson as well as a number of professors particularly
Knight, Siebert and Schlesinger were active supporters of this organization and also participated in the collecting and cataloguing of documents. Consequently this society came to house most of the official archives of Ohio. Regular appropriations from the state legislature did not materialize, however, with the result that the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society had to depend almost entirely upon private support.

The situation in Illinois was entirely different and offered impressive evidence of what competent leadership and ample funds could accomplish. Edmund J. James who became president of the state university in 1905 found that his duties also included heading up the state historical library. James had a German Ph.D., a great respect for Teutonic scholarship and an amazing facility for coaxing funds out of the state legislature. Consequently a library which had previously been little more than a name suddenly found itself with an ample budget not only for collecting and preserving records but also for the publication of a state history series under the auspices of the Illinois Centennial Commission.

Fortunately for James, Clarence Alvord was already a member of Illinois' history staff and in 1905 he was appointed general editor of the state historical library with the responsibility of seeking out documents throughout the state. In 1909 he assumed responsibility for the centennial history series and had the pleasure of overseeing the largest budget which any state had ever allocated for such a project. Entitled the Illinois Historical Survey and organized as part of the
graduate school its stated purpose was "... to facilitate research and to encourage the writing of monographs in Illinois history."  

Part of the Survey's work involved preparing the five-volume centennial history which offered professors and their advisees a fine publishing opportunity while rendering a distinct service to their state. Each volume was written by an Illinois professor who had ample funds available for hiring assistants:

"... The Survey and the workers on the centennial history, laboring winter and summer, employ a staff of twelve graduate assistants and a large office force; they have made a thorough search for all useful materials in newspaper files, in county archives, in local libraries, in private collections, have photographed thousands of documents in Washington and have hired experts in foreign capitals."  

Alvord also had funds enabling him to found the Mississippi Valley Historical Review which he edited for nine years. Consequently Illinois contributed significantly towards the creation of a Middle Western school of historians while also serving as an example for other states to emulate.  

Established Eastern historical societies expanded and refined existing facilities as did the Massachusetts Historical Society which moved into new quarters in 1899. Keynote speaker for the occasion was Charles Francis Adams who chose to discuss a problem peculiar to this oldest of historical societies as well as the larger libraries:

The problem of the future, therefore, is not accumulation; that is provided for. It will go on surely, and only too fast. The question of the future, so far as the material of history is concerned relates to getting at what has been accumulated,—the ready extraction of the marrow. In other words it is a problem of differentiation, selection, arrangement, indexing and cataloguing."
As more source materials became available the Bibliographical Committee of the Association was created in order to inform scholars of both American and European collections. Ohio State's Wilbur Siebert was probably the most energetic member of this committee and was able to accomplish a great deal partially due to a passionate interest in bibliography but also because of ample private means which he committed to these projects. Throughout his long life, Professor Siebert traveled extensively in this work and presented a number of exhaustive reports which were of considerable aid to the scholarly community. "Collections of Material in English and European History and Subsidiary Fields in the Libraries of the United States" appeared as part of the Association's 1904 annual report and is an example of his work.

Along with Herbert B. Adams and J. Franklin Jameson, Edward P. Cheyney was instrumental in the early development of the Association. Always available for committee duties he was ever a gentleman and a calming influence when periodic feuds erupted. He held a considerable number of offices and served as chairman of numerous committees as well as heading the Board of Editors of the *American Historical Review*. While in that position Cheyney dealt successfully with a revolt which had simmered for years and finally exploded in 1915 when a large faction of the membership charged that the Council ran roughshod over the wishes of the rank and file, kept deserving people out of Association offices and as unstated policy refused to publish articles from certain individuals and/or institutions in the *Review*. Tempers flared to the point that a mass pullout appeared imminent, and angry articles from the protestors appeared in the *Nation*. It is hard to imagine how
anyone other than Cheyney could have presided over this storm with such calm dignity and have succeeded in reconciling so satisfactorily such a bitterly divided organization. 11

Professional societies appeared in other social sciences after 1884 and historians were usually instrumental in their founding and development. The link between history and economics was particularly strong, and the initial meeting of the American Economic Association took place in conjunction with the 1885 meeting of the American Historical Association since nearly all economists already belonged to the latter organization. Richard T. Ely was aided by his Hopkins colleague Herbert Baxter Adams in formulating the prospectus for the new organization, something which Adams had done for history just one year before. History professors took part in the early meetings of the Economic Association and also served as officers. Ohio State's participation demonstrates this pattern. Dr. Knight served as one of the vice presidents of the organization and was also on the executive committee along with Ohio State's President Canfield. Professor Knight occasionally read papers before the economic association such as one he gave entitled "The Relation of the Teaching of Economic History to the Teaching of Political Economy" which he delivered at the 1897 meeting held in Cleveland.

In addition to professional societies which represented specific disciplines, an increasing number of organizations were founded which sought to facilitate communication between schools often with the hope of formulating common standards and curricula. Chicago's President Harper was active in the planning of such organizations being a founder
of the North Central College Association as well as host to the Association of American University's initial meeting.

The professors in various disciplines began organizing on a national level although a relatively small percentage of them belonged to the American Association of University Professors founded in 1915. Requirements for joining the organization were initially quite stringent, ten years of teaching or research being required for membership. Ohio State's chapter was particularly large, and soon had 47 members including Wilbur Siebert, Homer Hockett, and George Wells Knight who served as chairman of the local chapter.

History departments also frequently sponsored "clubs" which were supervised by a professor with a sufficient interest in his subject to encourage his students to meet together outside the classroom and discuss each other's research projects. These organizations gave a student the opportunity to research a topic of his own choosing and present his findings. Such groups were generally called the "Political Science Club" as was the case at Ohio State or the "Academy of Political Science" as it was at Columbia or the "History and Political Science Association," the term used at Hopkins. Knight introduced this concept to Ohio State in 1892 and announced in the university newspaper that his Political Science Club was to meet bimonthly in his home in order to hear the reading of a paper "... upon some topic of current history, or equally valuable researches in past history ..."\(^{12}\) Knight stated that professors as well as students were invited to give papers, and that membership was limited to 35. The club
soon became the most successful of its type on the campus, and by 1900 there was a waiting list of individuals eligible for membership.

Knight founded the organization partly because of his experiences in a similar club sponsored by Judge Thomas Cooley at Michigan. Cooley had studied at Hopkins and while there was a member of H. B. Adams' History and Political Science Association. Adams himself had been a member of such a club at Heidelberg under the auspices of Professor Bluntschli who seems to have originated this concept. Such organizations were particularly valuable during this early period in America when the seminar system was not sufficiently refined to enable a student to pursue his most avid research interests in the classroom. Having served their purpose such groups gradually died out so that as an undergraduate Arthur Schlesinger found the Political Science Club to be of questionable value:

A Political Science Club also existed under the wing of Professor Knight and Spencer, and I was president of it one year; but it was content to discuss papers, usually warmed over class reports, on subjects which at best had remote current application.13

Women were always excluded from these organizations in Germany but this precedent was gradually overthrown in America by able and resourceful female students. When Elizabeth Bancroft14 attempted to join the Political Science Club in 1909 Professor Knight explained, "When boys and girls are in separate organizations there is less self-consciousness, and more freedom and enjoyment of discussions; . . ."15

Undaunted, Miss Bancroft and others approached Professor Siebert who agreed to sponsor the young ladies and help them form a History
Club. A *Lantern* article stressed the eagerness of these girls to study what was relevant to them and explained their determination:

Not to study musty books about the heroic deeds of the Trojan warriors,... or about the illustrious conquests of the Emperor, Alexander the Great. ... 36 girls decided that the college woman needed to know more about current events: why the United States has a protective tariff, why Germany needs colonies, and all the other whys.16

Rather chivalrously Knight consented to speak at the club's first meeting although he miffed the girls somewhat by declaring in the course of his talk that "There are more pretty girls to the square mile in Ireland than there are in the United States."17

In the end the young ladies conquered. Preparing elaborate "spreads" of delicious food, they experienced no difficulty in persuading the leading professors to address their meetings. Some years later members of the Political Science Club began to be invited as "guests" to History Club functions with the result that membership became coeducational by the early 1920's, and the Political Science Club ceased to exist. The tone of the History Club was distinctly different from its predecessor. No longer a forum for scholarly presentations, it became more and more devoted to current events and was viewed largely as a social organization where students could meet professors on an informal basis. Clubs which survived in other schools were generally of a similar nature.

The period 1885-1916 was perhaps the golden age of the lecture series, and nearly every institution from the humblest college to the most prestigious university sponsored these on a regular basis. The Johns Hopkins series enjoyed the greatest prestige and widest audience
due to President Gilman's requirement that his professors be effective speakers and participate in his program of community enlightenment. Whenever Gilman was considering someone for possible employment, he would invite him to Baltimore to give a lecture series, and this system continued throughout his long administration despite strenuous objections from a number of professors.

Ohio State's lecture series received no financial support from the university until after 1900 and should by rights have been a modest operation utilizing purely local talent. What in fact did emerge reflected the capabilities of an energetic faculty determined to overcome the twin handicaps of limited funds and a somewhat remote location. It also shows the dedication of distinguished lecturers willing to travel a considerable distance to bring their message to a community.

As an example, speakers for 1895 included Edouard Von Holst from the University of Chicago, President Benjamin Andrews of Brown, Professor Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard, Professor George B. Adams of Yale and President Charles Kendall Adams of the University of Wisconsin. The speakers were gratified by the warm reception they received in Columbus, and often spent time with advanced students or attended a dinner hosted by an Ohio State professor. A series ticket for the year was $1.00, and sales went so well that receipts from the first lecture covered all expenses. The handsome profit realized at the end of the year was turned over to the library for the purchase of history reference works.
Other universities were able to sponsor similar programs, and the major Eastern schools frequently made provisions for such activities in their operating budgets. Appropriations in Midwestern institutions were slow to materialize, the first known being in 1911 when the University of Michigan earmarked $1,000 to bring in distinguished non-resident lecturers.

Included in nearly every institution of higher learning were a number of professors who enjoyed lecturing on specialities which at the time were too narrow to warrant separate courses. Schools which came to develop graduate programs often assigned these same professors seminars and advanced courses which paralleled their public speaking interests. Ohio State furnishes a typical example with Knight giving lectures in the 1890's on topics which he later incorporated into advanced history and political science courses. As the history staff became larger, professors cooperated on projects in order to familiarize both themselves and the public with new areas of study. In 1917 for example a series on Latin America was given at Ohio State by interested faculty members including Assistant Professor Schlesinger whose first lecture "... traced the development of the 20 republics south of the United States through a period of four centuries." Formal courses and eventually seminars in Latin American history would be developed from such beginnings.

Museums were viewed as effective educational vehicles and nearly every school assembled and exhibited a collection which more often than not was housed in a single room. Ohio State's Professor Siebert with the cooperation of the language department and other history
professors created a historical museum designed to function as a re-
source center for history teachers throughout the state. Siebert en-
visioned that this museum would "... contain specimens of the archi-
tecture, art and weapons of all periods of history, with busts and
pictures of historical characters ...". Such efforts were gener-
ally absorbed into the collections of existing historical societies
as the latter became more and more committed to serving the public at
large.

While most university presses were still in the future, the
letting of contracts to commercial printers was becoming increasingly
common. A typical example of this was the Ohio State Bulletin founded
in 1891 as a quarterly journal with a stated purpose to "... contain
the results of investigations or observations not before published,
submitted by professors, and covering work done by themselves, by the
instructors or assistants, or by students working under the direction
of professors in their respective departments.". Such projects were
often unsuccessful; the Bulletin never did appear quarterly and even-
tually ceased publication altogether. A number of attempts to revive
it proved futile until 1916 when a new series was initiated largely
to provide an outlet for unpublished works by Homer Hockett, Wilbur
Siebert and Carl Wittke.

The Undergraduate Teaching of History 1884-1900

The field of history first came into its own in the larger in-
stitutions. The University of Wisconsin made American history a re-
quirement in 1879 thus allowing Professor William Frederick Allen who
started at Wisconsin teaching Latin, Greek, political science and history to teach history exclusively by 1886. That same year, Allen received the half-time assistance of an instructor in elocution named Frederick Jackson Turner who became sufficiently interested in history to resign his position and take a Ph.D. at Hopkins under H. B. Adams. Allen died three years later, thus ending a distinguished twenty-two year career at Wisconsin. He had introduced the first history courses ever taught at the school, had succeeded in making the subject a requirement and "... left a well-organized sequence of historical courses which incorporated two of his pioneer contributions, the topical problem approach rather than the merely chronological, and the use of primary sources by undergraduate students."\(^{22}\)

Allen's death initiated a vigorous search to locate a worthy successor to a man who had gained a national reputation through writing numerous articles and several books, but no name historian could be found willing to venture into the wilds of Wisconsin. Consequently the search committee was forced to select an unknown and as Turner was a familiar unknown, he was hired.

The new history teacher soon established himself as the most popular and dynamic instructor at Wisconsin. People with no interest in the subject frequently took at least one of his courses simply because "Freddie" Turner was the instructor. Carl Becker was such a student who years later, explained why he enrolled. "A dull subject history. And yet there I was at the University of Wisconsin determined to take a course in history because, unfortunately, that was the only 'subject offered' by old Freddie Turner."\(^{23}\)
Becker went on to explain that Turner's "lectures" never related to the assigned readings. They were off the cuff and generally reflected how his mind analyzed something recently read or explored a given research topic. The result of this was that students were able to glimpse the inner workings of a brilliant mind and view a seminal scholar's day-to-day evolution of ideas. He took his students into partnership, exchanged ideas with them and taught them to question, probe and look behind the facts as a lifestyle rather than as an isolated process termed "research."

Besides being a master teacher and scholar Turner became a great power in the university and a skillful politician who eventually earned the title of "kingmaker" because of the great influence he wielded in the selection of professors and administrative officials. He hired Charles Homer Haskins in European history and pressured President Chamberlain into inviting Richard T. Ely to become chairman of social sciences. A highly controversial character who was anathema to the vested interests, Ely openly confessed his doubt that any other major university in America would have hired and retained him. Ely also paid a warm tribute to Turner in particular and historians in general for vigorously defending the cause of academic freedom:

... Generally speaking, however, the historians have supported me more warmly than the economists. The men who helped me found the American Economic Association ... were largely historians, ... It was a historian, Frederick J. Turner, who was responsible for influencing Chamberlain to call me to Wisconsin. Turner had been in my graduate classes at the Johns Hopkins, and though he was, primarily, an historian, he was also a good economist.
Collectively men like Ely, Haskins and Turner forced the Eastern professors not only to acknowledge the existence of the Mississippi Valley, but eventually to respect the institutions within it. The process was long and arduous but greatly aided by Turner who turned down repeated offers from Harvard with considerable fanfare.

Many Eastern educators failed to appreciate the University of Michigan until after World War One. Nonetheless, its law and medical schools had long drawn numerous out-of-state students, and in Michigan itself the university's prestige had been obvious for many years because the state did not contain many other colleges. In Ohio, for instance, Oberlin, Western Reserve, Miami, Wooster, Ohio Wesleyan and others competed with Ohio State. In the early 1890's an historian Burke Hinsdale was hired by the University of Michigan as the first full-time professor of pedagogy in the United States, and his writings, along with those of H. B. Adams, tended to standardize history methodology throughout the United States. Hinsdale crusaded for abandoning the notion that history's purpose is to inculcate moral, political or religious values. He believed instead that teaching students to analyze and form their own conclusions would lead them logically to a love of country and to embrace the commonly accepted definition of what was right and proper.

The innovative spirit at Michigan made it possible for a professor to teach any speciality which interested him providing he could justify a need for the course and find students willing to
enroll. Joseph Dorfman discusses this in relation to Charles Horton Cooley who received a Ph.D. in economics under H. C. Adams in 1894:

- - While Cooley was walking along with Adams and [Frederick] Taylor one afternoon in 1892, Taylor made some suggestions for extending the work of the department. Adams replied that he would rather see a course in sociology offered. Cooley told Adams he would like to offer such a course, and Adams encouraged him to prepare for it. In 1894 he introduced the course, and from that time devoted himself exclusively to the subject.25

The era's most publicized educational development was the opening of the new University of Chicago in 1892 with a thirteen member department of history, two of whom devoted full-time to the discipline. Part-time historians included Ferdinand Schevill who soon thereafter gave up teaching German and devoted himself exclusively to history and Henry Pratt Judson who was to succeed Harper as president. J. Franklin Jameson also joined the history staff during the Harper administration. Leading this department, by far the largest in the university, was Head Professor Hermann Eduard von Holst who did instantly for Chicago what Turner had accomplished at Wisconsin through long years of service. Perhaps the most respected professor of American history in the world due to his multi-volume Constitutional and Political History of the United States, von Holst had found it necessary to refuse prior offers from Hopkins, Cornell and Clark and remain in Europe because American institutions had no pension arrangements. President Harper had the resources to pay pensions and was thus able to secure this eminent historian who took as vital an interest in the development of the institution as he did in his own department and even contributed generously to fund-raising efforts. In
addition he was a dynamic and inspirational teacher who, although suffer-
ing from a chronic illness, enjoyed the enthusiastic support of his stu-
dents. Von Holst was able to devote five years of full-time service to Chicago, after which he found it necessary to take longer and longer leaves of absence and to retire completely in 1899.

Chicago was responsible for a number of innovations designed to promote flexibility in scheduling. The school operated on the quarter system and offered a full complement of courses during the summer. Although all professors were not entitled to sabbaticals, anyone wishing to do so could instruct for twelve consecutive quarters and then receive a year’s vacation at full salary. The school also pioneered in the offering of extension courses with a separate faculty to teach them. Students with jobs found it much more convenient to complete a degree at Chicago than at most other institutions since the vast majority of required undergraduate courses were offered all four quarters as well as at night. A student was free to take as many or as few courses as he wished each quarter, and it was possible to complete all requirements for the B.A. or M.A. simply by enrolling in successive summer terms.

President Harper believed that all administrators including himself should also be teachers in the university. He was able to achieve this ideal partly because of his own recruiting abilities and also due to the vast funds available to him for hiring personnel. For example when he sought a dean of women, he succeeded in securing Alice Freeman Palmer who formerly was president of Wellesley, held a Ph.D. in history and was possibly the most famous woman educator in the
country. Her salary at Chicago was probably higher than Wellesley could afford to pay, but more often than not schools made little or no attempt to retain the people Harper wanted because of the assumed futility of bidding against Standard Oil money.

John W. Burgess led Columbia's history department to a position of great eminence if not its golden age. Although chided by a number of scholars for being too publicity conscious and too much of a dramatist, a charge also leveled at C. K. Adams and von Holst, Burgess did a masterful job of promoting the concept that research is a desirable activity worthy of funds. At Hopkins and the University of Chicago, teaching loads for professors averaged but eight to ten hours per week. Burgess was also aware of how best to describe a history major to a potential employer evidenced by a surviving recommendation which states, "He is a gentleman, a scholar, a man of good appearance, possesses some property and voted for Mr. Cleveland in 1884."26

The first professionally trained historian hired at Columbia was William Archibald Dunning appointed in 1887 after receiving his Ph.D. from the Columbia School of Political Science. In 1890 this school was divided into three 'groups of subjects,' one of which was history and political science with plans to establish a new chair of history as soon as practicable. When the trustees refused to approve this chair, Herbert Levi Osgood was appointed adjunct professor of history in 1890, thus accomplishing the same end. The formal creation of a separate department of history occurred in 1895 with the establishment of the Seth Low Professorship of History and the appointment of William Milligan Sloane to fill the chair. Other professors of history for the
period 1884-1916 include James Harvey Robinson, George Willis Botsford and William Robert Shepard who in the late 1890's became one of the pioneer scholars in Latin American history.

The University of Pennsylvania's history department boasted a distinction never to be matched by any other university, as four of the first five historians hired by this school became president of the American Historical Association. History offerings were fairly extensive in the early years, the 1877 catalogue including American colonial ("Guizot with illustrations,") the decline of the Roman Empire, Medieval Europe, "Europe in the age of Louis XIV," eighteenth century Europe and the relationship of English history to English literature.

The promise of a substantial endowment prompted the founding of Pennsylvania's New School of American History and the transfer of McMaster from the Wharton School to direct this new venture. After he and Francis N. Thorpe, whose specialty was American constitutional history, had collected a working library of 14,000 volumes for the school, the project had to be abandoned following the principal donor's bankruptcy in the depression of 1893.

McMaster expressed the desire to teach the best history course in America, but he proved mediocre in the classroom, exhibited very little patience with his students and was as reticent to grade examination papers as he was unwilling to review the works of other authors. One class put sealing wax on all test booklets, and found every seal intact when the bluebooks were returned, despite the fact that each student had received the highest possible mark. McMaster came to concentrate
his efforts on textbook writing and during his long career sold over 2,500,000 copies thereby accomplishing for American history what Robinson's texts were doing for the European counterpart.

James Harvey Robinson taught at Pennsylvania from 1891 to 1895. Besides being an excellent teacher and distinguished scholar, Robinson was a man of independent means who moved with ease in Philadelphia's highest circles and did a great deal to bring the study of history to the attention of prominent citizens.

Until the turn of the century Johns Hopkins was still considered the pacesetter although the onset of serious financial difficulties in the 1890's coupled with the rise of other institutions with far larger budgets indicated that the hegemony of Hopkins would not be permanent. Symbolic of this trend was President Harper's repeated although unsuccessful efforts to hire Herbert Baxter Adams, eventually offering nearly triple his Hopkins salary with a year's preliminary vacation at full pay.

By 1885 undergraduate course offerings at Hopkins were gradually becoming more structured with seven designated groups of subjects, the student being expected to confine course selections to one of these. Group six entitled "Historical-Political" was described in the catalogue as "... a basis for the subsequent study of law."^{28}

Although far from mediocre, Harvard's history department in relation to the departments of other schools was probably at its nadir during the period 1884-1900. President Charles Eliot presided over an extremely conservative faculty who habitually ignored the changes going on about them and were often afflicted with a deadly smugness.
In absolute terms the school had not declined, but relative to other institutions such as Hopkins, Cornell, Chicago, Wisconsin and Columbia Harvard was merely making time and had definitely lost its unquestioned hegemony.

The presence of Edward Channing and Charles Homer Haskins on the faculty, however, indicated that excellence certainly was not dead at Harvard. President Eliot took a personal interest in Channing's *History of the United States* and saw to it that the professor's faculty responsibilities were lightened considerably. On the other hand there was Silas Marcus Macvane who first taught in the department of economics in 1873 before being transferred to history in 1878. Such switches were extremely common, but Macvane had almost no interest in history and stated so publically on numerous occasions with the result that he taught lackluster courses in both the European and American fields while continuing to concentrate nearly all his energies on economic controversies of the day.

Surviving examples of Harvard examinations prior to 1900 indicate extremely traditional testing methods being employed, in marked contrast to what Woodrow Wilson was pleased to find at Hopkins. The following samples from Professor Gurney's Roman history course are typical:

1. Draw a map of Italy showing its chief physical features and ancient political divisions . . .

2. Give, in chronological order, an outline of the chief wars in which the Romans were engaged during the century preceding the battle of Actium.29
The young Professor A. Lawrence Lowell, later to become President of Harvard, found the physical facilities of the school in such poor condition that there was no place suitable for him to lecture his survey students in political science, and being an affluent Lowell, he promptly provided funds for the New Lecture Hall. Most professors, however, even at Harvard did not have such an option open to them and were forced to endure inadequate facilities.

The University of Virginia found itself in difficulties similar to most Southern schools. While entrance requirements remained high and the law school retained its former excellence, a perpetual shortage of funds prevented the school from recapturing its former greatness. It is distressing to contemplate what a relatively small sum would have been required to return this school to the forefront of educational developments, but the money simply was not available. Although a School of Historical Sciences was established by gift in 1882 and re-organized in 1889 as the School of Historical and Economical Sciences, all history courses during this period were taught by one man while another covered all the offerings in political science and economics.

Until at least 1900, Berkeley was still considered education's most difficult of frontiers. The University of California was in perpetual financial difficulty and its faculty continued to suffer from periodic purges by the legislature. The presidents were extremely suspicious of any new or untried theories with the result that altering the curriculum proved almost an impossibility. Bernard Moses (1846-1931), long a professor of history and political science, used the classroom to vent his conservative rage upon any social
legislation including Germany's compulsory workman's accident insurance laws of the 1880's. A zealous Malthusian and Social Darwinist he preached his belief that democracy would wither and die as the brutal selection process of an industrial society forced more and more people to the wall.

Charles Levermore who taught at California in the 1880's offers a glimpse of what life was like at Berkeley:

... But I have been so steadily occupied in the endeavor to keep my mental equipment bright for the daily encounter, that I have not felt the lack of reading-matter, of music and lectures, of vigorous society. ... In coming years, if I stay here, the disconnected nature of our society will plainly be the greatest drawback—the river of current thought and opinion does not pour through this university. We are still digging the channels for it.30

Dig the channels they did, and worth keeping in mind is the fact that much of the history taught at the turn of the century was done in similarly ill-equipped institutions by underpaid and poorly trained professors forced to teach in a number of fields and groaning under the heavy weight of excessive course loads and numerous outside duties. When one discusses the leading institutions in order to formulate trends, one dare not assume that these developments were being emulated or even recognized at most other schools. Hence all schools discussed in this study were far superior to most others and distinctly atypical; a description of Berkeley prior to its days of greatness serves as a reminder of this fact. Contemplating the lot and the quality of the average professor prior to 1900 is disheartening at best. Upton Sinclair's controversial work, The Goose-Step,
describes the history teachers of his youth, men who unfortunately were typical of their times:

... I remember the tall, stringy old gentleman who taught us lists of names and dates, which we recited one hour and forgot the next.
I remember with vividness the men who put me through these various torments; young men, some feeble, some impatient, but always uninterested in what they were doing.

... 31

During the 1880's the trustees of Ohio State University were concerned that the history program was languishing under the guidance of Cynthia Weld who continued to be the subject of protests concerning the quality of her teaching, the fact that she did not have the doctorate and the observation that she had never published a line nor presented a paper in her entire life. A stormy board meeting in the fall of 1885 resulted in a vote of 5-2 for requesting Miss Weld's resignation, thus paving the way for the election of Dr. George Wells Knight, probably the most promising young scholar seeking employment at that time. Although but 27 years old, he had already served as a high school principal and had delivered before the American Historical Association portions of his dissertation which later became the first monograph ever published by the Association. The first history Ph.D. produced by the University of Michigan, Knight carried the highest recommendations of C. K. Adams and Thomas M. Cooley. In addition he had independent means and thus possessed the necessary funds to support travel and scholarly activities. An excellent lecturer and a man of considerable presence, he was appointed a full professor at the outset, and there were high hopes that a worthy successor to John Short had been found. It is certainly evident that the value of history was
appreciated at Ohio State and that considerable effort had been expended to find the best possible individual.

Knight was prominent at Ohio State from the day he arrived on campus, and was initially in charge of history and English until becoming chairman of history and political economy in 1887. He was considered a demanding teacher and early faculty minutes indicate a number of instances where students petitioned to be excused from taking his courses. He generally expressed historical issues as crystal clear dichotomies prior to presenting his own views with such persuasiveness that the average student accepted them without question.

Arthur Schlesinger who took course work under Knight at Ohio State expressed dissatisfaction with such teaching methods:

To his students, Knight seemed a peerless teacher, an opinion which he gave evidence of sharing himself. It was not until I reached Graduate School that I came to realize that human situations seldom lend themselves to such categorical treatment; . . .

Professor Knight introduced the historical seminar to Ohio State in 1886, described as "... the first trial of this on Ohio soil." In 1890 he found himself appointed to the faculty of the new law school at no additional pay while also having to concern himself more and more with the planning and introduction of all courses in economics. Besides serving on numerous committees and performing his duties as a chairman, this professor also played a key role in visiting the high schools of the state which sought accreditation.

In the midst of all these duties Knight found the time to publish a few monographs although their quality never measured up to his early promise. His only recognized published work outside of a
medium-quality doctoral dissertation on the history of land grants for education in the old Northwest was a critical and supplementary edition of Francois Guizot's *General History of Civilization in Europe* brought out by Appleton in 1896. His monographs on Ohio history, government and education created little impact beyond the state borders, and after 1900 his only production was an occasional article. The array of administrative duties he assumed, the range of courses he taught in American history, political science, economics and English plus the considerable amount of time he spent in social activities rendered it impossible for Knight to publish anything of substance. While contributing significantly to the institutional development at Ohio State, his professional reputation as an historian and chairman was minimal, thus greatly complicating the recruitment of established scholars in history since most of them proved unwilling to serve under a chairman of lesser stature than themselves.

Professor Knight corresponded with H. B. Adams during the years 1891-1899 in the hopes of adding a Hopkins Ph.D. to his staff. In a letter written to Adams in 1891 he outlined a projected vacancy in his department:

> Can you name to me a first class man, whom we could be likely to get, for an instructor in the department of history and political science. I should want a man who had made history his major specialty and was especially well grounded in medieval and European history. The work to be carried by the man next year would be a general course (for sophomores) in medieval and modern European history (2 hours a week for the year, mainly text book work,) perhaps another partial course in European history for juniors and seniors, and in the preparatory department, which we hope to cut off and close in two or three years, work in the U.S. general history, and in Civics.

> . . . The salary will range between $800 and $1200.
I may say that in all probability though it is by no means a certainty and should not be taken as an implied part of the contract for next year, my department will be divided in two or three years and the chair of European history (perhaps all history) will be open to be filled.  

Adams sent a polite reply, but suggested no candidate. Thus Knight concluded that Wilbur Siebert, one of his former students who had served as an assistant at Ohio State before receiving an M.A. from Harvard, was the best available applicant.

Professor Siebert, a Columbus native of independent means, had married Anna Ware Sabine whose antecedents possessed a rich educational and liberal heritage including leadership in the Underground Railroad prior to the Civil War. The young professor became fascinated by this heritage and undertook a lifetime study of the Underground Railroad which gave him a national reputation and resulted in his amassing the largest collection on the subject ever assembled.

Although having research and writing interests in the American field Siebert remained a European history teacher throughout his long career starting in 1891 when he taught six separate courses ranging from the middle ages to the nineteenth century. 1896-1898 saw a continuation of this dichotomy with Professor Siebert on leave taking advanced coursework in European history at Harvard while writing *Emancipation by the Underground Railroad System* which was accepted for publication by Macmillan and retitled *The Underground Railroad from Slavery to Freedom*.

In 1898 Siebert who had been on leave returned to Ohio State to teach ten distinctly different courses which soon rose to twelve after he became chairman of a one man European History Department.
Professor Siebert was able to find time for his research only by preparing a large manuscript for each course he taught. This was really never revised and was read slowly to the class in installments. Grades were determined by how accurately students could reproduce the appropriate lectures at examination time.

Frederick C. Clark, a Michigan Ph.D. and formerly assistant professor of economics at Stanford, received a temporary appointment to replace Siebert while he was on leave and during his first year taught both medieval and modern history, European survey, history of England, the Protestant Reformation and the French Revolution. Dr. Clark had taken this $700 position in the hopes it would become permanent and he would eventually be able to teach his specialty which was economics. With some assistance from his brother-in-law George Wells Knight who suddenly decided that a staff member of several years standing was doing unsatisfactory work, Clark was able to realize his objective and was teaching economics exclusively by 1902. In 1903 he fatally shot himself, having become despondent because Alaskan mining stocks had incurred losses to friends who had bought the securities on his recommendation.

Meanwhile Ohio State was undergoing changes which would transform it from a university in name only to a university in substance. First, abolishing the preparatory school in the late 1890's not only eliminated the necessity of professors teaching high school courses but also greatly changed the environment of a school which in its earliest years had a higher enrollment of preparatory than collegiate students. Second, although faculty teaching loads were excessive,
extensive course offerings including seminars had become available in both European and American history thus paving the way for a larger and more specialized staff in the near future. Third, a demerit system which had required all instructors to take attendance and to penalize absent students was abandoned along with compulsory chapel. Fourth, the school joined the College Oratorical Association and soon distinguished itself in debate thus doing much to erase the "sheep farm" nickname with which the school had been branded in the earliest years.

Ohio State's growth was also creating problems. Originally each teacher had a classroom that was exclusively his, plus a private office, but by the turn of the century professors were often teaching in several buildings and sharing a single office with a number of colleagues. The students themselves were becoming more articulate and more vocal. Earlier a Lantern editorial dated March 18, 1886 had pleaded for more relevance in the teaching of history and requested greater insights into "the real life to come." By 1899 such changes in the curriculum were taking place although many students would have been content to return to the old, simplistic recitation method. History had become a complex and demanding subject which many found bewildering as evidenced by a Lantern poem contributed in 1899:

Oh, the awful general history,
Oh, the hard and cruel history,
Ever harder, harder, harder
Grows the history of the nations.
Prior to 1900 even the major institutions considered themselves fortunate to have a single history specialist who taught the complete range of course offerings. After 1900, however, one can begin to discern the development of areas of specialization as well as the rise of European history as a field distinctly different than American. The separation of European history from history and political science which took place at Ohio State in 1900 is a reflection of this trend. Specialization soon became further refined with medieval and Latin American history both developing early in the twentieth century.

In 1902 Ohio State reflected this enthusiasm for medieval history by hiring Chicago trained Edgar Holmes McNeal as a specialist in this area, thus enlarging the European history department to two men. Class enrollment figures for 1905 indicate that Professor McNeal's middle ages course was by far the most popular offering in the department.

The development of Latin American history is illustrative of many other fields. Early in the twentieth century the subject appeared almost simultaneously in widely scattered institutions including Pennsylvania, Harvard, Illinois and California. Many departments not offering the subject took note of its development elsewhere and pressed for an expansion of their own curricula. Ohio State's Dr. Knight returned from a European sabbatical in 1909 with high enthusiasm for exploring the South American materials available in the British Museum and an awareness of the need for a Latin American
specialist at Ohio State. Knight hoped to be able to do further work in this field and urged his students to consider majoring in it. In 1915 he offered an instructorship to George Wood with the stipulation that he teach a course in this area which he did until 1922.

The publication of the Turner Thesis resulted in the development of American western and frontier history as an area of specialization with Frederick Jackson Turner producing the first generation of scholars in this field almost single handedly. One of the most productive and highly respected Turner Ph.D.'s was Homer Hockett who served as his secretary while completing the doctorate. Ignoring Dean Sellery's insistence that Hockett hadn't the slightest interest in Ohio State, Henry Russell Spencer acting on behalf of Knight who was in Germany persisted in negotiating with the young Ph.D. and had the satisfaction of seeing him accept an associate professorship at Ohio State and settle down to a lifelong career at the institution.

In the country as a whole other fields of specialization came into their own between 1900 and 1916. These included Southern United States history and the slavery controversy; the history of political parties; American colonial history; the American Civil War and reconstruction; American diplomatic and constitutional history; American social and intellectual history; American minorities and immigrant groups; state history; historiography and social studies education. Also included were ancient history; Modern European history; English, French and German history; and church history.

Semanticists have long cautioned that the map is not the territory. Likewise one cannot judge what is actually being taught simply
by studying course titles. Despite extensive listings in the cata-
logue Arthur Schlesinger considered the offerings at Ohio State to be
extremely narrow while he was in attendance as an undergraduate:

United States history was in those days at Ohio State
political history, a record of constitutional development,
party strife, diplomacy and war, with only cursory atten-
tion to economic aspects and none at all to such influ-
ences as education, literature and the role of the foreign
born. Religious factors received no mention after the
colonial period, and humanitarian movements only in the
unavoidable connection with the antislavery cause.37

The development and expansion of history was accompanied by an
equally impressive increase of quality textbooks in both the European
and American fields as well as the publication of research guides be-
ginning with Justin Winsor's eight-volume Critical and Narrative His-
tory, and continuing with the Channing and Hart Guide to American His-
tory and Jameson's Dictionary of United States History. (Channing and
Hart had compiled the Guide, beginning in 1896, and Turner began to
cooperate in the venture in 1912.) In addition an ever increasing
cadre of professional historians supported the production of scholarly
journals by their subscriptions to publications such as The American
Historical Review, the Magazine of Western History and the Magazine of
American History.

During the first decade of the twentieth century a controversy
began at a handful of the largest institutions which would eventually
engulf most American universities. At issue was whether or not in-
struction improved when the most able professors presided over large
lecture sections with graduate students serving as discussion leaders
and graders. Another subject of debate was whether or not advanced
graduate students were qualified to teach their own sections of a survey courses, and President Thompson rendered his judgment on this issue in Ohio State's 1905 Annual Report:

The Administrative Board is, however, strongly of the opinion that save in rare instances fellows should not be placed in charge of classes or be permitted to give class instruction. They should be "assisting" and not "teaching" fellows. 38

Columbia experimented with large classes, but abandoned them in 1906 declaring the advantages of small classes to be "indisputable." Turner and Haskins, however, came to the opposite conclusion after experimenting with both types of classes at Wisconsin. Large sections were also the rule at Harvard thus precipitating the excessive demand for oversize classrooms that motivated Lowell to build his own lecture hall. Ohio State was of insufficient size for this issue to become controversial until the 1920's but as early as 1909 Professor Knight had visited Harvard and voiced his approval of large lecture sections.

As both individual classes and the universities themselves became ever larger it was less and less probable that a professor would know more than a small minority of his students. Consequently many institutions expended a good deal of time and energy in hopes of formulating an objective system of grading which would create uniform standards throughout the university. Ohio State experimented along these lines, and its case may be regarded as typical. Numerous faculty meetings at Ohio were convulsed by heated controversies beginning in 1906 when a "floor" of 120 credit hours and 120 grade points was established as the absolute minimum for graduation in arts and sciences. In 1914 a new system was inaugurated whereby grades of
M, G, A, P, F and D were given with professors expected to award a certain stipulated percentage of grades in each category. This strict application of grading on the curve was designed to eliminate the problem of differing standards among professors and to insure that a "G" from one teacher was at least roughly comparable to a "G" from another.

Yet the next year Homer Hockett, serving as chairman of the committee on statistics of the college of arts and sciences, reported that an excessive number of high and low grades in comparison to a low number of average marks indicated that at least some of the professors were choosing to ignore this new system. At Ohio State and in most of the larger schools implementing such a plan proved impossible due to a lack of faculty cooperation. In more than a few schools, however, grading on the curve was mandatory, and a professor who deviated from fixed percentages faced the prospect of dismissal. In contrast the University of Michigan abandoned grades completely in 1906 and for a time converted to a pass, non-pass system.

The controversy concerning electives continued, although a considerable uniformity became evident due to the widespread popularity of the "Harvard Movement" which divided the curriculum into subject areas and stipulated that the student was required to take a minimum number of courses within several areas of his own choosing. Ohio State's rationale for embracing this concept was explained in a 1910 Lantern article which described the movement as one "... which provides some sort of system to the students' work and prevents undue scattering of forces, or the equally unfortunate overspecialization." This was virtually identical, however, to a system
inaugurated at Ohio State in 1902 which featured group majors and minors rather than the traditional subject ones, and was abandoned when university authorities discovered that none of the prestige institutions used such a system.

Traditionally universities had offered courses only in the morning but an ever-worsening shortage of classroom facilities coupled with a determination to instruct a wider range of students resulted in the development of summer schools, night classes and extension services. The public institutions were often in the vanguard of this movement although the University of Chicago was probably the most daring and innovative pioneer in this area, remaining for many years the only major school where a student could attain a degree solely by attending summer school, night school or a combination of the two.

Ohio State's situation was typical of the Land-Grant schools. George Wells Knight with his lifelong interest in teacher education saw the need for a summer school which he initiated on a trial basis in 1908 by offering his very popular course in methods of teaching American history. Knight planned subsequent summer sessions, recruiting the professors and gradually increasing the course offerings. Pay was generally not as high as for courses taught during the regular year due to an insistence by university officials that summer school be self-sustaining, thus affording teachers the unique distinction of being paid less for overtime. Ohio State's night school evolved not as a separate division but as an extension of the regular curriculum when teachers in the local public schools began persuading professors to offer late afternoon sections of certain courses. By 1913 classes
were being scheduled as late as 6 P.M. and occasionally were offered on Saturday morning. Ohio State's experience was typical of many other institutions including Johns Hopkins University which initiated both a summer program and a teacher education major prior to World War One.

The period 1900-1916 saw a complete reorganization of departmental structures in most larger schools. Gradually separate departments of history arose with Wisconsin, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Columbia, Hopkins and Chicago being among the pioneers of this movement. In 1900 Frederick Jackson Turner reorganized his department into a "school of history" which employed nine faculty members plus several special lecturers. Much in the fashion that H. B. Adams advanced the status of history at Hopkins, Turner used job offers he received from other schools as a wedge to gain the men and resources he needed. Most historians, however, were unable to employ such methods and had to settle for making the best use of whatever funds were offered them. Such a school was the University of Virginia which managed to maintain a creditable history program despite extremely limited funds by concentrating upon a few areas within the discipline, the most notable of which was Southern history with particular emphasis on the Reconstruction period.

Separate and well funded departments of history were seldom created on the initiative of university trustees or presidents. Generally a single ambitious individual capable of convincing others of the importance of history was responsible for the discipline coming into its own in any given school. Frequently such a man consulted with historians outside his own university who had experienced success
in organizing their own programs. The excitement of building departments, reshaping universities and creating several distinct professions in the social sciences bound men of varying disciplines together in a common crusade. The link between history and economics has already been discussed. Likewise the relationship between history and political science was often particularly close.

There was, however, a strong possibility that a man capable of creating a department where none had existed previously would in time become a tyrannical chairman who quashed any suggestions involving change in his department thereby frustrating the younger men's hopes for advancement and a share in the decision-making process. Such was the case at Ohio State where two historians each created his own department and regarded it as a personal monument. The result was an unnatural division of resources and an intense rivalry between two competing departments of American and European history which persisted until 1925; a succession of feuds which continually embarrassed the university as both men had powerful friends in the community and on the board; and a deep sense of frustration on the part of promising young scholars serving under these men who saw little hope for their own or their department's advancement.

1900-1916 saw a great expansion of most history faculties, and Ohio State was no exception despite the controversies which engulfed the two departments. Wilbur Siebert became chairman of his own European history department in 1900, and devoted the vast majority of his time thereafter to writing and research. In 1904 he authored The
Edgar Holmes McNeal was a shy, reserved individual with a passionate interest in medieval history who was promoted regularly, being appointed instructor in 1902 and attaining the rank of full professor in 1914. He and political science chairman Henry Spencer became firm friends and were part of a small group of faculty members who went canoeing and hiking together. McNeal found himself teaching a wide range of subjects including early medieval, renaissance, modern European, Greek, Roman and English history since this two-man department offered twenty-two distinctly different courses in 1902. He was an exceedingly careful scholar whose published works were few due to his insistence upon perfection, but he came to enjoy a fine, scholarly reputation. In the early years of his career he collaborated with his former advisor Chicago's Oliver J. Thatcher in the preparation of Source Book for Medieval History which Scribner's published in 1905. Later the two cooperated in publishing a college text in medieval history. Professor McNeal's soft voice and shy mannerisms limited his effectiveness in addressing large groups, and he was most at home conducting seminars which he led with great skill.

Clarence Perkins became the third member of Siebert's staff upon joining the faculty in 1909 as an assistant professor. A lively, outgoing and thoroughly entertaining lecturer he attracted large numbers of advisees partially because of his personality and partly due to his genuine interest in students. As he found his greatest pleasures in social activities such as chatting with students or playing the
mandolin or guitar with a group of his friends, he spent little time in research publishing only an occasional article in his field of English history.

Professor Knight's American history and political science department, organized as such in 1898, became the department of American history in 1909 when Political Science became a separate department under Henry Russell Spencer. Knight's assumption of an enormous variety of non-teaching duties halted his scholarly production save for an occasional article and left him with little time for the development of his courses or his department. Some of Knight's more important tasks included twice serving as acting dean of the law college, attending to duties as a commissioner in charge of Ohio's building at the Jamestown Exposition in 1907, spending several months helping revise Ohio's constitution in 1912 and serving as dean of the college of education from 1914 to 1920.

Despite the stern exterior Knight presented to his students, his concern for them was constant and included a willingness to loan them money at no interest. One of his former students recalls taking a final examination under Knight and writing in the test booklet his belief that one question was unfair since it dealt with material not covered in the course. A stormy conference between Knight and the student followed, after which the professor agreed to re-read the student's exam and to study the notes which he had taken during the course. Several days later Knight handed everything back without saying a word, but the student noted that his old grade had been crossed out, and replaced with an "A." Ohio State President William
Oxley Thompson no doubt had Knight in mind when he publicly lamented the fact that good teachers and scholars were often sidetracked into administration.

As stated previously Homer Hockett joined the American history staff in 1909 and offered a course in Western history during his first year at Ohio State. In 1910 he coordinated the publication of Essays in American History Dedicated to Frederick Jackson Turner which honored the great historian's elevation to the presidency of the American Historical Association. Turner wrote his former pupil a warm note of appreciation for the volume making special mention of Hockett's essay within it, "... I like it very much and have learned much from it. It is no repetition of things which I told you--you are telling me things, and that's the pupil to be proud of..." 40

Throughout his long career Hockett remained an extremely thorough researcher who by example taught his graduate students to examine every possible source before putting pen to paper. To this day his former students recall an office stacked high with shoeboxes, each containing hundreds of references to be researched. Like his European history colleague Eddie McNeal, Hockett lacked the vigorous personality to be an effective teacher save in the seminar situation and despite his national reputation as a scholar he never received the job offer from a major institution which would have elevated his salary at Ohio State. Hockett was consequently in serious economic circumstances throughout much of his career, and his family resorted to measures such as taking in roomers in order to make ends meet.
Arthur Meier Schlesinger joined the Ohio State faculty in 1912 after passing his general examinations at Columbia University. A graduate of the class of 1910, he had been extremely prominent on the Ohio State campus having served as editor-in-chief of the Lantern, member of Sphinx honorary, president of the Political Science Club, member of the Cosmopolitan Club, vice president of the Lantern Publishing Company, and member of Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Delta Theta fraternities. He was best known as a vigorous editor of the school newspaper who succeeded in wresting its control from the hands of a few fraternities which had long dominated it. While working on the Lantern staff Schlesinger met Elizabeth Bancroft who served as his society editor and was also extremely active in Ohio State's History Club. The two became man and wife in 1914 following Schlesinger's elevation to assistant professor at a salary of $1,500 which was then considered sufficient to support a bride.

Schlesinger worked with intense energy spending every spare moment in professional reading and research. He received the services of the department's only grader, an earnest undergraduate whom Schlesinger was fond of advising. One day the young instructor exhorted his assistant to emulate Wilbur Siebert who had attained a national reputation as a scholar by hard work and publishing rather than lavishing his time upon social activities and obligations outside the field of history as Dr. Knight had done. Following his own advice Schlesinger traveled extensively during his vacations gathering information for the dissertation that would win him the Justin Winsor prize and establish the beginnings of his reputation.
This young scholar took his teaching duties as seriously as his research, delivering well thought out and carefully formulated lectures as well as spending hours with his assistant in order to assure reasonable and uniform grading standards. His desire to ask questions any student could answer resulted in the first examination being so comprehensive that everyone was still writing when the embarrassed instructor finally called in the papers after four hours. Schlesinger was concerned that his teaching was not being favorably received by the students so he asked two of them to remain after class and analyze what was wrong. One young lady remained mute, but the other launched into a veritable diatribe stating that students were "sullen" because the professor was too stiff, too formal, too earnest and too prone to overwhelm rather than to enlighten. The young lass with an Irish temper may well have been exaggerating but she received an "A" in the course nonetheless and Schlesinger revamped his teaching methods to such an extent that students could hardly believe it was the same man. Anxious to be a success both as a teacher and as a scholar at Ohio State, Schlesinger was not overly critical of the institution and retained a lifelong interest in the school.

Schlesinger found himself appointed director of survey courses in American history and viewed this position more as an opportunity than as a burden. Both he and Professor Hockett were concerned that reading matter available to students was out of date and that teachers were forced to assign obsolescent materials such as writings by James Ford Rhodes or John Bach McMaster for lack of anything better. In 1915 the two professors published a syllabus to accompany Bassett's
Short History of the United States. Unlike contemporary texts which rarely mentioned events after 1877, this work concentrated heavily on the past Reconstruction period concluding with the election of Woodrow Wilson. Every other page was blank, thus inviting the juxtaposition of notes taken on outside readings with the body of the text. Most students found the syllabus to be useful, and a number suggested that this be expanded into a full length textbook.

By the mid teens the established graduate schools were beginning to award some of their most prestigious fellowships to recipients of the Ohio State B.A. in history, a number of whom then returned to Ohio State as professors. Those who followed this pattern include Arthur Schlesinger who received a fellowship from Columbia, Carl Wittke who won a university scholarship from Harvard, and Eugene Roseboom who faced the pleasant dilemma of choosing between Pennsylvania, Columbia and Harvard and selected Harvard. Collectively individuals such as these created a favorable impression upon the leading graduate schools thus paving the way for a national awareness of Ohio State's history program.

Graduate Study in America 1884-1916

The founding of the American Historical Association in 1884 signified a probable expansion of the job market for history teachers and thus directly encouraged the development of American graduate facilities in the humanities which had previously been almost nonexistent. Although the majority of available funds would continue to be expended in the sciences an increasing public enthusiasm for history assured
the establishment of graduate programs in this discipline and provided ever increasing opportunities to earn a living as a historian.

Financial assistance for graduate students first became a part of university budgets in the late nineteenth century and increased dramatically after 1910. An investigation of funds appropriated or endowments available does not present a complete picture because it was common in the early days for a professor, a trustee or an interested citizen to loan money to a student and then fail to press for its repayment. It was not uncommon at Hopkins for instance for a professor to contact the trustees personally when a worthy student was without funds such as occurred in 1888 when Professor Dana C. Munroe interceded on behalf of John Rogers Commons.

The University of Pennsylvania first included fellowships in its budget in 1885, and ten years later President Charles Custin Harrison endowed the graduate school with $500,000 of his own funds thus assuring that all students of recognized ability would be provided for. Harrison's gift, unique in the history of American graduate education, assured his university a position of eminence in advanced instruction by providing funds not only for fellowships and scholarships but also for source materials needed in research and for the employment of visiting professors who lightened the teaching load of regular faculty members pursuing original investigations. By 1940 the value of this endowment exceeded one million dollars.

The University of Wisconsin first granted fellowships in 1888 although the eight established were reserved exclusively for the school's own graduates. The following year the University of Michigan's first
fellowship was established by a faculty member's widow, but unfortunately it soon lapsed due to her financial distress. A precedent had been set, however, and by 1913 Michigan had 47 separate funds worth over $800,000 dispensing student aid. The University of Illinois granted a few fellowships upon the founding of its graduate school in 1891. Appropriations for this purpose increased steadily, and by 1915 there was $25,500 available annually for the support of graduate students.

Columbia and Harvard followed Hopkins' lead in providing funds for advanced students, Harvard's appropriation soon becoming the largest in the nation with a budget of $43,825 by 1913. Due to a special Rockefeller gift, the University of Chicago had $10,000 for graduate fellowships during its first year of operation, a sum which was steadily increased in subsequent years. By 1913 70 fellowships and scholarships ranging in value from $120 to $520 per year were available to Chicago's graduate students.

Ohio State's situation reflected that of most larger universities, particularly the Land-Grant ones. The graduate school had no budget save for office help, and the university's resources were concentrated very heavily in the sciences. The first monies available for history students came in the form of sporadic emergency appropriations to aid an ill or disabled professor, the first such money going to Edwin E. Sparks who assisted John T. Short in the last months of Short's life. By the turn of the century limited funds were squeezed out of some departmental budgets for grading assistance, an example of which was $90 paid to future history chairman George Washburne while
still an undergraduate in 1905. This informal system of employing occasional graders continued until 1913 when graduate dean William McPherson received $2,500 for two fellowships and six scholarships which was raised to $10,000 the following year, the latter figure being quite respectable for the times. The graduate program in history was not formally established until the mid 1920's, and nearly all of this fellowship and scholarship money went into the sciences until after World War One.

Pennsylvania's graduate school, founded in 1882 as the department of philosophy, offered seminars and advanced lecture courses in some twenty fields by the mid 1890's prompting Francis N. Thorpe to assert that, "... More time is given to the study of American History and Economy at Pennsylvania than at any other university in this country." Until 1896 public oral examinations were required for both the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees, and the publication of each doctoral dissertation became mandatory in 1900.

Columbia University concentrated so heavily upon graduate education that many undergraduates complained of being ignored. President Barnard offered them little comfort as he favored eliminating the undergraduate divisions completely. With the arrival of Herbert Levi Osgood and William Archibald Dunning in 1890 doctoral applicants could study history exclusively, thus ending the necessity of having to combine it with political science or economics.

Ph.D. requirements were extremely stringent at Columbia and included written examinations reviewing all coursework, a knowledge of three languages and orals on the dissertation which after 1890 were
open to any interested faculty member. Doctoral applicants no longer followed a uniform, predetermined course of study after 1890 but instead selected a major and two minors from the large number of subjects open to them. As was typical in prestigious graduate schools, the awarding of a Columbia Ph.D. signified the fulfillment of certain almost mystical prerequisites. Depending upon the individual candidate these requirements might be satisfied by taking a few courses, many courses or possibly never at all.

This meant that in effect every doctoral applicant followed a custom made program, a situation which necessitated frequent interaction between the student and his professors. Schlesinger and others criticised their graduate experiences at Columbia, maintaining that professors lavished attention on the anointed few leaving the rest to flounder as best they could. Despite the school's undeniable excellence, a reputation of faculty inaccessibility and even indifference became associated with the institution from the onset of its graduate program. The University of Wisconsin, on the other hand, with the same type of curriculum came to enjoy precisely the opposite reputation by 1916.

According to President Eliot, Harvard's graduate program "started feebly in 1870" and gained momentum only after Hopkins was established. Like Ohio State, the graduate school had no budget save for office expenses, a situation which continued until the 1930's, thus forcing a juggling of existing departmental budgets as well as the acceptance of additional duties by some professors. This situation created fewer problems than in a Land-Grant school, however, due
to the independent means of many Harvard faculty members, the relatively generous departmental appropriations to the humanities in comparison with those available to public institutions, the large budget devoted to the library and the willingness of friends of Harvard to provide funds for graduate fellowships and scholarships.

The study of history continued to progress at Johns Hopkins despite the presence of an administration almost indifferent to its existence. Ten years after the school opened, Adams remained unsuccessful in his struggle to establish a separate department of history and political science and was forced to employ devices such as inviting distinguished lecturers for short periods and hiring part-time men to teach additional courses in order to stretch the limited resources available to him. One of the most valuable of these part-time appointments was James Schouler who lectured in constitutional history from 1890 to 1907 as well as sharing his keen interest in historiography and introducing the use of new source materials in numerous Ph.D. seminars.

The 1890's were particularly difficult for Johns Hopkins University whose entire endowment was invested in the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, a firm which ceased paying dividends during the economic depression which gripped the nation. Adams' early death in 1901 was possibly hastened by the strain of seeing the school he loved in such dire circumstances and by his ceaseless efforts to maintain a quality program despite all obstacles.

Midwestern institutions including Ohio State, Michigan, Illinois and Chicago recognized Adams' plight and sought to lure him from
Baltimore. His most tempting offer came from the new University of Chicago whose role in the development of historical studies deserves underscoring as Harper was one of the few university presidents to insist upon a strong history program without being prodded by others. At Hopkins and Wisconsin, for example, history instruction would have been far weaker and possibly not even respectable save for the vigorous lobbying of H. B. Adams and Frederick Jackson Turner. President Harper, on the other hand, created the nation's largest and most highly paid history department on the first day his school opened and even favored historians for administrative posts throughout the university. Chicago had a fully developed Ph.D. program from the outset plus average weekly teaching loads of eight to ten hours in order to allow ample time for research and working with advanced students.

Chicago's faculty displayed remarkable unanimity in insisting that each Ph.D. candidate demonstrate the ability to perform independent, original research with the result that qualitative rather than quantitative requirements were instituted. The M.A. degree, however, was the subject of heated controversy which raged for a decade and resulted in the granting of two distinctly different M.A.'s termed "specialist" and "non-specialist." The latter degree, unique among the better known institutions, was a terminal M.A., with no thesis or residence requirement, designed to permit public school teachers to earn the degree by taking a stipulated number of advanced courses during summers and/or evenings.

Wisconsin was the only Land-Grant institution which stressed the humanities as much as the scientific and agricultural subjects.
Although Ph.D. programs were announced by the Regents as early as 1869, financial considerations made advanced work largely perfunctory until the early 1880's after which the number of graduate students increased from almost none to 57 in 1892, 126 in 1901 and 250 in 1910. Probably the most famous division at Wisconsin was Richard T. Ely's School of Economics, History and Political Science which contained a distinguished staff thoroughly devoted to excellence in teaching and research as well as interdisciplinary cooperation and communication, hallmarks of the university which have persisted to the present day.

Even in that less hectic era Wisconsin became famous for warm and vital professors who took a deep, personal interest in their students making it the rule rather than the exception to invite them into their homes frequently. Such close contacts made it relatively easy to spot a student in personal, academic or financial difficulty, and extraordinary efforts were often exerted to come to his aid. Paul Knaplund describes how the department discovered his financial destitution causing Chairman Munro to arrange an assistantship for this earnest young scholar who was too proud to request any aid. John Hicks also mentions the personal attention he received as a graduate student, describing his oral examinations as a nonthreatening dialogue between longstanding friends. 42

Insufficient library holdings coupled with severe budget problems hampered Virginia's graduate program. The school retained sufficiently high standards, however, to become the South's only representative in the Association of American Universities which was composed of institutions undertaking recognized graduate education, and
which consisted of but eighteen schools in 1908. The Ph.D. was awarded only after fulfilling a series of rigorous requirements including a minimum of three years of consecutive full-time graduate study.

The University of Illinois exerted a profound influence on neighboring institutions when in 1907 President Edmund J. James convinced the state legislature to appropriate $50,000 per year for graduate education, thus engineering America's first legislated appropriation earmarked exclusively for advanced work. Graduate students had been present since the school's earliest days although no holders of the B.A. from other institutions were in attendance prior to 1893. The formal opening of the graduate school took place in 1907 with delegates from throughout the United States attending the elaborate ceremonies. One of the visitors to Champaign-Urbana in 1907 was Ohio State's Wilbur Siebert who served as his university's official delegate because none of Ohio State's top administrators chose to attend.

In fact President Knight had faced official indifference compounded by student hostility when he introduced the seminar to Ohio State in 1886. Despite a Lantern editorial protesting that conducting original investigations left students with no time for anything else, Knight continued to insist upon high standards as evidenced by this course description which appeared in the 1889 Annual Report:

Each student was assigned a separate subject, and his work for the term consisted of a careful investigation of public documents, Congressional action and debates, official reports etc. as well as historical treatises bearing on this subject. Once a week the class was assembled,
and each member reported orally the nature and results of the previous week's investigation, and at the end of the term embodied the completed investigation in a written paper of from thirty to one hundred pages. 43

Despite the absence of any formal structure, graduate work at Ohio State expanded steadily in the 1890's with professors conducting its operation at no additional pay nor with any reduction in their regular duties. President James Hulme Canfield showed far more interest in advanced instruction than did his successor William Oxley Thompson, but Canfield's concern was of little significance as his term of office was brief and his influence over the legislature limited. Despite these obstacles Canfield attempted to establish a graduate school with Knight as its dean, but the history professor wrote a polite refusal pointing out that the school lacked a graduate faculty, had no funds earmarked specifically for advanced work, was not following uniform standards, and occasionally even granted an M.A. in absentia. 44 Knight's keen interest in graduate education continued, however, and he eventually consented to accept the post of "Chairman of the Administrative Board" of graduate studies in order to answer letters of application in a systematic fashion and to coordinate advanced course offerings. Thus until 1911, graduate education at Ohio State was conducted through a federation of autonomous departments under no meaningful central authority.

This somewhat informal supervision of graduate work was initiated by interested faculty members in 1885 when a policy committee was formed to establish university wide standards for the M.A. and Ph.D. Some interesting features of this program were the absence of any language requirement and the possibility of substituting "three years
spent in a suitable educational endeavor" for the one year in residence needed for an M.A. or "five years spent in a suitable educational endeavor" for the three years' residence required for the Ph.D. 45

Seminar offerings in history gradually expanded until by 1901 they included historical material and its use, topical research in American history, a seminar in research work, and a seminar in American history and institutions. With one exception these courses were either two or three semesters in duration. The doctorate was rarely given at Ohio State, and only eight were awarded from 1879 to 1909. It is of modern interest that the school's second Ph.D. (1894) was in history and was awarded to Columbus housewife Lucy Adelaide Booth who was a classmate of E. E. Sparks while studying for her M.A.

Consequently when Ohio State's graduate school was officially organized in 1911, Dean William McPherson inherited an ongoing program thanks to a handful of professors who had persevered despite minimal encouragement from administrators and trustees. McPherson himself remained in charge of chemistry survey courses throughout his deanship, continued to draw most of his salary from this department and found it necessary to rely heavily upon the help of several faculty members, most notably Professor Knight, prior to 1914, and later Professor Carl Wittke. McPherson worked quietly yet persistently in an effort to convert President Thompson from a tolerator to an advocate of graduate education as Thompson, who had been president since 1899, wielded enormous influence over the legislature and trustees and enjoyed a national reputation as an effective
administrator. Although the dean did not gain everything he desired, he did achieve a permanent budget for the graduate school which increased steadily up to 1916.

The expansion and institutionalization of graduate study at Land-Grant schools which prided themselves on the absence of frills indicated the acceptance of advanced work as an integral part of university curricula. Indeed the number of graduate students in America increased from a mere handful in the 1880's to nearly 10,000 by 1916. Furthermore, a coordination of efforts by the Association of American Universities, the National Association of State Universities, the newly formed American Association of University Professors and the professional organizations such as the American Historical Association had done a great deal to standardize both M.A. and Ph.D. requirements throughout the United States.

By 1917 graduate schools were sufficiently well established for people to become introspective about them. Senior professors often worried about the flood of advanced students who generally, it was feared, were of lower quality than the trickle of previous years. Students, comparing overcrowded seminars of a dozen or less with the days when they consisted of individual tutorials, lamented the depersonalization of the educational process. And the public including many trustees and even a few college presidents frequently compared the proliferation of graduate study to the increase in dissipating idleness which hastened the fall of Rome. From a hallowed novelty in a handful of institutions, postgraduate education had come of age and entered the mainstream of American life.
Outside Duties

In general the period 1884-1917 witnessed a gradual reduction of the non-teaching duties required of professors in the larger institutions. Many smaller schools, however, particularly the denominational ones still considered their professors to be on call at all seasons for tasks ranging from assisting in the library to trimming the shrubbery. Nearly every school exercised some supervision or at least scrutiny over their professors' private lives ranging from Gilman's advice to attend church to prohibitions in smaller schools regarding drinking, card playing and theater attendance. Even spending the summer teaching at an alien campus might anger the authorities as one University of Illinois professor discovered after finding his pay reduced as punishment for teaching at the University of Chicago.

In the vast majority of schools regardless of size or reputation professors assumed many non-required duties in an effort to enhance the position of their school or aid in the development of their profession. In 1917 a high percentage of professors remembered the days prior to the founding of the American Historical Association when history hardly existed as a teaching field. These men had worked hard to gain its acceptance in college and university curricula and to establish their discipline as a professional one. They were keenly aware that what they had so laboriously created was fragile and could easily be destroyed. Present-day professors who often remain aloof from university or community matters are apt to assume that the historians of this period were forced to undertake these duties. Usually
this was not the case although there were obvious exceptions such as the "spotters" who recorded attendance at required chapel or those forced to attend faculty meetings to approve a football schedule or discuss an out of state band trip.

The University of Wisconsin demonstrated what a closely knit, well-organized and dedicated faculty could accomplish. The school began inauspiciously as the state was not wealthy, and the farm elements controlled the legislature. By the 1880's, however, its teachers were banding together in a concerted and highly successful effort to prove their usefulness to the citizens of Wisconsin. By aiding the legislature via special studies and consulting work and engaging in a myriad of public service activities, these professors soon made themselves indispensable. Such efforts bore fruit. In 1884 Wisconsin was considered academic exile; by 1917 it had gained worldwide recognition.

History professors everywhere received constant requests to lecture in their areas of specialization or to interpret current events. In the days before mass media a high proportion of teachers met and interacted with the public frequently, thus affording an excellent opportunity to advertise both their presence and their value. University presidents frequently sought professors who were effective platform speakers. Herbert Baxter Adams greatly resented this requirement being imposed at Hopkins and wrote J. Franklin Jameson, "I declare, I wish I could be in a place where 'other considerations' didn't have quite so much weight. It is not enough to be a doctor philosophiae, one must be a magister artium."46
A large proportion of the public lectures presented in almost any college or university community were given by history faculty members. Another type of "lecture series" which was extremely popular consisted of a short non-credit evening course which generally involved no compensation to the professor. George Wells Knight was one of Ohio's more effective series speakers specializing in short courses of ten or twelve lectures highlighting various aspects of American history as well as social studies education for public school teachers. Wilbur Siebert became a frequent lecturer who specialized in presenting his findings on the Underground Railroad. Until the First World War, Edgar Holmes McNeal remained almost unknown to the citizens of Columbus due to a lack of popular interest in European history. Beginning in 1914, however, the demand for his services became considerable, and the public came to realize that this shy and halting scholar had a message well worth straining to hear. Professor Schlesinger was a particularly popular campus speaker although his tenure on the faculty was too short for him to become well known outside of the university.

Until 1913 Ohio State's professors took it upon themselves to be responsible for the chaperoning and scheduling of student dances. Faculty couples were in constant attendance at proms, Greek functions and all major social events, and the atmosphere appears to have been one of cordial interaction with faculty wives chatting informally.
among the coeds while their husbands expounded freely to anyone who cared to listen. A 1906 *Lantern* article reflects this sentiment:

One of the most delightful things about this prom was the interest and graciousness with which the faculty women entered into the spirit of the evening and were girls with the girls.47

In 1913 what had previously been done informally was transformed into a faculty committee charged with this responsibility, but the atmosphere remained the same with approximately thirty faculty couples attending the junior prom in 1916.

The cordial social atmosphere between students and teachers extended to faculty homes the vast majority of which were an easy walk from the campus. Professor Knight set the tone in the late 1880's by opening his residence to Political Science Club meetings, a practice he continued for two decades. Nearly all history professors entertained students at least occasionally, and Knight, Siebert, Hockett and Perkins did so far more than mere politeness required.

Knight and Siebert must have been particularly intriguing to students as they both appeared cold and even forbidding in the lecture hall yet could be completely different in other situations and often went to great lengths to help individual students. One of the most famous instances of this occurred early in the twentieth century when Siebert exploded in utter fury upon discovering the wretched living conditions some of his students were forced to endure in off campus rooming houses. Within a few days he assembled a corps of faculty wives who soon were inspecting these rooming houses in order to affix their stamp of acceptance or rejection. About this same
time a freshman visited William Oxley Thompson's office to request aid in finding a room. Without hesitating Ohio State's president seized this opportunity to look into the situation first-hand and spent several hours with the young man tramping from block to block until satisfactory quarters had been located.

Professors of this period frequently devoted much attention to community and state activities with prominent faculty members of the larger institutions often serving as advisors to governors or legislatures as was the case at schools such as Wisconsin, Hopkins, Harvard and Chicago. These men, however, made almost no impact on the national level until the onset of the Progressive Era.

Ohio State's George Wells Knight and Wilbur Siebert were exceedingly active in state and local activities as was typical of hundreds of their contemporaries who were enlightened men of means as well as historians. In 1912 Knight's knowledge of constitutional law made him a most useful delegate to the convention charged with revising Ohio's constitution. Following this experience there was the inevitable heavy demand for lectures on the subject which were delivered both in and outside of Ohio. During the months Knight was active in this convention his classes were covered by Homer Hockett and political science chairman Henry Spencer who taught them as an added overload with no additional compensation. Such substituting work was not unusual. In the case of an absent or ill professor it was taken for granted that a faculty member of comparable rank would assume responsibility for these classes as though they were his own.
Knight's experiences as an economics professor resulted in his appointment as a consulting vice-president of the Buckeye State Building and Loan Company, a position which he held for over twenty years. This same background explains his presence on the auditing committees of the Columbus Y.M.C.A. and several campus organizations as well as his being a financial advisor in Washington Gladden's First Congregational Church. Professor Knight was also quick to offer his services during the disastrous flood of 1913 working around the clock for days serving as co-director of the voluntary aid bureau.

Professor Siebert's activities were equally noteworthy. Extremely concerned with the problems of the poor, he established the Godman Guild, a cultural and recreational center for Columbus' underprivileged, and long served as chairman of the board. Facilities were gradually expanded and the investment in real estate and equipment exceeded $100,000 by 1916. In addition to being the administrative and financial mainstay of the organization Siebert gave evening lecture courses and succeeded in interesting other professors to do the same.

Siebert's activities on behalf of his university were constant and spanned over 70 years. While an undergraduate he was a member of Beta Theta Phi's first Ohio State chapter and maintained a lifelong interest in this fraternity beginning with his successful efforts to raise funds for the first chapter house. When the university architect suggested that appropriate gateways be erected at both ends of the campus, Siebert raised the money and presented them on behalf of his class of 1887. When the spring adjacent to Ohio State's oval was
in need of permanent improvements and no university funds were avail-
able his father contributed a large sum to construct the present-day
Mirror Lake. And finally towards the end of this period when a
stadium was erected out of private funds Siebert, besides being one
of the earliest and largest contributors, lent his fund-raising ex-
pertise to the project thereby doing much to assure its success.

Most university faculty members were pleased to undertake re-
 sponsibilities, such as those previously discussed, which they felt
contributed positively to a given school or community. There were,
however, certain required duties which the majority of professors
resented having to perform:

Adopted-"Whereas by the rules of the Board of Trustees,
the Faculty are entrusted with the charge and oversight of
the University buildings; and whereas, experience has con-
clusively demonstrated that the existence of water-closets
in the main building creates a nuisance that cannot be
abated as long as the closets remain: therefore Resolved,
that the Board of Trustees be respectfully asked to remove
the closets from the second and third floors of the build-
ing, and to provide for suitable conveniences outside of
the building."48

The many hours spent in faculty meetings and on committee work was
rarely relished by professors as the matters discussed were often
trite and of little impact on the overall development of a particular
college or university. Indeed there were very few schools where fac-
ulty members could significantly influence important decisions which
had to be made. Ohio State's situation is worthy of consideration in
this respect as its professors performed a wide range of duties vary-
ing from the most trivial to almost complete responsibility for es-
 tablishing a graduate program.
The new faculty member often found these activities burdensome when coupled with the heavy teaching load he generally faced. For example when George Wells Knight joined Ohio State's faculty in 1885 his responsibilities for the year included advising all seniors and serving as secretary of the faculty as well as being a member of the arts and philosophy committee, the catalogue committee, the committee on electives and the committee on admission. Three years later a trustee directive authorizing high school visitations by the faculty resulted in Knight and two others having to travel throughout the state at their own expense. Knight passed this duty on to Siebert who was only too happy to do the same to Edgar McNeal when the latter was hired. Finally in 1915 the responsibility for evaluating these schools was transferred to the superintendent of public instruction's office.

Until after the turn of the century faculty meetings at Ohio State dealt with many responsibilities which have long since been assigned to specialists. If a student wished to waive a required course it had to be debated before the entire faculty. When Dr. Knight discovered cheating during an examination, the student was required to appear before the next faculty meeting and be publicly reprimanded by the president. The professors in turn created a committee on cheating and made Knight its chairman. Any student dismissed from the school had the right to state his case before the faculty, and no one could enroll as a graduate student without this body's formal approval.
A great deal of time was spent on matters relating to the activities calendar such as when to schedule dances, football games and band trips as well as the academic calendar which almost inevitably precipitated a fierce, prolonged debate. If any student or group of students wished to be excused from classes a formal faculty vote was necessary since this was seen as a scheduling matter.

The faculty was also responsible for assuring that university facilities were in good condition following a scheduled event and as a consequence Knight spent several hours investigating complaints of student failure to clean up the gymnasium following dances.

Graduation ceremonies were also within the professorial domain, and many hours were spent debating this subject. For two decades Professor Siebert was a tireless proponent of requiring all faculty members to wear the appropriate cap and gown, and in 1905 he succeeded in passing a resolution which compelled his colleagues to wear them. His triumph was brief as the following year saw yet another committee regretfully conclude that the faculty lacked the power to force dissident members to wear the academic costume.

Occasionally Ohio State's faculty considered itself a censoring body for the school newspaper, and in 1895 two stormy meetings were devoted to discussing the Lantern business manager's attempts to prosecute a professor who had refused to pay the amount due on his subscription. All manners of punishment were contemplated for this student including expelling him from the university. Whether or not the professor concerned did or did not actually owe the money was never even discussed.
In 1901 Knight and two other faculty members were charged with the responsibility of investigating the physical risks of students playing intercollegiate football and baseball. The issue was of nation-wide interest, and the Columbia faculty was already mounting a campaign which temporarily abolished football at that institution. The committee spent over a year on this project which involved formulating, mailing and then tabulating hundreds of questionnaires sent to schools throughout the United States. Yale president Arthur T. Hadley replied in a fashion which indicated that his faculty members were not as involved in committee work and other non teaching duties as were their counterparts at Ohio State:

I may also add that sports at Yale have been managed . . . by students and graduates, the faculties have, I think wisely, devoted their time to the intellectual work rather than to the intercollegiate games of the institution.\(^{49}\)

If one assumes Ohio State's history department to be typical of larger institutions during this 1885-1916 period one is struck by the comparison between modern professors and what was at one time considered the norm of service to one's school, community, state and nation. The atypical handful of intellectuals who presently concern themselves with such matters are all that remain of a once hallowed and vigorous tradition.

Scholars in Controversy

Teachers in the social sciences found it very difficult to avoid the controversies which swirled about them. Colleges, universities and society itself were in a state of transition, and
professors often indicated the direction in which they hoped these changes would move and articulated their eagerness to share in the decision-making process. Frederick Jackson Turner is perhaps the prime example of a scholar who came to wield enormous influence and to play a key role in the formulation of university policy. Men like Turner were extremely rare, however, and most agreed with Woodrow Wilson that one had to abandon teaching in order to gain real power.

A lack of influence needn't deter one from expressing an opinion, and history professors spoke out increasingly on issues which concerned their particular college or university. When Ohio State's Lantern of October 3, 1890 contained a one line announcement, "that all gentlemen below the rank of junior shall drill," the university became embroiled in controversy from that day forward, and the history department, somewhat unjustly, acquired a reputation for blindly opposing anything military on the campus. Even Dr. Knight, despite his innate cautiousness, found himself intervening on behalf of a student whose drill instructor denied him permission to be excused so that a doctor could change his bandages following an operation. After visiting the instructor and failing to change his mind Knight took the matter to President Thompson in order to insure what he felt was a just settlement of the issue.

One controversy which raged on many campuses was whether or not to admit women as regular students, and once enrolled whether they were capable of doing quality work. A terrific battle over this issue developed at the University of Virginia and culminated in a faculty vote in the 1890's which defeated the liberals and maintained
the status quo. Ohio State never faced this issue because Hattie Townsend, the daughter of a trustee turned professor, presented herself for admission when the school opened, and no one was prepared to risk his job by contesting her right to enroll. As stated previously admitting women and accepting them as competent students are two entirely different matters, and Dr. Knight was never willing to concede the latter point. Wilbur Siebert on the other hand encouraged women to do advanced work from the very beginning of his teaching career. Arthur Schlesinger went one step further and asserted that the fair sex did better work than the men, a stand which hardly ingratiated him with his department head Dr. Knight.

The Schlesinger genius for seeing both sides of an issue was relied upon in several instances during his career at Ohio State. As one who had successfully fought some of the less desirable aspects of the fraternity system he was in a particularly good position to evaluate proposals aimed at abolishing or seriously curtailing its existence on the campus. After considering the matter, Schlesinger commented that no one should propose eliminating the fraternity system unless he could formulate an alternative to it in which the same deficiencies did not merely repeat themselves in another form. His very clear message was that many students mistakenly assumed that the rest of society operated under a different set of rules than did the fraternities.

By the mid-teens the "cheating issue" had gripped virtually every campus as students found themselves seeking solutions to the problem of "getting by," and the professors themselves were often
unwilling to act as policemen. Some believed the students could solve
the problem by policing their own ranks while others advocated aban­
doning any form of supervision in favor of the honor system. While
most teachers preferred to avoid this issue, Ohio State's Schlesinger
met it head on, spending a great deal of time with student leaders in
hopes of affecting a solution.

College and university faculties have long been famous for
feuding among themselves, and these rivalries were occasionally of
sufficient intensity to attract public notice. The humanities in
general waged a constant struggle against the scientists and the ag­
riculturalists for a greater share of operating budgets, but failed
to achieve parity with the sciences save in a few schools such as the
universities of Chicago and Wisconsin.

In addition to the general competition for funds, interdepart­
mental feuds were to be expected. Besides the inevitable personality
clashes there were differences in educational philosophies in the
areas of curriculum, teaching methods and entrance and graduation re­
quirements. The issue of whether or not to continue the Latin re­
quirement was a particularly thorny one which both vexed and divided
some of the nation's most prestigious institutions.

At the turn of the century very few teachers challenged the con­
ventional stereotypes of American history, and almost no one discussed
controversial issues such as poverty, the single tax and socialism in
the classroom. The vast majority of professors assumed a strictly
conservative stance out of genuine conviction, and those who did not
had to withstand enormous pressures exerted by businessmen, patriotic
organizations, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and particularly, their own colleagues. It is consequently very difficult to explain how a considerable number of professors and students came to reject traditional concepts such as that the Civil War involved only slavery, and that perfidy characterized all Southerners, that all Northern generals were peerless leaders, and that the party of Lincoln was above corruption and scandal. Education seems to have been proceeding on two levels, the traditional one in the classroom and the revisionist in less formal situations. Ohio State's George Wells Knight typified this dual standard when called upon to address the student body at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, a situation which forced him to reconcile his private doubts in order to be properly patriotic:

... Technically, we are ... aggressors(sic). ... morally, we are entirely and unqualifiedly right. Today it is the duty of every loyal American no matter what his party, or his views prior to last Wednesday, to support the country to which his allegiance is due. The government has spoken. It is theirs to command; ...\(^5\)

Professor Knight's reservations concerning war with Spain were admittedly somewhat opaque, but as was increasingly the case in larger schools a more transparent opponent soon appeared in the person of President-Emeritus William Henry Scott who was only too happy to give the students his candid and cutting appraisal of the war in general and the issue of the Philippines in particular:

... I know it is claimed that we had incurred a grave responsibility. We had no earthly business there. ... Many pulpits and religious papers talk about a remarkable
Providence which has called us to a great duty. Divine Providence no more sent our fleet to Manila than it commissions us to take possession of the Aurora Borealis.52

A few professors risked and retained their academic necks by challenging traditional concepts in a reasoned and legalistic fashion. Beginning in 1902 a young instructor of history and political science and the future president of Ohio State University attacked both past and present American foreign policy from the twin standpoints of international law and tenants of common decency, and was particularly harsh in his condemnation of the recent Spanish American War. A man whose anti-war sentiments had led to his petitioning to be excused from the art of war requirement while an undergraduate, George Washington Rightmire was a professor of iron convictions and unquestioned integrity who would later acquire a somewhat different reputation as an administrator.

President McKinley's assassination in 1901 buttressed the contention that dangerous forces were at work that threatened the Republic's existence. Spokesmen for denominational institutions viewed this murder as the fruits due a nation fast slipping into godlessness, lawlessness and immorality. Larger universities in particular were singled out as being responsible for the high number of young men and women purportedly going to the devil annually. As if to answer these charges Knight chaired a faculty committee which prepared a long resolution concerning both the late president and the state of the nation:

... President William McKinley has been slain by an anarchist; the victim of a growing spirit of lawlessness, which willfully confuses liberty with license.
And finally they (the committee) feel it is a duty to express. . . their hope that the country will be aroused by this terrible warning to purify itself from the spirit of lawlessness and anarchy which threatens with destruction the government and all social order.53

As higher education loomed ever more significant in American life, a constantly increasing number of individuals sought to influence its course. All such pressures were not necessarily harmful. Patriotic organizations pressed vigorously for programs in American history and deserve a good deal of the credit for the astonishing growth in this field. Alumni influence was becoming exceedingly powerful as their numbers increased and their importance as potential donors became recognized. Virginia alumni interfered in curricular matters, and pressured the Board to reinstate the recently abolished Latin requirement. The same thing almost happened at Pennsylvania but trustees resisted the pressure reasoning that the time was ripe for professors to be supreme in educational matters.

Trustees themselves tended to treat professors as they would any individual whose appointment hinges upon providing satisfaction to the employer. Concepts of tenure and academic freedom were weak at best, and very rarely did a professor try to assert them. Indeed trustees often tightened their control in much the same fashion as they prided themselves in overseeing all aspects of the businesses they owned. At the University of Wisconsin for example an 1885 resolution prohibited any "professors or instructors" from leaving the university without the
written permission of the executive committee. In addition any change in textbooks was prohibited without the consent of the regents.

Frederick Jackson Turner attempted single-handedly to alter the oppressive atmosphere at Wisconsin. Undaunted by the Regents' cool reception to his proposals he appealed to state senators and representatives by writing numerous letters which were most explicit and still worthy of interest:

... our regents are determined that our pork, poultry and cows shall have a great moral uplift. ... There are thirty bills in the present legislature regulating us from antisegregation, antivivisection, university extension etc. to allowing every student under discipline to have an attorney and to suffer no testimony except under rules of law. ... I'm glad I'm not dean.54

... As a matter of fact, however up to the present, with one or two exceptions, all of the really important historical writing in the country has been done by men not connected with universities ... Unless universities meet these conditions by some mode of attracting better men, the teaching will decline by dry rot.55

Although Turner went to Harvard in 1909 as a protest against continued meddling by the regents and as a result of his anger over being criticized for carrying a light teaching load, Wisconsin had already gone far towards becoming what Turner desired it to be. The likes of Edward Alsworth Ross and Richard T. Ely, men considered dangerous radicals who probably would never have been hired by the school to which Turner fled, were permitted to pursue long and distinguished careers at Wisconsin in important posts and at attractive salaries. Repeated attempts to oust these men failed, and when the State Superintendent of Education sought to remove Ely for being a "socialist and
strike aider" the regents used the occasion to draft a statement of academic freedom as university policy:

... We cannot for a moment believe that knowledge has reached its final goal, or that the present condition of society is perfect. We must therefore welcome from our teachers such discussions as shall suggest the means and prepare the way by which knowledge may be extended, present evils removed... and others prevented. 56

Ohio State's professors made some attempts to obtain the rights and privileges being won by their Wisconsin colleagues, but these efforts were neither persistent nor well coordinated. In 1897 English chairman Samuel Derby sought to clarify the areas of faculty authority by drafting a detailed report on the subject and submitting it to the trustees who in turn chose to ignore it and thus by implication retain their formidable powers over university matters.

In 1899 the board's right to veto the offering of any projected new courses was challenged when Professors Knight and Derby persuaded President Canfield and most of the board to meet them at a Columbus hotel to discuss the trustees' recent veto of commerce and administration requirements. In this instance the faculty prevailed although the professors agreed to create a separate college of commerce and administration in the near future. Characteristically, no formal agreements came out of this dialogue, and the faculty was almost totally unsuccessful in attempting to expand its authority. In marked contrast to the trustees the faculty was seldom able to present a united front and was saddled with deep divisions which resulted in professors criticising one another in the classroom and occasionally bringing their misunderstandings directly to members of the board. 57
Most professors in the United States facing dismissal chose to accept their fate with quiet dignity and conform to the ritual of being permitted to resign. As the twentieth century wore on, however, an ever increasing number risked publicizing their predicament and fighting for reinstatement, although the few who succeeded were nearly always full professors with powerful contacts and established reputations. Such a man was H. C. Adams who while at Cornell evoked the wrath of Henry Sage by authoring a radical monograph in 1887 which stressed the difference between free and unrestrained competition and branded the latter irresponsible. The dismissed Adams was hired so promptly by the University of Michigan that he failed to miss a paycheck thus inducing the Cornell trustees to make a concerted though unsuccessful attempt to woo the man back.

Pennsylvania's Robert Ellis Thompson was not so fortunate when removed in 1892 from an endowed chair which he had occupied for 19 years thereby precipitating a ferocious struggle which pitted the provost and the board against most of the alumni and some of the professors. Thompson considered his campaign a failure because, although offered another teaching post at Pennsylvania, he did not regain his old chair and thus chose to depart.

Matters remained relatively quiet at the school for the next twenty years until the need for continued legislative support initiated an unprecedented wave of repression against radical faculty members, one of whom was a young assistant professor named Scott Nearing who was suddenly removed from the payroll in 1915. Pennsylvania's trustees were confounded and chagrined when a tremendous outcry all out
of proportion to the stature of the man resulted from their refusal to explain why this dismissal had taken place. Defending a mere assistant professor with such fervor was a new development which finally convinced the Pennsylvania authorities that permanent reforms were in order and also led directly to the founding of the American Association of University Professors the same year. The formation of a Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure was immediately undertaken by the new organization which published a classic landmark of academic freedom in the December, 1915 Bulletin destined to be severely tested in subsequent decades.

In 1914 one hundred years of uneasy peace in Europe were shattered by the guns of war. Both sides of the conflict were discussed and debated as long as America remained neutral, and seldom were the pros and cons presented with more forcefulness than at Ohio State where Knight's insistence upon German culpability was more than matched by Professor Spencer's brilliant defense of the Central Powers. These two departmental chairman who had great respect for one another and were both extremely effective speakers treated the students to thrilling debates up to the eve of America's entry into the war. Other members of the history and political science departments were also deluged with requests for lectures on the subject. For a brief and exciting instant in history, Americans struggled to amass the necessary information to evaluate objectively the most costly struggle the world had ever witnessed.
The years 1884 to 1917 placed great strains and considerable demands on the president of virtually every major institution in America. A deft individual indeed was required to balance the many interest groups including alumni, trustees, students and the general public while preventing faculty feuds from attaining ruinous proportions. In former days this position had been generally regarded as a coveted sinecure which afforded a pleasant and remunerative early retirement. Times had certainly changed. Not only were presidents younger, but they were becoming difficult to find given the rigors of the position and increasing opportunities for administrators in private industry. Indeed remote institutions such as the universities of Illinois and California had to expend extraordinary efforts in order to find anyone willing to take the presidential post. For example, in 1891-1892 Illinois endured a host of refusals with H. B. Adams, Woodrow Wilson, John Fiske, Washington Gladden and numerous others declining in rapid succession. Finally Andrew Sloan Draper, superintendent of the Cleveland schools, said yes although even he held out until offered twice the going rate, a free house and a statement from the trustees which defined and greatly expanded his executive powers.

Consequently the authorities at Illinois and a good many other schools went to almost any length to retain a president rather than endure the protracted ordeal associated with locating a successor. Edmund James who succeeded Draper expanded presidential authority
still further and won approval of budgets comparable to those of the University of Chicago. Thus a series of strong presidents could and often did transform their office from a mere symbol into an authority of vast power capable of charting the course which a given university would follow. It was precisely this challenge and this opportunity which motivated the great administrators of the period.

In 1884 Ohio State still lacked a strong president. Edward Orton who served from 1873-1881 found little pleasure in administrative duties, considered his term temporary and rejoiced in being able to return to the classroom. William Henry Scott, who took office in 1883 following the dismissal of Walter Q. Scott, assumed his duties on an acting basis with the understanding that he would soon be replaced. From Scott's first day in office he made it clear that he hoped his tenure would be brief, and he continually urged the trustees to press on in their efforts to secure a replacement. Eleven years later he was still president, and negotiations with Herbert Baxter Adams were in progress. Scott had great enthusiasm for Adams who shared his interest in the development of history and political science yet he felt obligated to warn him of some problems at Ohio State which he outlined in a confidential letter dated May 30, 1894:

... Your success and satisfaction in your work here, if you come, will depend much on the understanding that may be established between you and the board of trustees before you accept their offer. ... Much of the authority that should be exercised by the president is retained by the board. The trustees seem to regard him simply as an adviser, ... The welfare of the university requires that the president should be supreme and I should have insisted on it long ago if I had not expected from year to year to retire.
Consequently a pattern of weak presidents was emerging at Ohio State despite vigorous efforts to attract a "name" administrator. Finally in the fall of 1896 after several years of negotiations a man accepted the presidency whose past performance indicated vigorous, effective and dynamic executive leadership. James Hulme Canfield was a rugged individualist who had declined his father's offer to underwrite three years of foreign study in order to spend an equal amount of time on a railroad construction gang. He then practiced law prior to becoming professor of history and literature at the University of Kansas in 1877 where he exerted a profound influence on students such as William E. Borah, Vernon Kellogg and William Allen White. One of the very few radical economists supporting the Western agrarian movement he advocated the single tax, urged his students to read the most modern and radical literature, and wrote a monograph which spelled out his philosophy.59

Canfield continued espousing these views after becoming president at Nebraska in 1891 with the result that his own faculty considered him a heretic and exerted vigorous pressure upon the regents to oust him. Ohio State's initial offer came at this point, but Canfield deferred it for two years until stability had been restored at Nebraska. This radical president's ability to retain the regents' confidence in the face of conservative faculty opposition gave Canfield a national reputation and put him on a familiar basis with men such as Thwing of Western Reserve, Harper of Chicago, Angell of Michigan and Draper of Illinois.
Ohio State's new president initiated a burst of activity roughly analogous to Franklin D. Roosevelt's Hundred Days with Canfield instituting change after change often circumventing established channels and occasionally dislocating the budget in the process. Determined to make Ohio State one of the top handful of universities in terms of budget, enrollment and facilities, he fully expected to effect this transformation in less than a decade. His 1899 report included the observation that, "It should be comparatively easy to build up a great school of American History and Political Science, inferior to none in the country." Of course most presidents dabble in such rhetoric, but it became increasingly obvious that Canfield was serious and had accepted his position as a mandate to achieve greatness in the shortest possible time, regardless of the expense or inconvenience involved and without really checking to see what support he had to do this.

It is unfortunate that Canfield was in such a hurry as his ideas were sound and his abilities uncontested. Even William Rainey Harper whose haste was possibly greater than that of any other only let Rockefeller know piecemeal what immortality was going to cost and kept assuring him time after time that just a few million more would indeed be the final payment. Consequently after three years filled with many achievements but no miracles, Canfield quit in disgust spurning four other university presidencies to become the librarian of Columbia. Despite his impetuousness and occasional lapses of tact, Canfield's loss was regrettable in an era when men of comparable vision and ability were in such short supply.
William Oxley Thompson was destined to be recognized as an outstanding president of Ohio State. Described as one of seventeen men who "... laid the foundations for the present scope and quality of higher education in the United States," he came to Ohio State in 1899 after serving for eight years as President of Miami University. A tactful and gracious gentleman who made very few enemies and strained every nerve to meet each person he encountered more than half way, he commenced to build in the slow and steady fashion which in reality was the only pace which citizens and trustees would tolerate.

It was Thompson's honest and frequently stated opinion that scholars should be the most highly respected and richly rewarded of all university personnel:

It is my belief that the University ought to put a premium upon the men devoting themselves to scholarship in their subjects and the development of their teaching power rather than upon men who willingly or unwillingly are dragged into the mechanics of education.

Faced with severely limited budgets Thompson never succeeded in giving scholars what he felt they deserved, and he considered this shortcoming to be the most serious of his long administration. The president was able, however, to encourage research in various ways such as the granting of sabbaticals starting immediately with the most distinguished professors and gradually extending them until they became official university policy in 1909.

As a former professor of history Thompson showed keen interest in the discipline and relied heavily on professors Knight and Hockett when seeking advice. The chief executive's interest in history beyond the undergraduate level is difficult to ascertain, his critics
charging him with indifference concerning both advanced training and the establishment of a first-class library. Recent evidence, however, indicates that Thompson worked behind the scenes far more than was readily apparent, particularly with reference to improving the library. As neither the legislature nor the trustees were enthusiastic concerning these, it is questionable if Thompson could have accomplished more by increasing the visibility of such requests. The president also lent considerable support to the Ohio Historical and Archealogical Society long serving as a trustee and constantly lobbying to gain legislative funds for its activities.

President Thompson is perhaps best known as an extremely effective guardian of academic freedom and enjoyed a reputation of being one who could not be pressured into removing an employee or into bending the regulations in order to accommodate a student with highly placed connections. Purges which swept through some of America's most distinguished institutions did not occur at Ohio State as long as this man remained in office.

William Rainey Harper combined Canfield's sense of urgent mission with Thompson's awareness of reality. This genius who taught Assyrian, Arabic, Aramaic and Syriac while at Yale and had the ability to work with full powers of concentration seventeen hours a day is far better known as a legend than as a human being. Few realize that even more than Gilman he applied the demanding standards he set for himself to his own employees with the result that he gained a reputation as a slavedriver which increasingly hampered his recruiting efforts. Turner, Ely, H. B. Adams and others were aware of this and based their
unwillingness to go to Chicago upon this consideration. On the other hand these high standards impelled Harper to seek extraordinary men and to expect the highest budget of any university in the world. The fact that Chicago opened its doors with the largest library and the biggest graduate school in America reflected an incredible man who demonstrated that a great university could be produced in months and that centuries of evolution were no longer required.  

Angell of Michigan and Eliot of Harvard typified a new breed of president who would be increasingly in evidence as men came to head institutions whose programs and reputations were already established. Such schools required a man more skilled in maintenance than in innovation, capable of welding an institution into an integral and smooth running whole in much the same fashion that the professional managers were administering the giant corporations. Angell had a deep professional interest in history, and was president of the American Historical Association from 1893-1894. Consequently he paid particular attention to appointments in this discipline as indicated by a letter written in 1885 to his friend D. C. Gilman describing the type of candidate he desired and of value as a reflection of the temper of the times as perceived by a master administrator:

In the Chair of History the work may lie and often does lie so close to Ethics, that I should not wish a pessimist or an agnostic or a man disposed to obtrude criticisms of Christian views of humanity or of Christian principles. I should not want a man who would not make his historical judgments and interpretations from a Christian standpoint.

Quite possibly the ideal university president was a selfless millionaire anxious to part with his wealth, and in the days before
high taxes universities such as Columbia, Pennsylvania and Harvard found men who while in office gave millions building libraries, establishing fellowships and meeting deficits as the need required.

The state schools with few wealthy alumni found their fortunes in the legislatures. Wisconsin, Illinois and Michigan enjoyed considerable success due to the leadership of their chief executives, one of the most ingenious of whom was C. K. Adams who became president of Wisconsin in 1893 and faced a crisis in 1895 when the Democratic administration was replaced by a Republican one stressing economy in government. Adams' solution was to give a huge dinner attended by the governor elect, the legislators and prominent alumni. A carefully rehearsed crescendo was orchestrated as the fellowship flowed, the speeches were uttered, the school cheers were chanted and the new governor soon overwhelmed. Hastening to the rostrum he issued a thrilling challenge, "Gentlemen of the legislature, I warn you that you cannot pass any bill in favor of this university so large that I will not dare to sign it."66

Beginning with the inauguration of Thomas C. Chamberlain in 1887 Wisconsin had enjoyed a series of strong presidents who constantly expanded their power while upholding academic freedom and demonstrating considerable interest in graduate education. Their careers were often short and stormy, but nearly all of them succeeded in making a great institution even more distinguished.

Since Gilman's departure the University of California had languished under a succession of weak and ineffective presidents, and by the late 1890's an earnest search was on for a leader of real
ability. Dissension and factionalism still racked the institution but enrollments were starting to rise because the state government began supporting the high schools.

In 1899 Benjamin I. Wheeler became president of California after demanding and obtaining important concessions from the trustees which gave him real power. While inaugurating the summer school program and convincing the legislature to purchase Hubert H. Bancroft's library, Wheeler retained the all important common touch and seldom neglected to say publicly what most citizens wanted to hear. In his 1904 address to entering freshmen he stressed the necessity for personal health and hygiene, instructed his students to bathe daily and warned them of the pitfalls of "sexual uncleanness." Thus while liberalizing and expanding the University of California Wheeler retained the endorsement of conservative elements whose support was necessary for anyone wishing to remain in office.

Overview of Incomes and Facilities

University endowments in 1884 were minuscule by modern standards with Columbia, Hopkins and Harvard being the wealthiest in the country with assets ranging from three to five million dollars. Ten years later when donating money to higher education had become fashionable, Chicago and Stanford both had assets in excess of one hundred million, and a number of state legislatures were making appropriations comparable to the interest on these sums. This vast upsurge in incomes permitted modernization and expansion of physical plants, allowed a significant increase in faculties and created an air of stability and
permanence which had previously been lacking in all but a handful of institutions.

Professors' salaries, however, tended to decline in terms of real money after 1900 and by 1916 averaged 30 to 50 percent less in actual buying power than at the turn of the century. Contrary to accepted notions of supply and demand the constant hiring of new faculty members only tended to dilute existing payrolls further and further. Promotions were often exceedingly difficult to obtain and, particularly in the larger state schools, salaries tended to be concentrated at the lower end of the scale. One authority writing in 1914 noted that at Columbia, "practically every married man, without private means, has . . . to add to his income by outside work . . ."67

There were some bright spots, however, in this outwardly bleak picture. The vast increase in positions coupled with a need to economize on salaries resulted in a widening of employment opportunities for those beginning their careers. Prior to 1900 and particularly in the 1890's a sizeable number of capable and highly trained individuals were simply unable to start their careers.

New fringe benefits were also introduced. Non-contributory pension plans began to appear after the turn of the century although they were seldom sound actuarially and originally applied only to professors whose services had been particularly long or meritorious. In 1912, however, Chicago broke new ground by instituting America's first university-wide retirement program applicable to all teachers and administrators. Soon thereafter California became the first state university with a pension plan, a move which prompted Wisconsin's Van
Hise to spearhead an effort which succeeded in convincing the Carnegie Foundation to include public institutions in their pension system.

In addition the larger institutions were beginning to offer lighter teaching loads, to grant sabbaticals as a matter of course and to decrease the number of extracurricular duties required of faculty members. These improvements facilitated the professionalization of historians and also reflected the acceptance of research as an activity worthy of official encouragement.

The few Land-Grant institutions enjoying incomes comparable to the wealthiest private schools accomplished this first by requesting a large budget and second by convincing the legislature that their university rendered a considerable service. As Americans have always favored the practical over the aesthetic or erudite, it was most logical for a public university to concentrate initially upon agricultural and scientific matters before emphasizing areas of less immediate utility. Consequently the first ongoing programs supported by regular biennial appropriations were agricultural research projects. Although modest initially such appropriations created a precedent and reversed the prior philosophy that Land-Grant schools should be self-sustaining. In addition to regular legislative support, this 1884 to 1917 period witnessed the creation of special taxes earmarked specifically for the state university which provided income as regular and predictable as the return from a substantial endowment. The 1891 Hysell Bill was one of the more modest of these special taxes levying one-twentieth of a mill for Ohio State University, but even that assessment provided $100,000 per year which was the equivalent of a
$2,000,000 endowment. The levy was increased to one-tenth of a mill in 1896.

The vast expansion of Land-Grant schools created a greater squeeze on faculty salaries than in most private colleges. The University of Michigan was particularly hard hit since neither the state's agricultural school nor its school of mines was located at Ann Arbor, and this dilution of resources created enormous budget difficulties since the school received only about half the income per student as did the University of Illinois which had all its facilities in one location. Yet money isn't the only consideration, and Angell showed a rare genius for juggling available funds in such a way as to maintain the atmosphere which inspired professors to remain at lower salaries than they could find elsewhere. Angell's greatest financial difficulties began in 1885 when a succession of severe pay cuts reduced salaries to their lowest level since the 1860's. Even in 1892 when wages were "restored," the salary ceiling of $3,000 was a figure which few professors ever attained and became even less feasible following an 1896 regulation which prohibited any department from having more than one employee who earned over $2,500.

For many years Wisconsin had a salary ceiling of $2,500, but C. K. Adams won the right to disregard this in order to obtain an established scholar or prevent one from leaving, thus permitting his university to compete effectively for top individuals. Ohio State, on the other hand, also had a $2,500 ceiling, but it was enforced so rigidly that its presidents simply had to write off being able to attract and hold the most promising scholars. Thompson made the
removal of this ceiling one of his highest priorities and was especially concerned that the other two state universities in Ohio had no such restriction. In 1906 he succeeded in eliminating this ceiling but a severe financial crisis immediately followed and depressed salaries even further. To make matters worse there were a number of promising younger men who had remained at Ohio State in hopes that President Thompson could lead the university out of the financial wilderness and who still found themselves unpromoted despite the removal of salary restrictions. The President's Annual Report of 1908 discusses his "solution" to the problem:

During the year fifteen of the younger members of the instructional force were promoted to the title of professor and given seats in the University Faculty. The majority of these men have served the University in one capacity or another from eight to fifteen years.

... The regret in connection with such action is that the University was not able to make suitable recognition also in the matter of salary.

Thompson continued to press for more support from the Ohio legislature and proved successful in obtaining ever larger appropriations. The expansion of the school was so rapid, however, that it took considerable effort merely to stay even. Consequently, the President could offer little more than sympathy to the growing number of teachers who found themselves in serious financial difficulties.

In 1914 Thompson kept in close contact with an assistant professor who agreed to furnish him with a detailed accounting of how he supported a family of six on a $1,500 salary. The teacher kept a record of all his expenses which included little more than food, clothing, shelter and medical care and proved that providing his
family with these necessities resulted in an annual deficit of $727. Not surprisingly the man developed credit problems soon after joining the faculty and despite loans from President Thompson, found it necessary to exchange teaching for a career in publishing.

Professors Knight and Siebert both contributed a good deal of their own money to better Ohio State's history program with Siebert being particularly successful in pressing his relatives to give annual donations to the library for European history books. Knight, too, made frequent purchases of books but on a somewhat smaller scale than his wealthier colleague. Maps and teaching aids also had to be purchased by the individual professors as there was almost no money available for them. In 1912-1913 for example the Department of American History received $4,806 of which $4,800 went for salaries while the larger European History department received $6,267, of which $6,250 was for salaries. It should come as no surprise that Professor Siebert found it necessary to purchase the stationery used by his department and that bluebooks were strictly rationed and occasionally unavailable. Despite the large number of students enrolled in history courses the two departments received less support than all but a handful of the university's smallest departments. In 1912-1913 for example five received over $20,000 and one with an enrollment far less than history's enjoyed an appropriation of over $29,000.

Even as late as 1917 most Americans failed to realize the importance of good reference and research facilities with the result that the presidents of Columbia and Pennsylvania both financed the construction of much needed library buildings out of their own pockets
after finding it impossible to raise funds from other sources. When Harvard's librarian found his cataloguing system in shambles because the new Library of Congress cards were smaller than the ones used at his school, Archibald Cary Coolidge was unable to locate funds to retype the old cards despite the fact that his library budget was the largest in the nation. Finally he hired student labor and paid for the changeover himself.

Libraries were also becoming far more than just a repository for books. Space was needed where students could study in close proximity to their sources as well as special seminar rooms which housed reference works and documents being used by graduate professors and advanced students. It was also desirable to have private working spaces for the professors wishing a quiet and convenient place for writing and research. In 1917 no more than six American universities offered such facilities on a scale adequate to accommodate the needs of faculty and students.

Just as universities themselves pressed for dependable incomes, librarians struggled against the prevailing sentiment that their labors were peripheral and thus unworthy of regular and substantial appropriations. Librarians nearly always failed to gain the support they desired given the vast sums needed to construct new classrooms, dormitories and athletic facilities. The University of Virginia is illustrative as a fire in 1895 reduced its already inadequate library holdings by two-thirds. Because no special appropriations could be found there was little more than the regular budget from which to rebuild and consequently recovery was not complete by 1917.
Despite the enviable reputation enjoyed by the University of Wisconsin the total expended on books during 1885-1916 was distressingly small, although in 1900 funds were provided for a building to house both the Historical Society and university collections.

Berkeley's highly inadequate library began to improve dramatically around the turn of the century with history receiving a considerable boost in 1910 by the purchase of the Hubert Howe Bancroft collection containing some 50,000 books and 100,000 manuscripts. While this expenditure greatly aided the graduate program in American history, the overall content of Berkeley's library was not as strong.

The plight of Ohio State's library was typical of most larger schools although its collection of history materials was far better than the meager and often nonexistent appropriations would indicate. Miss Olive Jones, long the librarian and a person with no formal training in her profession, showed considerable ingenuity, dedication and persistence in acquiring materials. One marvels at her wizardry upon realizing that the number of volumes in the university's possession increased from 13,000 to 120,000 between 1893 and 1913 despite the fact that from 1893 to 1909 no money was appropriated for books and periodicals. Furthermore a separate library building did not exist until 1913. Books came from many sources. George Wells Knight convinced the University of Michigan to send its law reports free of charge. Olive Jones discovered that the American minister to Spain was anxious to dispose of 800 volumes of "Congressional and other public documents" and Ohio State obtained them for the cost of shipping them to Columbus. When England published the Roll Series, 250 volumes
covering English history from the Roman period to Henry VIII, Professor Perkins went to the British Museum at his own expense to compare the volumes with the original manuscripts and deemed it worthy of purchase. In cases such as this, departments would pool their resources and coordinate their purchases, but the Roll Series was still too expensive and Siebert money contributed the difference.

Miss Jones lobbied extensively to have her library become a depository for Congressional documents and other government publications, and in 1902 succeeded in transferring the Wyoming depository to Ohio State. Since all needed books could not be purchased, Olive Jones was a pioneer in developing the inter-library loan system which in 1900 borrowed from Adelbert College, Cincinnati Public, Cleveland Public, Missouri Botanical Garden, Oberlin College and the Library of the Surgeon General during its first year of operation.

The University of Illinois proved an exception to the general rule that libraries in Land-Grant schools were inadequate. This was primarily because President James made stocking a new but largely empty building a matter of high priority. Consequently from 1905 to 1916 Illinois' book budget was rivaled only by Harvard and the University of Chicago. In fact, appropriations for any two of those years were higher than the total amount expended for books at Ohio State for the entire 1884-1917 period. Other libraries of exceptional size and quality included Harvard, Columbia, Pennsylvania and the University of Chicago.

Today a university press is considered necessary by almost any institution with a doctoral program. This was not always the case,
and in 1913 there were but five in the entire nation. Hopkins announced a press at its opening in 1876 as did the University of Chicago in 1892. Columbia and California followed in 1893 and then twenty years later came the appearance of the Harvard University Press in 1913.

Although many acknowledged the need to encourage publication of solid historical works which often had no appeal to commercial printers, very few trustees would commit funds to this as such presses were considered a violation of the free enterprise system as well as unfair competition to the commercial publishers. Private printing interests long managed to abet this attitude by amassing a powerful lobby whenever they felt their interests were threatened. The public universities were particularly vulnerable to such pressures as the term "socialistic" could be applied to state supported presses. Consequently in 1917 scholars of limited means still found it exceedingly difficult to publish their works.

Conclusions

The period 1884 to 1917 saw the professionalization and institutionalization of the teaching of history in the United States. In 1885 a person teaching the discipline exclusively was almost unknown, while in 1917 the vast majority of colleges and universities had at least one history specialist. In 1884 there was but a single American graduate program of recognized quality. In 1917 there were at least a dozen.
The growth of history did far more than merely reflect the great increase in students and facilities during this period as the subject came literally from nowhere to become a significant and occasionally the largest department in the typical university. History as a field experienced the transition from being regarded as a superfluous novelty to becoming one of the keystones of the American educational system. Professors of the discipline enjoyed respect as individuals whose opinions were valued and whose leadership abilities often resulted in their selection as administrators and policy makers in colleges and universities.

Yet even during this euphoric period of growth prior to America's entry into World War One, substantial problems were emerging. The character of the American undergraduate was changing. Polite people called him more rounded, and Corbin pointed out the obvious in saying, "For better, or for worse, the thing an American undergraduate cares most about is that his college shall be known for manly vigor and success on the field of sport." 70

The quality of professors was challenged just as vigorously. In the days prior to education becoming big business low salaries did not prevent keen competition for available vacancies. In 1917 the compensation was still meager, despite rapidly expanding opportunities for educated individuals, causing Turner and others to warn that low salaries in teaching were severely hampering the recruitment of well qualified graduate students.

The purpose of teaching history, particularly American history which had become a widespread undergraduate requirement by 1917, was
seldom formally defined by scholars although the vast majority of trustees and administrators articulated the conviction that such a requirement facilitated the production of loyal and dependable citizens. The consequences of professors in any number choosing to question or refute this philosophy were as yet unknown.
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SECTION THREE
THE STUDY AND TEACHING OF HISTORY
1917-1940
Introduction

In 1917, Wisconsin President Charles VanHise made the following remark:

The early recognition of the fundamental principles involved in the world contest has made each one feel the imperative necessity of making some contribution, however small, toward overthrowing the evil plans of Germany and thus making possible the continuance in the world of a mortal civilization.¹

Thus he typified the militant idealism accompanying America's entry into World War One, a conflict destined to alter the academic landscape as thoroughly as it changed the map of Europe. For a variety of reasons, America's initial idealism curdled into an intolerance which frequently accompanies the war spirit.

Germany's defeat failed to alter this situation characterized by abhorrence of nonconformity often coupled with a determination to identify and stamp out anything perceived as un-American. Labels such as "Communist," "Socialist" or "atheist" could be affixed to individuals and institutions which were instantly condemned without the necessity of lengthy investigations. These labels and their positive counterparts such as "free enterprise," "God fearing," and "patriotic" remained islands of certainty in a land engulfed by change. Viewing a world shifting all around them, many preferred reviving the past to enduring the struggle of constructing a new society. Though this proved impossible, many sought to graft old values onto the new reality via the educational process.

Teachers consequently faced enormous pressures arising from popular enthusiasm for rendering a changing world predictable.
Historians, viewed as custodians of traditional virtues, were frequently subjected to heavy teaching loads on the grounds that research was unimportant and leisure undesirable. Some educators protested. Thus, Harvard's Arthur Schlesinger viewed a 1926 commencement address as "... an opportunity to decry the spirit of intellectual and social conformity which infected the country following World War I." This historian charged that mechanization, mass production and technological advancement created an atmosphere of standardization, sameness and conformity. He further asserted that a nation of proud individualists had recently become a sniveling pack of joiners interested in little more than conforming and being accepted. His statement "... the forces making for social uniformity and the suppression of dissent have attained an unprecedented momentum," reflected genuine concern for the future of academic freedom in America.

Howard K. Beale, long a professor at the University of Wisconsin, shared Schlesinger's pessimism, isolating American local pride as a major cause of intolerance. He presented a grisly recital of "... hangings, mutilations, whippings, mobbings, incendiarism, sabotage, ridings on a rail, tar and featherings, shootings, lynchings that the annals of American life present," as proof that actions by local leaders were both irresponsible and dangerous. As these same individuals controlled schools and universities while knowing little about education, he wondered why they seldom advised physicians or lawyers concerning their professions while feeling perfectly capable of monitoring teachers. Beale feared that if educators continued
receiving such treatment, only those of limited talent would enter the profession—docile conformists content to do little save reinforcing conservative virtues.

Thorstein Veblen charged that businessmen serving on university boards shared the average citizen's intolerance and conservatism. He accused them of meddling in curricula and of rejecting "impractical" subjects while pressing for "... pragmatic, utilitarian, worldly wise, ..." schools which Veblen branded "barbarian." He lamented changes in board composition away from clergymen towards, "... men who have proved their capacity for work which has nothing in common with the higher learning." He also accused these businessmen of hiring "captains of erudition" to administer universities by competitive principles, striving to attract more students than neighboring schools and tending to lavish resources on the construction of impressive buildings. Veblen charged administrators with circulating blacklists which excluded faculty dissidents as effectively as they banned union sympathizers from factories, and evidence indeed exists that most schools took considerable pains in assuring the reliability of faculty appointments. Although few agreed with Veblen that no administrators were desirable, professors generally perceived them as nuisances and of little value in protecting academic excellence.

In 1917 Ohio State followed the trend of other schools when its trustees, despite opposition from President Thompson, passed a resolution formalizing the screening of all faculty members:

... a resolution and questionnaire were adopted to gather information about the faculty— as to background, academic history, departmental activities and the like.
The deans, in turn, were asked to estimate the teaching ability of each instructor in their college and their productive scholarship. They were asked also to name instructors not properly ranked and compensated—whether any should be demoted in rank, salary or both, and those who should be promoted similarly.6

Such resolutions meant little while Thompson remained in office, but his successor, George W. Rightmire, was less vigorous in thwarting conservatives and often failed to resist trustee determination to weed out troublesome professors. He discussed this concern emphatically, ordering the following investigation of a candidate seeking a one year appointment:

In view of recent happenings in University circles it would seem conclusive that this is a proper time to begin a careful study of the men and women who are being considered for teaching positions here. I have reference, especially, to ascertaining their moral fibre, their domestic lives and their general attitudes towards morals and fine living conditions.7

Rightmire amplified this concern to a Lantern reporter stating:

... Persons in whose record there is the least taint of moral delinquency are not even considered. ... Not only are members of the teaching staff required to sign the oath of allegiance, but the Board of Trustees reserves the right to terminate their services where their 'efficiency in service' is impaired.8

Such measures proved very effective in regulating faculty conduct during a depression when professors realized the difficulty of finding new employment and knew that hoards of job seekers pressed eagerly to replace them.

Though teacher loyalty oaths began in the Revolution, the practice was rare until World War I when more than twenty states, including Ohio, enacted legislation requiring them. These oaths, like prohibition, reflected a belief that morality could be legislated.
They also, however, isolated teachers from other professions and labeled them untrustworthy. Despite humiliations imposed by such oaths, few teachers protested and most sympathized with conservative forces creating them. For example honorary degrees, generally controlled by faculty members, were rarely given to liberals, being more typically awarded to conservatives and even reactionaries. Professors themselves made certain men like Louis D. Brandeis, Robert M. LaFollette, Clarence Darrow and Lincoln Steffans were not recommended for honorary degrees.

Quick to recognize social change, students became critical of traditional education and increasingly difficult to motivate. Rather than alter course content or revise teaching methods, professors tended to brand students inferior and to stimulate excellence by artificial means. Ohio State's Special Committee on Student Scholarship sought to end student apathy via regulations such as stipulating that each unexcused absence either immediately preceding or following a vacation would result in three hours being added to the offender's requirements. President Rightmire sought an alternate incentive via a junior division to include two year degrees as well as individualized tutoring for those requiring training prior to entering the regular program. But the faculty opposed Rightmire's insistence that public institutions satisfy a greater variety of student interests and abilities and succeeded in defeating this and similar proposals for nearly forty years. Faculty concern that funding this operation might damage existing programs is understandable. Less defensible was their opposition to all curricular changes, coupled with an open belittlement
of undergraduate abilities. Student reactions to this situation resulted in muted protest and subtle sabotage. When in 1927 Ohio State students grew weary of the annual ballyhoo surrounding the homecoming queen's selection they nominated then elected Maudine Ormsby, prize Holstein cow, dumbfounding the alumni and precipitating frantic post election investigations by university authorities.9

Just as professors often criticized their pupils, students were openly mystified as to why anyone chose teaching. Enamored by the success of businessmen and anxious to possess their products, most students embraced their practical, materialistic society and found it incomprehensible that anyone would renounce creature comforts to pursue the scholarly life. John D. Rockefeller lamented the economic hardships teachers had to endure, and in December of 1919 donated 50 million dollars in a far from successful attempt to improve professorial salaries. Just as Carnegie's resources proved insufficient in providing pensions for college teachers, Rockefeller's millions were incapable of effecting any permanent change.

Jean Jules Jusserand, Ambassador from France, chairman of the American Historical Association's Committee on the Writing of History and past president of the organization was also concerned for the discipline's future. He noted that unlike in the past, people of high social position and inherited means were rarely historians and increasingly were gravitating towards law, medicine and engineering. He blamed this situation on the subject's waning prestige and loss of popular appeal exemplified by a sudden decrease in historical books and articles.
History's image also suffered when professorial working conditions failed to improve. At the turn of the century when the discipline was new and university expansion just beginning, historians expected that American universities would soon resemble continental ones in terms of salaries, teaching loads, and academic freedom. When, after several decades, this failed to occur, a growing pessimism infected academia.

Such setbacks, however, failed to halt history's continued development by those seeking to redefine its purpose, to introduce new courses and to devise improved methods of research. Specialists in European history, for example, reflected a concern with social factors which had long challenged American history. World War One impelled historians to cease treating the continent as a unit and served as midwife to the birth of modern Europe as a field. These scholars also applied "... some ... social science concepts that had proved their usefulness in American history to the European scene as well as to broaden the investigation of diplomatic events by exploring the extent to which they were determined by public opinion, economic interests, and the social structure of the society."10

American historians of the 1920's and 1930's experienced a marked shift in interest from colonial to national studies while witnessing the emergence of once neglected diplomatic history into a viable field. American social history continued gaining relative to a political and economic emphasis. Arthur Schlesinger first taught a separate course in 1922, the same year research began on the thirteen volume History of American Life which he co-edited with Dixon Ryan.
Fox. The study of immigrant groups also became prominent with Carl Wittke and Arthur Schlesinger making major contributions in this area.

With continuing growth of historical specialities, teachers became increasingly loyal to their own field of interest rather than any particular institution. John Hicks' decision to advance professionally rather than building his life into Hamlin College, exemplifies this attitude which heightened professors' individualistic tendencies making unified action nearly impossible.

The difficult time of the 1930's compounded and intensified the problems of the previous decade. Though financial emergencies plagued most institutions, professorial pay cuts were often made to mollify public opinion as well as to balance institutional budgets. Harvard's Lowell was the only important university president who successfully resisted salary slashing pressures, and even he undertook extensive staff reductions at a time when the school's bond investments made it wealthier than ever in real terms.

The financial crisis in public schools was, to be sure, more real than Harvard's. Ohio's reduction in income demolished a competitive pay scale while making basic supplies, such as bluebooks and chalk, virtually unobtainable. Yet a state-wide roadbuilding program continued, the refurbishing of university buildings proceeded on schedule, and no other public employees suffered pay cuts as drastic as did professors. The conclusion one draws, at least in Ohio's case, is that even more than the troubled economy, public disenchantment lay at the root of university economic problems.
Educators sought to counter these attacks by proving themselves efficient and useful. Ohio State's 1935 Annual Report, The Public Services of the Ohio State University; The Outreach of Teaching and Research to the People of Ohio, reveals a certain straining for effect. Within its pages is the following apology, "... the Department of History does not render so conspicuously the type of public services which the more practical and scientific departments, ..., can perform."¹² Though Schlesinger and others cautioned against defending history from a utilitarian standpoint, many persisted much to the later disgust of Richard Hofstadter:

One of the most conspicuous things about American writing and speaking on education is a strange and pervasive reluctance—even when the writers and speakers are teachers and scholars—to admit that enjoyment of the life of the mind is a legitimate and important consummation in itself, at least as valid among the ends of life as the enjoyment, say, of sports, sex, or liquor. Education is justified apologetically as a useful instrument in attaining useful ends: ... Rarely, however, does anyone presume to say that it is good for man.¹³

The popularity of history in Europe, by contrast, lay in its reputation as a fascinating hobby, an appreciation of which is usually obtained via independent reading not formal coursework. Americans, on the other hand, experienced little success in applying industrial concepts of mass education to the teaching of history. Just as prohibitionists felt a law could end drunkenness, many professors believed a history requirement would foster its appreciation. And indeed it might have, had sufficient resources been devoted to the effort instead of assembly line methods which speeded students along with a minimum of expense and effort. Pupil response to such
treatment was to consider required courses, and occasionally the entire educational process as a mere exercise in collecting credits. Textbooks did not improve the situation since history's most interesting aspects seldom survived scrutiny by pressure groups, any one of which could effectively ruin sales.

Depression problems curbed an already limited appetite for experimentation in educational matters. Administrative control of most institutions remained firm and often unyielding. In an era when teaching faculties were being decimated, administrators seldom declined in number, and occasionally even multiplied. Professors generally controlled curricula and individual courses, but rarely influenced the budget, matters of university policy, or the selection of key administrators and trustees. Dr. A. J. Carlson, President of the American Association of University Professors, and Ohio's Carl Wittke were two men seeking to reverse this trend they termed "anaemia in the university." Speaking in 1937, Carlson exhorted professors to take the offensive to restore the dignity of teaching:

We should begin to develop a sense of professional conscientiousness, a code of ethics which will correspond to those of the men in medicine or law or other professions. It will have to be administered by ourselves, and to date we have not even begun to formulate any code.\textsuperscript{14}

Theodore Clark Smith, a veteran of over three decades of distinguished teaching and research, penned an extraordinary article in the 1934 \textit{American Historical Review} revealing a troubled and
thoughtful man as concerned with the future of his country as he was the fate of his profession:

... There is, however, a disquieting thought that persists in forcing itself to our consciousness when reflecting on the ease with which a growing number of writers discard impartiality on the ground that it is uninteresting, or contrary to social beliefs, or uninformative.... There are today countries where history... is systematically employed as a means for educating people to think as the ruling authorities wish them to do....

That history in this country may undergo similar control is by no means unthinkable. We have already had our troubles with 'Confederate' history and 'patriotic' history.... From this it is a very short step to history as written or taught in Italy, Russia or Germany....

It may be that another fifty years will see the end of an era in historiography, the final extinction of a noble dream, and history, save as an instrument of entertainment, or of social control will not be permitted to exist. In that case, it will be time for the American Historical Association to disband.... My hope is, none the less, that those of us who date from what may seem an age of quaint beliefs and forgotten loyalties, may go down with our flags flying. 15

While many professors sympathized with such idealism, few showed willingness to take up the cudgel on its behalf. Carl Wittke, for example, despite a good salary and no threat to continued job security, exchanged his Ohio State job for an administrative position at Oberlin simply because he had tried and had failed to become Dean of Arts and Sciences. While the liberals were indignant that many colleagues remained conservative, the experience of the 1970's indicates once again a demonstrable correlation between timidity and limited employment opportunities. Neither teachers nor anyone else are apt to risk starvation over principles, and particularly in the 1930's, pressures by powerful interest groups inspired many a liberal to turn prudently conservative.
Administrators themselves experienced enormous pressures as the depression deepened, and the very businessmen trumpeting self-reliance and rugged individualism often pulled every wire imaginable to secure jobs for friends and relatives. Habitually men of extraordinary power insisted upon professorships or even graduate assistantships on the basis of favoritism rather than merit.

Compounding an already difficult situation was the hobgoblin of little minds. While Harvard's Lowell battled unsuccessfully to stem a widespread dismissal of junior professors which claimed scores of victims, overseers and alumni purportedly were demanding an explanation for the presence of Yale locks on campus. Some pettiness was bound to surface in a nation worn thin by years of economic and social uncertainty. Even outwardly serene titans controlling the fate of great universities were unnerved by politicians seeking to confiscate their wealth and by radicals insisting that capitalism was no longer viable. Gnauling fears and uncertainties convulsed an entire society which collectively despaired of solutions and individually scurried to seize the few remaining opportunities.

Yet somehow life went on. Despite studies showing the percentage of college graduates in Congress to be far less than during the earliest days of the Republic and in the face of gloomy statistics questioning the value of higher education, students continued attending colleges and universities in record numbers. Even graduate programs preparing individuals to enter the glutted teaching profession continued increasing in enrollment, despite numerous unemployed graduates and severe cuts in most operating budgets. While money was
hard to come by, little was necessary in an era of 10c breakfasts, 25c lunches and 35c dinners. One Ohio State doctoral applicant found his $450 assistantship allowed him to live comfortably, maintain a car and save $150 to see him through the summer of 1935. Indeed by the late 1930's, parking problems were becoming acute on many large campuses, financial hard times not withstanding. Exhibiting the resiliency of youth, students worked and saved to attend college which they themselves referred to as, "... the four years between high school and the C.C.C. camp."17 While the depression placed a severe test on many individuals, the human organism proved too durable for the flames of hope to become totally extinguished.

**Scholarly Activities**

By the twenties and thirties the spirit of James Harvey Robinson's *The New History* (1912) had inspired a whole cadre of disciples. According to one such individual:

The period of human savagery was far longer than that of civilization, and has left its indelible impress upon our modes of thinking. It generated our animistic and mystic tendencies, our strange deference to authority, and our unbelievable conservatism. Most of the basic elements in our religious and ethical beliefs date from this stage of human psychogenesis.18

Another writer suggested:

... history is a continuous process; its chief goal should be to show how the present has become what it is as a basis for reforming it; its standards and values must change with the present; its scope must extend to all the various interests and activities of man; it must emphasize conditions and institutions more than events; it must utilize the new and more advanced social studies.19
This group of "new historians" sought to influence the discipline by utilizing discoveries in the emerging fields of anthropology, economics, psychology and sociology in analyzing man's evolution and attempting through education to render him more sensible, more rational, and in a word more "civilized." This new breed of scholar-activists proved more critical of colleagues than of the public at large. Scorning the pedantic, politically oriented recitation of facts encompassing most courses, they branded textbooks inadequate asserting history must change to meet the interests of each new generation. These "new historians" also accused traditional researchers of expanding a "thin film of knowledge" to present an attractive though often inaccurate story.

The 1920's witnessed the production of papers, books and articles applying new historical principles to various contexts. People calling themselves "historical economists," "historical anthropologists" and "historical geographers" pursued exotic new specialities centered at Columbia University which for a time housed Robinson himself, Franz Boas (the father of historical anthropology), Charles A. Beard and William A. Dunning. Clark's G. Stanley Hall offered the first "historical psychology" seminar in 1918. A distinguished psychologist with keen interest in history, Hall inspired the vogue of subjecting famous personages to psychoanalysis, a procedure often undertaken by scholars with little knowledge of psychology. Harry Elmer
Barnes, for example, devoted thirty pages of his *The New History and the Social Studies* to psychoanalyzing leading Americans:

> Lincoln suffered from cyclothemia, a melancholia disorder induced by a mother attachment and rebellion against the father, neither of which was resolved by a happily consummated marriage. 20

Thus Barnes led the "new historians" with abrasive dedication buttressed by a conviction that the Republic was doomed if conservative elements remained in control. While Barnes did succeed in popularizing the "new history," he also amassed vitriolic enemies not above accusing him of being the Kaiser's paid agent during the recent war. A decade later, however, Barnes was sufficiently passe' to be dean of a major graduate school while Schlesinger was codifying the relationship between history and other disciplines, particularly economics, starting with his widely quoted *New Viewpoints in American History* (1922). Schlesinger also continued his *History of American Life* (1927-1948) with Dixon Ryan Fox while aiding in the birth of American Council of Learned Society Committees promoting neglected fields including Chinese, Japanese, Indic-Iranian and Byzantine history. Towards the end of this period Allan Nevins sought to enlist wider support for the "new history" via *The Gateway to History* (1938) which sold well but failed to convince the American Historical Association that it should sponsor a popular journal.

Because these "new historians" seem particularly appealing and relevant to modern readers, one must caution that prior to 1940 their works were considered radical and almost heretical by the vast majority who continued teaching in the traditional fashion. Nearly all
important "new history" works for example, were authored by full professors in major universities while ambitious younger historians tended to utilize safer vehicles when attempting to establish a publishing reputation. While these "new historians" were highly capable scholars, they moved in a very tight circle exerting minimal influence on history teaching in most schools prior to 1940.

Despite financial difficulties caused by inflation of the twenties and pay cuts of the thirties, historians in ever increasing numbers supported state, national and local professional organizations. Reimbursement for travel expenses was unheard of save in a handful of institutions and, in addition, professors normally needed written permission from the administration in order to attend such functions. Depression budgets were everywhere curtailed, and for a time scholars feared the American Historical Association's annual expenditure would of necessity drop below $25,000.

During this 1917-1940 period Association conventions were held twice in Ohio; Cleveland in 1918 and Columbus in 1923, with Ohio State professors prominent at these and other meetings. Wilbur Siebert was extremely active professionally, and with Arthur Schlesinger was instrumental in arranging the Columbus meeting. He served on numerous Association committees and during the 1920's worked tirelessly raising a permanent endowment for the organization. Professors Cole, Wittke and Hockett were also prominent in the Association during this era when attendance at annual meetings averaged 500. The "slave market" remained an annual feature with placement relatively easy prior to the depression. It was at the Columbus meeting that Schlesinger sought and
secured the Harvard post created by Turner's retirement. Also at this meeting a controversial resolution was adopted reflecting opposition to continued attempts by outside groups to control course and textbook content, a portion of which stated:

Criticisms of history textbooks should not be based on false patriotism, but rather on the presentation of the facts, this to be determined by recognized experts. The fostering of arrogance, boastfulness, and indiscriminate hero worship makes for pseudo and harmful patriotism.21

It is difficult to ascertain the effect this and similar resolutions exerted on the teaching of history, but probably scholarly attempts to portray reality harshly had limited appeal during the 1930's when most citizens faced enough problems without heeding crusading historians. While millions sought escape via fiction, lavish movies and soap operas some historians were busy debunking the founding fathers and smashing other long venerated idols. This situation angered many who felt a national emergency was hardly the time for historians to abandon their traditional mission of creating patriots. Since many of these same historians had cheerfully presented "facts" in conformance with Allied war-time propaganda, widespread indignation resulted from this sudden shift to unvarnished veracity. The American Historical Association, fearing a lessening of public support, devoted papers and discussion sessions to the problem of making history attractive without sacrificing the truth. Carl Becker (1931) and Charles Beard (1933) devoted presidential addresses to this theme, the former suggesting scholars consider popular needs and the latter pleading the discipline be made more relevant to everyday life.
Ohio State continued its vital participation in the Mississippi Valley Historical Association with Homer Hockett and Carl Wittke serving as president while nearly every American historian in the university delivered papers or was active in its committees. During 1930 while Hockett was president, he appointed a committee to select the Review's new managing editor which prompted Wittke to persuade President Rightmire to furnish necessary funds for publishing the Review in Columbus under the editorship of Arthur Cole. Soon thereafter, however, Cole moved the Review to Western Reserve and left Ohio State. When in 1940 Reserve found the Review too costly, Ohio State offered its support once again with Henry Simmons, Francis P. Weisenburger and Homer Hockett suggested as possible editors.

Professional determination to encourage and identify outstanding history students led to the founding of Phi Alpha Theta, national history honorary, in 1921. Ohio State's Zeta chapter, established May 21, 1927, included Knight, Siebert and Wittke as charter members, and during the first year welcomed fifteen students into its ranks including doctoral candidate Harold J. Grimm who later became Ohio State's chairman. Surviving records indicate this ambitious youth had worked as a band director, piano soloist, glee club accompanist, part-time music teacher and part-time history teacher while earning his degrees. While the number initiated into the Zeta chapter declined steeply during the depression, history chairman Carl Wittke poured considerable effort into the organization arranging for guest speakers, setting up programs and planning dinners and departmental receptions. Non members were welcome at these functions which nearly all history
and political science graduate students attended. Phi Alpha Theta remained an active and dynamic campus organization throughout Wittke's chairmanship.

National organizations attracting teachers of varying disciplines included the American Association of University Professors, the American Federation of Teachers and the League for Independent Political Action. Such groups, particularly active during the depression, saw teachers as agents of change rather than bastions of conservatism. Membership in such organizations was considered quite daring and frowned upon by authorities in all but the most liberal institutions. Ohio State proved exceedingly tolerant of these activities so long as their members disavowed pacifism.

Many state historical societies continued expanding their holdings and services despite meager budgets and the consequent necessity of relying on volunteers or those receiving minimal salaries. But-tressed by a national desire to collect and preserve records of the First World War, Ohio's Archaeological and Historical Society proved typical of the more active organizations as well as a monument to what high enthusiasm can accomplish with limited funds. Ohio State's history department devoted considerable energy to the Society, spearheading the organization's shift in emphasis from archaeology to history. Lobbying by Schlesinger, chairman of the Historical Commission of Ohio, and Wilbur Siebert was largely responsible for Governor James Cox designating the Society as the official collecting agency for materials covering Ohio's World War One activities. Space for this work was provided by the Society while Ohio State furnished office supplies and
reduced Schlesinger’s teaching load. A campaign to collect this mate­
rial followed with a chairman appointed for each county and acces­
sioned materials divided into pictures, printed matter, manuscripts, 
emblems and relics. Upon being presented with a hand-written volume 
entitled The Second Liberty Loan of 1917, of the Rural Districts of 
Franklin County, the ever diplomatic Schlesinger responded, "I do not 
know of any other state commission which has had the good fortune of 
having such a piece of work presented to it."23 As materials poured 
in, Siebert discovered a wealth of information concerning Ohio State 
alumni and resolved to utilize these resources in writing an account 
of university participation in the war. Systematically he divided the 
information into three categories while soliciting the aid of McNeal, 
Schlesinger and Wittke in collecting and arranging materials. Siebert 
bore the brunt of this enormous task, ".  .  .  to follow the career of 
every student, alumnus and professor through the war, .  .  ."24 and 
labored over a decade bringing this work to its conclusion.

When Schlesinger exchanged Columbus for Iowa City in 1918, Carl 
Wittke took administrative charge of the Ohio Historical Commission 
while continuing to assemble scrapbooks of Franklin County’s foreign 
language newspapers. This young scholar proved a tireless representa­
tive of Commission interests who fearlessly informed trustees, adminis­
trators and legislators of its importance and corresponding need for 
funds. At the same time he attempted to extend this wartime project 
into an ongoing program to collect, edit and publish Ohio historical 
materials. The Commission was expanded to include professors from
universities other than Ohio State, and the legislature provided a modest annual appropriation. In the 1930's, work began on a six volume history of Ohio as well as the best selling one-volume work co-authored by Roseboom and Weisenburger.

A myriad of local and regional organizations often limited in scope and ephemeral in nature existed during the 1920's and 1930's. Some catered to popular interest in analyzing a changing world while others concentrated on preserving historical materials or improving the teaching of social studies. Such organizations frequently depended on the willingness of local college or university personnel to expend time and effort on their behalf. Fruitful interchanges often took place between professors, school teachers and ordinary citizens sharing a common love of history.

Central Ohio contained a variety of such organizations attracting a wide range of individuals. The Ohio History Teachers' Association reflected Siebert's concern to promote discussion among all types of history teachers in the area although most papers were delivered by Ohio State faculty members. The Central Ohio Branch of the Foreign Policy Association was also dominated by Ohio State historians especially Carl Wittke who participated in its founding and also served as president of the organization. Meetings were held five times annually and generally featured debates between professors. Membership grew steadily throughout the depression necessitating larger and larger auditoriums. Columbus' Kit-Kat Club provided a more exclusive forum for discussing events of current interest. Inspired by Dr. Samuel Johnson's gatherings at the Cheshire Cheese, membership was
limited to thirty men who attended nine annual dinners featuring a lecture followed by a discussion. Ohio history professors were frequent speakers, and Knight and Washburne served terms as president of this organization whose members included George W. Rightmire, Governor John Bricker and leading community businessmen.

Campus historical organizations were exceedingly popular during this period. At Ohio State, Professor Washburne sparked a 1932 revival of the Toastmasters Club featuring bull sessions on popular topics between professors, undergraduates and graduate students. Siebert's History Club continued gaining members although Knight's Political Science Club languished and died soon after his retirement in 1926. In addition to papers and discussions, strictly social functions including hayrides, picnics and parties were sponsored by the History Club. Wittke appears to have been its most frequent and most popular speaker specializing in immigrant history topics interspersed with folk songs and violin solos.

In contrast to most universities, Ohio's administration interfered little in the activities of campus organizations. Johns Hopkins, for example, forced the Liberal Club and other organizations to disband, and by 1934 prohibited radical speakers from visiting the campus.

In conclusion, the second and third decades of this century witnessed a transformation in the role of historian-scholars. Content no longer to be passive observers of a changing world, they infused a new activism into historical writing buttressed by improvements in research techniques which widened horizons and emphasized the value of
interdisciplinary cooperation. A resulting appreciation of the need for well preserved and logically arranged source materials encouraged the expansion of historical societies sparked by a coalition of scholars and concerned laymen. This activist breed of historian often faced vigorous opposition from conservative interests. Yet by contrast, a growing liberal population lent articulate encouragement to these intellectuals who admittedly were on the defensive, but not without friends who shared a hope that scholars could aid in creating a better world.

Undergraduate Teaching

This period, beginning with unprecedented growth and ending with a depression, witnessed a lessening of interdepartmental cooperation in most universities. Special loyalties became so intensified that even within history departments meaningful dialogue between European and American specialists often ceased. One notable exception was a continuation of the long standing alliance between political science and American history in many schools including Ohio State where political scientists often covered the classes of ailing historians and vice versa. Harvard's Lowell sought to counter increasing departmental isolation by requiring majors in his former division of history, government, and economics to take comprehensive examinations modeled on Oxford's honour schools and administered by special tutors.

Despite an ever growing stress on research, teaching loads remained high and class sizes increased in most institutions. When in 1919 Eugene Roseboom arrived as an instructor at Ohio State, his class
load was fifteen hours divided into five sections every Monday, Wednesday and Friday. He had no assistants although his classes averaged 60 and university regulations sanctioned graders for courses larger than 25. Little wonder that critics of survey courses believed their introduction at the very time Ford perfected his assembly line was more than coincidental. Quite frequently senior professors lectured to students who filled auditoriums and whose papers and tests were graded by inexpensive, frequently inexperienced M.A. and Ph.D. candidates. While a junior staff member at Ohio State, Arthur Schlesinger was often charged with administering survey sections. Every Friday at 11, he chaired a meeting of professors and graders during which methods of teaching, testing and evaluation were discussed along with special problems like the coordination of courses. Following Schlesinger's departure, Carl Wittke gained his administrative baptism by assuming this responsibility.

After his doctoral work at Harvard, Eugene Roseboom took charge of Ohio survey courses as Wittke insisted on relief from this responsibility. In the early 1920's such courses stressed student mastery of the text when available and familiarity with lecture notes. Memorization with little interpretation was expected from students as the rationale behind these courses was to impart "fundamentals" and weed out the incapable. Roseboom prepared a syllabus for American survey sections which spelled out structure and content including specific reading assignments and lecture topics. He also scheduled all mid-terms on a given day at five P.M. with each professor furnishing his own essay questions.
Such courses exposed large numbers to alleged "basic concepts" at minimum cost. Students, however, often opposed this academic assembly line charging impersonal treatment by professors and widespread incompetence among graduate assistants. In addition, factually oriented and rigidly structured courses afforded few opportunities to accommodate individual differences or interests. Even Schlesinger who stressed creative teaching found himself forced by weight of numbers to compile a secret list of facts for graders to look for from which was calculated an equally secret percentage which then translated into a grade.

Few considered survey courses perfect, and innovations were frequently made attempting to improve them. A vigorous recruitment campaign was launched at Harvard to attract personable and interesting quiz leaders, a few of whom were neither history majors nor graduate students. At Wisconsin, widespread conviction that "quiz masters" were eroding instructional quality resulted in abolishing the senior thesis in order to concentrate more on survey courses. Idealistic Berkeley professors increased their own teaching loads, subdividing large classes to provide more personalized instruction. Many schools, including Ohio State, formed committees for evaluating student performance and suggesting course improvements. These efforts generally condemned students and advocated learning by coercion, but occasionally changes in course methodology and content grew out of such meetings. Pennsylvania's Edward P. Cheyney showed keen interest in instructional improvement, asserting that while one third of his students were
substandard a similar percentage of professors were unworthy of their rank.

Many chairmen and other administrators maintained that more funds were necessary for courses to achieve maximum effectiveness as only money was capable of hiring more instructors, reducing class sizes and increasing library holdings. A shortage of resources was especially evident at Ohio State where prior to their 1926 merger a department of European History and a department of American History vied for funds as witness a letter Knight wrote President Thompson in September of 1916:

I have no right to make comparisons. The department of European History is doubtless in need also of relief. I hope they may have it. I note, however, that they have the same number of sections (nine) for their fundamental course with an enrollment... of not over three hundred students... an average of 33 to the section, while the department of American History has an average of 48 to the section.27

And when Wittke took charge of all history, he found no money for graders in survey courses prompting the new chairman to request additional funds:

It has been necessary to close all sections of 401 except the 3 o'clock sections. In each of four rooms it was necessary to requisition 15 additional chairs. The paper work in the first course, in European History (401), the gateway course for freshmen working in the department, is necessarily very heavy. To curtail these requirements would seriously affect the value of the course.28

Some changes cost no additional money. Pretesting could be administered to incoming freshmen and class assignments made according
to scores. Examinations could be altered in format, in length and in frequency. The term could be expanded or shortened and grading systems changed. These and other innovations, some permanent and some fadish, swept academia during the 1917-1940 period.

Yet the ultimate success or failure of any course rested on the instructor. Writing to his fiance' in the mid 1920's, the young Francis P. Weisenburger demonstrated the enthusiasm and dedication necessary to succeed in this profession:

Today I am giving my second mid-term exam. . . It keeps me humping from 7 A.M. to 10 P.M. to turn out all the work I have to do . . .

. . .

. . . I have over one hundred in a single section (this quarter) which taxes the capacity of the room and will tax the ingenuity of the instructor . . . as it is supposed to be a quiz section.

. . .

The University budget was arranged in such a way this year that we do not have the assistants that helped considerably with the grading last year.

. . .

. . . Just now my greatest problem is to be breaking the news gently to those students of mine who can't escape flunking. It takes a very hard heart to do it. . .

. . .

Saturday I had an hour and a half session with a student and her mother, . . . It was somewhat of an ordeal, especially since I could not come out plainly and say that the poor girl had a deficiency of brains.
Today some of my Freshmen with High School tricks still in mind tried to put a little brown puppy in my desk, but I came into my room a little early so that the stunt was spoiled.

This week I have been launching into my regular work... I surely enjoy it... and I look forward with anticipation to my next classes every day.

By the late 1920's a common topic of conversation was the "mix" of faculty members in any given institution. John H. McNeely and others noted a dynastic tendency in many large schools where a high percentage of professors had received one or more degrees from the employing institution. In addition, the median salary of these teachers was higher than that of their colleagues. Once alerted to this situation, most universities sought to limit inbreeding save those of highest prestige such as Wisconsin where 75 percent of the faculty had done graduate work at that university. Examples such as this seemed to indicate inbreeding was not necessarily detrimental.

While salaries were depressed throughout the 1920's job opportunities were plentiful, and many young scholars found promotions almost automatic. The onset of the depression, however, made entry into the profession difficult and rendered promotions almost impossible. How this translated into human terms can be illustrated by discussing some Ohio State instructors who overcame tremendous odds to be employed by a Big Ten university. One, a highly recommended Hopkins graduate with an excellent dissertation, taught the same survey courses for six years with no hope of advancement. He then left teaching to
head an illegal publishing venture which was sued for reproducing verbatim materials copyrighted by the College Entrance Examination Board. An outstanding Harvard Ph.D. proved sufficiently impressive to win the position he eagerly sought—a one year instructorship paying $1,948.50. Another Ohio instructor destined to attain eminence in his chosen field had to turn down a prestigious American Council of Learned Societies fellowship when Ohio State refused to hold his position open for a year. In addition, budget cuts caused highly capable instructors to lose their jobs despite the fact enrollments continued to rise, though somewhat erratically, throughout the depression. Most such individuals, all of whom had shown promise, faded into obscurity never to be heard from again. The majority had families, and many endured real privation and hardship. While depression statistics are impressive enough in quantitative terms, human tragedies of broken dreams, family catastrophies and thwarted careers are far more poignant.

Very few teachers escaped some inconvenience during the depression. Class sizes and teaching loads generally rose while all fringe benefits from travel monies to grading assistance became difficult or impossible to obtain. Some schools required teaching at night or in special extensions such as "emergency schools" for the unemployed and at no additional salary. Requiring professors to end summer vacations a week or more early to attend or conduct various "orientation" programs became commonplace. Salary cuts were the rule, and small schools filled positions paying only room and board. The fortunate few winning promotions generally received token or nonexistent raises. One Ohio
State instructor taught for six years at the same pay prior to becoming an assistant professor and receiving a $200 raise. And indeed the man was fortunate for he had retained his position, had gained recognition and had started teaching advanced courses and advising graduate students. This was the best most top notch scholars could hope for during the depression.

While educational reforms have been discussed, most professors were conservative and dedicated more to restoration than innovation. While some individuals did cause changes, one should not ignore the legions of teachers who clung to yellowed lecture notes refusing to alter a syllable of course content despite constant changes occurring all about them. Consequently any discussion of reforms must be tempered by observing that most educators were hostile to change.

Perhaps the era's leading educational radical was Chicago President Robert Maynard Hutchins who spelled out his concern for education's future by writing *The Higher Learning in America* (1936). Hutchins asserted that course offerings reflected public whims not educational considerations and that freshmen and sophomores should be excluded from the university. He advocated eliminating all departments, save metaphysics, social science and natural science, and replacing them with a standard curriculum featuring great works of Western Civilization. Alexander Meiklejohn refined this plan at Wisconsin where students concentrated exclusively in various aspects of Athenian civilization.
Chicago economist Harry D. Gideonse led those opposing Hutchins by penning a slim but scathing volume which he later asserted delayed his promotion:

No one would be more delighted than its author if Mr. Hutchins, recognizing in this essay the substance of his views, allays the apprehensions which his own pages have raised. . . . There are even rumors--incredible as it may appear--that the faculty of the University of Chicago, . . . is to take the lead in charting this new course for the higher learning. This essay is contributed to the discussion with the purpose of correcting these misapprehensions and rumors. 31

Reforms in most schools were far less extensive and more peripheral than substantial. Some institutions, for example, added several new staff members at very high salaries in hopes they would upgrade the school. Such efforts, at least at Ohio State, were largely unsuccessful prompting economist Edison L. Bowers to caution against hiring such an individual as a dean of arts and sciences:

There are . . . today a number of men who have been brought here at salaries considerably higher than those received by other professors. These intellectual "hot shots" are supposed to develop the institution along genuine university lines. . . . During the past year I have heard one of these gentlemen refer to Ohio State University as a "cow college." Another advised a prospective graduate student not to come to Ohio State if he could possibly go elsewhere. Still another man advised several assistants and instructors to forget about giving service to Ohio State University and to do those things which would most likely assist them in obtaining positions elsewhere. 32

Just as lecturing had gradually supplanted the older recitation method, a number of professors came to believe that classroom discussion would eventually replace lectures. Studies were conducted comparing student performance in discussion and lecture situations, one of the most thorough being supervised by Ohio State's Arthur Noyes
who studied a large sample of students over a four year period. Results indicated that in addition to preferring the discussion method, students tested better in survey courses using this approach than those attending lecture-quiz or straight lecture courses. Identical tests administered to everyone showed discussion trained students performing better on both essay and short answer examinations. Results of a follow-up study in 1931 were even more dramatic. A group of students excused from attending a large lecture section studied the text on their own aided by two tutorial sessions during the three week trial period. After rejoining the class for the regular mid-term, the experimental group achieved almost the identical median score of those attending the lectures. In addition a far higher percentage of this group earned "A" or "B" on the exam than did the rest of the class prompting Noyes to conclude that better students improved their performance in freer situations, while poorer ones found this lack of structure detrimental. Consequently, lectures in survey sections were abandoned, but staff resistance soon returned these courses to their original format.

President Rightmire supported such studies and articulated his preference that individualized instruction be available to undergraduates. He was influenced by trustees receiving numerous complaints that instruction, particularly in the arts and sciences, was both inadequate and impractical. Consequently Rightmire implemented a number of reforms, none of which ever received more than token faculty support. He pressed to create a separate Junior Division dedicated to good teaching and meeting the unique needs of individual students.
Thus Rightmire sought to create a separate faculty for teaching freshmen and sophomores, a position he explained in the 1937 Annual Report. "Perhaps greater poise and inspirational ability on the part of the teacher are needed by the freshmen students than by the upperclassmen." Such a philosophy naturally drew fire from professors whose doctoral candidates supported themselves by teaching undergraduates.

As a result Rightmire faced determined faculty opposition to the Emergency Junior Colleges he established throughout the state as a pilot project. Wittke strenuously attacked this program. To the great disadvantage of the students concerned, he ordered that all history exams taken in these schools be graded by Columbus faculty members "... as though the students had taken these courses at Ohio State." Consequently, individuals with no exposure to the course nor any knowledge of the students concerned marked 80 percent of these tests "D" or "F."

Wittke nonetheless always maintained a positive approach. His successor George Washburne, in advising a visiting professor, displayed a disenchantment typical of professors dealing with masses of students:

You must not take our graduate students in the summer quarter too seriously. We have a large delegation of teachers who wish to achieve an M.A. degree because it is required for state teaching. This is said not to dampen your enthusiasm, but to give you a slight warning.

Ohio historians were free to conduct their classes any way they wished. A number of professors including Cole, Dorn and Washburne were skillful discussion leaders. Wittke and others experimented with using no texts and giving students a number of alternatives in
selecting their own readings. As the library lacked the funds to buy additional history books, students were each assessed 10 cents which was used to buy the outside readings and eliminated the necessity of students' having to buy their own books. Professor William McDonald in conjunction with Huntley Dupre and the classics department offered an intensive fifteen hour course in Greek Civilization to top notch students willing to devote an entire quarter to this learning experience. Though student interest was minimal, the university funded this program until the professors themselves decided to end it.

By 1940 courses in large universities were comparable to those offered today, and one can recognize the majority of present-day majors and fields of concentration. The period between the wars was therefore an era of unprecedented curricular growth despite awesome problems facing universities as well as the larger world. In fact one might logically assert these challenges facilitated the introduction of new courses.

Popular interest in European history inspired many new courses including a number called "problems" stressing the application of analytical skills to contemporary issues. Other courses, frequently summer offerings, were popular in nature requiring little from students save attendance. Ohio's 000 series included such courses, some at a very high level despite the lack of formal requirements. McNeal, Hockett, Wittke and Washburne together taught a two semester course, "The World War: its Causes, Issues and Results," affording students intimate glimpses into trained minds digesting, synthesizing and analyzing information. All four professors, each entirely different in
background and approach, sought in his own way to interpret current happenings. Early in 1915, Professor Schlesinger had believed the current war would ultimately affect the United States as extensively as Europe. His 000 course, "Some Revisions of American History," afforded the opportunity of exploring this and other theories with his students.

Though keen interest in contemporary history inspired many new courses, relatively few became a permanent part of the curriculum. Initiating a course was seldom complicated so long as no budgetary increase was necessary and some minimum number elected to take it. While students probably found frequent curricular changes confusing, they did reflect quite accurately the rapidly changing world about them.

New subjects and even new fields could and did arise anywhere at any time. After writing the first recognized Canadian history text authored by an American scholar, Carl Wittke offered the first course in Canadian history taught in any American university. Ohio's chairman pioneered other courses including Ohio history and immigrant groups which were firsts for the state. Arthur Schlesinger was instrumental in establishing the field of American social history and writing the literature to support it. As Iowa's chairman he could teach whatever he wished, and therefore was free to experiment, innovate and develop a "package" of courses most universities were anxious to adopt. Consequently a veritable "pipeline" was established enabling his doctoral students to teach in first-rate institutions.

Earlier, Turner had seized a similar opportunity to construct his own
"pipeline" which flourished for nearly four decades. Other scholars achieving similar prominence could be mentioned including Charles Homer Haskins in Medieval, John T. Lanning in Latin American and William A. Dunning in the American South. Though all these men became professors in top-rank institutions, their reputations were such that they could have been equally effective in most any university.

Specialization in major universities enabled successful professors to narrow gradually the range of courses they taught while rising through the ranks and gaining expertise in a particular field. In the vast majority of schools, however, teachers were denied this opportunity. Many were fortunate to have one American and one European specialist, and cases still existed where one professor taught the entire range of history and political science courses.

Courses frequently offered in American history included constitutional, diplomatic, social, economic, colonial and history of a given state such as Wittke's Ohio history. Other courses in the American field included "modern," "Hispanic," the frontier, immigrant groups, Southern, Western, biographical and religious.

Popular European offerings included medieval, English, diplomatic, ancient, renaissance and reformation, imperialism, the Christian church and scientific history. Other courses occasionally presented included Balkan and Slavic, postwar problems, the crusades, social and economic and specialized studies of major European nations particularly England, Germany and France.

In addition the 1930's witnessed the introduction of non-Western specialities including Far Eastern, Russian, Jewish, Byzantine, Near
Eastern, African, Turkish and Islamic history. Such offerings, however, were relatively rare and generally confined to prestige institutions such as Columbia, Chicago, Harvard and Berkeley.

Summer school offerings multiplied dramatically during this period, and by 1940 most universities featured courses in all major disciplines many of them designed for public school teachers. In the late teens special summer programs helped returning servicemen complete their education and/or improve job related skills. Summer was also a time when visiting professors introduced new courses or taught on a trial basis while being considered for full-time positions.

From the mid twenties to the mid thirties Ohio State's history department was highly respected, consisting of a staff with almost no "dead wood" and boasting a wide range of solid, scholarly talent. An explanation of how this momentum ceased initiating a period of decline is part of the Scholars in Controversy section.

George Wells Knight ended a 43 year career as full professor with his retirement in 1926. During his final years as "grand old man" of the department, his scholarly production, which had never been extensive, ceased, and his teaching became so ineffective that other professors absorbed his courses leaving him with little to do but await formal retirement. Knight realized he was slipping and abandoned his courses in mid-term never to teach again.

Outside the classroom Knight remained very active. In 1923 he toured Europe extensively and visited Czechoslovakia where he met numerous public figures and delivered some highly effective lectures. While in Rome, his daughter Adelaide was operated on for cancer and
died ten days later. Upon discovering this, President Thompson telegraphed his suggestion that Knight take an additional quarter's vacation at full pay, but the old warrior insisted on doing his duty. After completing his itinerary as planned, Knight returned to the campus and resumed full responsibilities as scheduled.

Knight continued his enthusiasm for teacher education, insisting that he alone instruct the social studies methods course, resulting in summer sections of over 100. In this and other courses he sought to instill respect for democracy and the desire to participate actively in its operation. Throughout his career he believed that citizens who do not vote should lose this right, and that America's might reflected the power of intelligently concerned citizens. Typically, in late 1922 he forwarded to Secretary of State Hughes resolutions prepared by his students concerning disarmament proposals. That the secretary appreciated this material is evidenced by a letter written Knight on January 6, 1923 containing the following:

It affords me great pleasure to receive such expressions as are conveyed in the resolutions, and I should be very grateful if you would express to the students my deep appreciation of their interest and support.38

Knight's last extensive trip, occurring in 1926, consisted of several months in South America, a land he believed filled with opportunities for Yankee business and engineering graduates. His daughter Margaret accompanied him having resigned her position as Penn State's Dean of Women to serve her parents in their declining years. She was a tragic figure having tried and failed at securing a fiance worthy of her mother's approval. Disappointed that her husband's
career had achieved limited status and a moderate income, Mrs. Knight had dreamed of attaining the former via a society wedding for her daughter.

Professor Knight transcended these situations with the firm serenity of a man with no regrets for pursuing his chosen career. He continued attending club meetings, serving as director of a savings and loan and carrying out self-appointed duties as guardian of the university purse. Senior faculty members recall lecturing classes when suddenly Knight's hand reached around the corner switching off the lights. When subordinates complained of their salaries, he urged them to save on suits by having their tailors install patches under knees and elbows, advice quite difficult to heed for those who had no tailor.

As the years went on Knight's memory gradually faded creating an ever tightening circle of acquaintences. To his last breath, however, he expressed great admiration for his former student George Rightmire and a few others including Carl Wittke who with Knight's support came to head the united history department in 1926 as the campus' youngest chairman.

When an already weakened Knight contracted pneumonia in January of 1932, his strength proved inadequate, and he died on February 10. His probated estate revealed what literally no one had suspected, offering mute testimony to the inadequacy of teaching salaries. Despite legendary frugality and an ample inheritance, Knight's entire estate probated at $23,197.64, $15,000 of which, the value of his home, was
given to the First Congregational Church as a residence for foreign students. Thus Knight exerted a very great influence on the growth and development of Ohio State, expending a long professional life and the bulk of his fortune in its service.

Wilbur Siebert outlived Knight by over twenty years. A man who appeared old even when young, his exterior features never changed thereby giving the impression he could live forever. With a snow white beard and so intensely nearsighted that glasses afforded little relief, he was the living embodiment of Hollywood's version of the Dean of Arts and Sciences. In his enormous study the fruits of decades of research were deposited in files extending from floor to ceiling. His nose was ever in a book, and throughout life he remained the passionately intense scholar. But students discussed his driving more than his scholarship for when he took the wheel of his Franklin there was no telling what would happen. He would exit from either end of the garage and frequently drove with two wheels on the road and two on the sidewalk. Finally after a particularly serious accident on the Olentangy River Road, he agreed to give up driving, much to the relief of all who knew him.

Despite an extremely heavy teaching load, often encompassing a dozen courses per year, Siebert's scholarly production continued unabated. In addition to constant interest in the Loyalists and the Underground Railroad, he undertook a study of the colonial South by authoring a two volume history of Florida and also wrote numerous articles including several for the Dictionary of American Biography. Moreover, pressed on with his description of Ohio State's role
in World War I appearing in 1935 as volume four of the university's history.  

After the merger of European and American history in 1926, Siebert was placated by becoming Ohio State's second research professor with the privileges of this rank outlined by President Rightmire:

Professor Siebert has the rank of Research Professor and whether he teaches or not is a matter between himself and the Department and consequently he may teach little or much or not at all and still be in the circumference of his contract with the university. This new position had little visible effect on the professor's routine. He taught his usual heavy load and continued spending lavishly on research, building an ever increasing documents collection sent in by hired copyists working in European and American archives.

The Sieberts remained prominent socially, maintaining a heavy schedule of entertaining. Mrs. Siebert, an accomplished miniature portrait painter, did all she could to encourage artists by inviting them to use her Columbus studio or a house in Providence for their work. Despite her many commitments and the responsibility of raising two children, Annie Siebert did her own housework and was proud of never requiring hired help. During this 1917-1940 period, Wilbur Siebert spent two summers on the continent and one at Columbia teaching courses on modern Europe.

Siebert stressed his Harvard connections and learned society affiliations. He was extremely active in Phi Beta Kappa, and exhibited his key wherever he went. During the 1930's he became an honorary vice president of the United Empire Loyalists of Canada; a fellow of the Royal Historical Society of England, a corresponding member of the
Royal Society of Canada, a fellow of the American Geographical Society, and a member of the American Institute of Social Sciences. He was also awarded the "Great Gold Medal" by the Institute Historique et Heraldique de France.

By the onset of the depression Siebert's admirers considered him the campus sage while his critics labeled him an old fuddy duddy. He never revised his hopelessly out of date lecture manuscripts, and his research was seldom related to what he taught. Nonetheless he was interviewed frequently by campus newspaper reporters on topics ranging from research, famous students, and hobbies to his well known contempt for the radio. To the end of his 95 years, Wilbur Siebert remained a prominent and highly visible individual.

By the mid 1920's Edgar H. McNeal was a nationally recognized professor and scholar. His prestige skyrocketed when the University of Wisconsin offered him a lucrative professorship for the 1926-27 academic year with clear understanding the position could become permanent. Ohio administrators who heretofore had paid little heed to McNeal, asked Dean Henderson to clarify this new development:

"Both the salary and the teaching load are so attractive that Professor McNeal is very anxious to accept the offer.... It is understood by all concerned that he will return to Ohio State University unless inducements of so compelling a nature should be offered him that it would be a clear injustice to hold him here."

McNeal did return to Ohio State and his devotion to research continued, his classes and seminars revealing a thorough knowledge of medieval and French history. He remained primarily a teacher for serious, gifted students like John LaMonte, and he was known as an
exacting and demanding teacher who required fluency in at least one foreign language. Warm, sensitive and encouraging to students, McNeal displayed little of the arrogance or impatience often characterizing the deep scholar. His classes were never large, and shrinking depression enrollments caused a number of sections to be cancelled.

McNeal's sharply increased salary permitted him to take extensive European trips both for work and for pleasure. Several months were spent at the Bibliophique Nationale studying sources of the French nationalist movement, and he reveled in tramping through medieval ruins such as Agues Mortes, Arles and Avignon. A vigorous and enthusiastic outdoorsman, McNeal and Henry Spencer of the Political Science Department once hiked the length and width of Ireland and often went canoeing in the woods near Mansfield, Ohio.

By the 1930's Homer Hockett was enjoying tangible rewards for his long devotion to scholarship having exchanged his Columbus home for a residence in the prosperous suburb of Worthington. As his text was America's best seller, 45 Hockett could afford the luxury of teaching two quarters a year at a reduced salary which left six months for uninterrupted research. Like his colleague McNeal, he was a pedestrian, lackluster teacher with limited appeal to the average student. He also showed his age in seminars by dozing off in mid sentence only to awaken minutes later and complete his thought as though no time lapse had occurred. Generally a halt in his speech reflected a passion for perfection rather than the ravages of time. If not absolutely certain of a statement's validity he would halt in mid-sentence rather than risk being incorrect. Dr. Hockett was precise, thorough
and cautious in nearly everything he said, a rare exception being his fanatic support of prohibition. A birthright Quaker, he was active as a Methodist layman teaching Sunday School at King Avenue Church near campus. Blessed with a talented, attractive wife and four fine children, Hockett drew great strength from his family who repeatedly restored his optimism in the face of adversity.

Upon completion of Volume One of his *The Constitutional History of the United States 1776-1826* (1939), Hockett became a leading authority in this field. In addition his well organized and exhaustive *Introduction to Research in American History* (1931) filled a void in historical literature and made him a household word among advanced graduate students. Though Hockett's scholarly achievements earned him many honors including the presidency of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, this meant little to Ohio's administrators who frequently brought in younger historians at higher salaries though none of them did more for scholarship or the university than Professor Hockett. Besides teaching Sunday School, he was active in Phi Beta Kappa, cooperated in the writing of Ohio State's involvement in World War One, served voluntarily on various historical prize committees, worked to promote the interests of the Ohio Historical and Archaeological Society and staunchly supported Phi Alpha Theta and the History Club.

Beginning in 1923 Hockett occasionally acted as chairman, accepting these assignments readily while expressing his willingness to assume these duties permanently. He was not, however, an ideal administrator partly because of frequent absences from campus and also
because he seemed overwhelmed by the many details accompanying such a position. In 1934, for example, graduate assistants were not being paid because Hockett had neglected necessary paperwork. Upon discovering this error he contacted President Rightmire, offering to compensate these individuals himself.

In 1919 Arthur Schlesinger exchanged Columbus for Iowa City. Though Knight matched his Iowa offer, 46 a history chairmanship coupled with the opportunity to train graduate students and the right to teach anything he wished proved irresistible. Controversy still exists as to why Ohio made little effort to hold this man whose recent book *The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution* (1918) had won the Justin Winsor prize and established the beginnings of his reputation. University critics charged its administrators were defeatists who simply assumed any person acquiring a considerable reputation would leave. Others point out that Schlesinger's being dominated by a number of senior men made it almost impossible for him to play a meaningful role in the department. Certainly Iowa's offer afforded a rare opportunity to build a department and a program. Yet admittedly, Iowa administrators fought harder to obtain and hold Schlesinger than did their Ohio counterparts. Several years later when he went east to choose between Columbia and Harvard, Iowa's president pursued Schlesinger armed with permission to pay any sum necessary to retain him.

During Schlesinger's final years at Ohio State he participated actively in community and university affairs. In addition to Ohio Historical Society work and frequent speaking engagements he was
particularly devoted to the campus Y.M.C.A. In addition he worked constantly to improve his teaching though his natural talents were ample and his star was rising rapidly in the historical firmament. Perhaps the greatest quality of this man destined to become Harvard's Department Chairman was his combining fierce determination to succeed as a scholar with equal dedication to excellence in teaching.

Chauncey Boucher, hired as Schlesinger's replacement, came to Ohio as a full professor after publishing *The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina* (1916). A dynamic and personable individual, he remained one year before moving to the University of Texas.

While seeking Boucher's replacement, Knight heard that Illinois' Arthur Cole was dissatisfied and entertaining other offers. In the throes of severe administrative problems, the school was experiencing wholesale resignations due to an unpopular president. Cole's work for the Illinois centennial was well known in Ohio, as were his activities in the Mississippi Valley Historical Association which put him in frequent contact with Hockett, Wittke, Siebert and others. In addition to numerous scholarly articles, his book *The Whig Party in the South* (1913) had been widely hailed as definitive. Consequently a considerable effort was made to hire Cole, and Ohio's historians were extremely pleased at his acceptance.

Cole became an extremely prominent though somewhat controversial campus figure. Although undeniably brilliant and a superb teacher, he was fiercely competitive and sought to prove his superiority in matters ranging from square dancing to bridge playing and horseshoe pitching. The quickness of his mind, coupled with his crusading
liberalism and vocal intolerance of mediocrity tended to intimidate students who often saw him as somewhat forbidding.

In the classroom Cole encouraged student discussion and participation. Each pupil had a unique reading assignment, and Cole remembered them all, calling on the appropriate student to lend insights during class discussions which moved with a rapidity taxing the brightest students. While an extraordinarily effective teacher, Cole exhibited disdainful intolerance for those disagreeing with him or whose minds could not keep pace with his own. His standard practice of requiring each student to review one of his books hardly enhanced his reputation for compassion and fair-mindedness. Yet his brilliance was undeniable and many found his courses superior to all others in the department.

Cole showed great talent for impressing the university's administration. A dynamic and articulate member of the most powerful committees he convinced those who counted that he was indispensable. Typical is the following correspondence between Dean Henderson and President Thompson:

• • •

Professor Cole is under careful consideration for an appointment to the Harmsworth Professorship of History at Oxford and also to a professorship at the Brookings School at Washington. . . . I feel he is one of a relatively small body of younger professors whom we cannot well afford to lose. I think we should advance his salary, $7,000, and I feel that he should have some assurance.

Using other offers as a club, Cole won substantial annual raises, but overplayed his hand in 1930 during a round of ferocious bidding
between Ohio State and Western Reserve. Ohio's final offer made Cole financially equal to any dean, but Western Reserve's figure exceeded that of many university presidents. Consequently Cole left Ohio State to accept a salary Western Reserve could not afford which was only paid but a few months. Matters worsened steadily for Cole who later would plead to return to Ohio State, offering to work for 40 percent less than he had earned there a decade before. During these and other disappointments, a brilliant man became bitter, his writings ceased, and scholarship suffered an irreparable loss.

Meanwhile Wittke was hard at work attempting to upgrade his department. After determining to add a renaissance-reformation historian, he concluded that Walter Dorn was the best available candidate following his stay as visiting professor at Ohio in the summer of 1930. Having taught full-time at Oberlin, Chicago and Wisconsin Dorn's background was particularly impressive for a man still in his early thirties. Brilliant, dynamic lectures reflected a mind bursting with ideas, and although he had published but two articles, he purportedly was writing three books.

Initially Dorn expressed no interest in leaving Wisconsin, being particularly concerned about the well known poverty of Ohio's library. Undeterred, Wittke coupled a very attractive salary offer with a special trustee resolution earmarking thousands of dollars for books in Dorn's field. While his acceptance greatly heartened Wittke and others, some questioned investing so heavily in a man of unproven productivity.
Dorn proved impressive to colleagues and administrators while functioning as an "idea man" on several campus committees. However, he showed little patience for details such as reports or student recommendations and for a time even refused to keep a grade book despite Wittke's constant prodding. Dorn drew complaints from those failing to pierce a tough outer shell erected between himself and others. One student felt he was treated like an "insect;" others found him arrogant and tactless. Yet Dorn did everything possible to assist selected students, lavishing vast amounts of time and attention upon them. Dorn's teaching drew equally mixed reactions. Habitually lingering outside the classroom until after the bell, he would burst in and begin lecturing as if presenting the gospel hot off the griddle. Though a brilliant speaker, students observed ragged, yellowed notes, and some took bets on the number of times Dorn would say "I" in a given lecture. While constantly discussing his research and reminding students they were impeding it, the years came and went with no sign of the long awaited books. Dorn was therefore considered a poser by some and described as "brilliantly superficial" by others. Yet it is difficult to criticize this behavior from one hired as a highly paid full professor. Having received in advance the rewards of distinguished scholarship, he consequently had little incentive to produce. As one might imagine, when Dorn transferred to Columbia some years later he fulfilled his potential far more completely.

Carl Wittke, a graduate of Ohio State, joined the faculty in 1916 as an instructor and remained at that rank until receiving a Harvard Ph.D. in 1922. That same year, Wittke was offered the
Pittsburgh chairmanship at double his Ohio salary thereby forcing his superiors to decide whether or not to retain him. In evaluating Wittke, Ohio State's administrators recognized his excellent teaching reputation, his promising beginnings as a scholar, his considerable work for the Ohio Historical and Archaeological Society, and his creditable supervision of survey sections. Consequently, Wittke was promoted to full professor; was released from the responsibility of directing survey courses; and was permitted to teach advanced offerings.

After rejecting the Pittsburgh opportunity, Wittke blossomed into a familiar campus figure ever ready to deliver a lecture or to demonstrate his ability as a musician and singer. His talks on German folk songs included musical demonstrations of professional quality, and his position as first violin in the Columbus symphony reflected Wittke's conviction that scholars should have broad interests. He was especially disheartened at popular conceptions of scholars, complaining to a reporter that, "Profs are human-honest they are. I wish students would realize it more."\(^48\)

Above all else Wittke loved to teach. When asked what he would do if suddenly showered with wealth he replied, "I wouldn't do anything else under heaven but teach, and I would put my money into some altruistic organization."\(^49\) His strong personality ignited before a group of students. He advanced his arguments in a booming voice which occasionally was used to prod underachievers. Pet peeves were aired such as his contempt for wasteful competition exemplified by half a dozen milkmen working the same street.
Students seeking Wittke's aid discovered him ever helpful and in many ways reminiscent of Knight in his vigorous prime. Also like the youthful Knight of earlier days, Wittke was considered an exacting and demanding teacher interested in maintaining the highest possible standards. He was criticized, particularly during the depression, as being too difficult. In 1934, Junior Dean C. W. Reeder discussed objections to Wittke's teaching uncovered while interviewing freshmen. Characteristically, Wittke took this personally, attacking Reeder in a lengthy letter which concluded:

... I deeply resent the implication that examination questions are made in this course "to trip the student." ... This matter is of such importance that I must insist upon a formal reply from you in writing within the next few days, giving whatever specific evidence you have. ...

Since this last point involves a matter so fundamental to the character of a scholar and teacher, I feel that the Dean of my college and the President of the University should know about it. I am therefore sending copies of your letter and of this reply to Dean Shepard and President Rightmire.50

As chairman, Wittke exhibited similar strengths and weaknesses. In marked contrast to Knight, Wittke was vigorous and decisive thereby improving departmental organization and enhancing its attractiveness to scholars. His stressing of higher salaries and lighter teaching loads was welcomed by all. On the other hand Wittke's determination to enforce hiring and promotion standards typical of prestige universities, and his contention that all staff members should publish regularly was hailed enthusiastically by some, indifferently by others and with anomosity by the remainder who branded him a "Prussian" and a "martinet."
Those critical of Wittke frequently emphasized his blunt, direct approach in dealing with subordinates. On the other hand, no one accused this chairman of sneaky or devious behavior. He spoke candidly on all issues, letting the chips fall where they might as evidenced by the Reeder incident. Wittke was entirely open and would not have even considered a devious or indirect attack upon any individual.

Wittke's scholarly reputation redounded to his department. His leadership in professional organizations and works in Canadian and immigrant history have already been mentioned. He also was visiting professor in distinguished universities such as Chicago and Wisconsin. One of Wittke's greatest achievements occurred in 1931 when he was selected above all other American professors to deliver lectures at six German universities during George Washington's bicentennial. Many expressed amazement that a Midwestern professor was chosen, and the publicity Wittke received during this assignment buffed his department's image to an unaccustomed lustre.

John Knipfing joined Siebert's European history department in 1917 as an instructor specializing in classical and religious history. A bachelor of varied interests, he had studied at the American Academy in Rome, at both Freiburg and Munich universities and finally at Ghent where he was completing a doctorate. Knipfing took two leaves of absence. The first to work in Europe and the second to accept a Hoover Commission fellowship to complete his thesis in Belgium. Knipfing proved an especially effective teacher and also a competent scholar. However, his talents as a linguist in conjunction with many European contacts made him worth far more to businessmen than any
school could pay. After considerable soul searching he abandoned teaching to accept a particularly lucrative offer from the import-export department of Lehman Brothers.

When in 1937 Wittke resigned his position to become an Oberlin dean, George Washburne replaced him at Ohio after a futile search to attract a "name" historian to the chairmanship. Washburne introduced his own style of leadership and, like his predecessor, had supporters as well as critics. Though the author of a creditable dissertation appearing in one of Columbia University's series, Washburne had produced nothing since and demonstrated little interest in professional activities. Indeed he had attained his chairmanship because of good teaching, valuable community contacts and excellent rapport with university officials.

As a teacher Washburne was extremely effective, interspersing his lectures with jokes and anecdotes to maintain student interest. Though not as strict as Wittke, he strove to uphold standards in survey courses, requiring assistants to take attendance at lectures and occasionally castigating sections for mediocre work. Undergraduates found Washburne interesting, approachable and helpful. In addition he looked like a chairman being handsome, well groomed and tastefully dressed in marked contrast to Wittke who lacked a concern for fashionable attire. Washburne was an controversial an administrator as Wittke. Like his predecessor he inherited department feuds stemming from nineteenth century differences between Knight and Siebert. Just as Wittke was Knight's choice to be chairman, Washburne was Siebert's selection and hence faced automatic opposition from one faction of the
department. While Wittke had confronted this problem head on, Washburne dealt with opponents more discreetly, preferring a quiet stab in the back to the shouting and confusion of open conflict. Particularly during the depression, university administrators preferred surface calm to controversy, and Wittke's robust leadership had created constant problems for his superiors. Largely because of this a conservative, noncontroversial, outwardly pleasant chairman had been sought and found, and Washburne worked hard retaining the image which had brought him success.

Washburne was always courteous to those outside the department spending considerable time answering all inquiries including those from publishers and booksalesmen. Anyone sending a Vitae received prompt, courteous attention though it was an open secret he would not consider female applicants. Former students could count on his advice when they wrote, phoned or visited his office. If Washburne learned of an acquaintance's success, he was quick to send congratulations such as the following to Cleo L. Dumaree:

Will you allow me to tell you how pleased I was to notice your name among those promoted in the Columbus school system. I think you will enjoy administrative work... I am always interested in what you are doing and in your success.

To conclude, Washburne's leadership style embittered some and satisfied others. His method of operation reflected a determination to cooperate with university authorities and to avoid entering into controversies outside of the history department. Washburne was far more conservative than Wittke and not nearly as active in publishing
or professional activities. Yet just as much as Wittke, Washburne desired to lead a distinguished department. Consequently, though these two chairmen differed greatly in their leadership styles, both sought the same goal.

After receiving a Michigan M.A., Arthur Noyes became instructor of European history in 1920. A man of great physical courage, he suffered perpetual discomfort from a number of painful rectal operations connected with the cancer which ultimately killed him in 1934. A totally dedicated scholar, Noyes said almost nothing about his condition, discharging his obligations so effectively that very few were aware of anything being wrong. In addition to his heavy course load, Noyes administered the European survey sections, completed his Ph.D. and carried out an active program of publishing and research. As a teacher he was earnest, pleasant, a believer in discussion and capable of instilling genuine excitement for English history. While neither outstanding as a lecturer or researcher, Noyes exemplified strength of character as well as total honesty and dependability. His death was mourned throughout the university.

Siebert's gradual retirement created an opening for a mature English historian. Carl Wittke had been deeply impressed by Miami professor Howard Robinson whose recent talk to a Columbus audience had been exceedingly well received. The authority on England's postal system, Robinson had traveled widely while researching several books on the subject. After teaching at McGill and Carlton, he had returned to Columbia and finished his doctorate under James Harvey Robinson prior to joining Miami's faculty in 1924. A decade later Robinson was dean
of Miami's College of Arts and embroiled in problems facing nearly all depression administrators. Consequently he welcomed Wittke's offer and was anxious to return to the classroom. At Ohio State, Robinson proved a fascinating teacher of great personal charm who eschewed departmental politics in favor of teaching and research. As a full professor who voluntarily taught European survey, he was deeply disappointed that an open admissions policy forced him to instruct poor students. This and other factors prompted Robinson's acceptance of an Oberlin offer in 1938.

In 1920 Eugene Roseboom returned to his alma mater as instructor of American history. Gifted with a near photographic memory he used no notes for lectures delivered with a bowed head while seated on the edge of a desk. A shy, sensitive individual with a love of gardening and legendary knowledge of baseball, he was known as a considerate and fair-minded scholar who did everything possible on behalf of his students, his university and his profession. Roseboom was ever an oasis of serenity. In a department racked with strife he remained the quiet, hardworking scholar harboring no jealousy or excessive ambition. In addition to his interest in Ohio history he studied American presidential elections, and ultimately became the leading authority on the subject.

In 1924 Michigan doctoral candidate Francis Weisenburger joined Ohio's staff as a 23 year old instructor of American history. A scholar with deep interest in Ohio nurtured by three generations of family residence, he and Eugene Roseboom were soon inseparable both in terms of friendship and the linkage of their names co-authoring
works on Ohio history. Both sacrificed the possibility of substantial royalties on their *History of Ohio* to support the Ohio Historical and Archaeological Society. They accepted small stipends instead of the large amounts usually accruing to authors of best selling volumes.

Weisenburger was a thoroughly devoted teacher with a transparent interest in students. Though his lectures were dry and catalogish, a passionate interest in his subject greatly enlivened a traditional approach. Generally beginning behind the rostrum, he departed more and more from his notes as the hour progressed. Weisenburger could become lost in his subject, and on at least one occasion fell off the podium only recovering his balance by lunging halfway across the room. Like his colleague Roseboom he was serenely happy as a teacher exhibiting no interest in empire building or self-glorification. He apparently paid monetarily for being well adjusted since promotions came less quickly than merited by his publications. Weisenburger built a reputation for solid scholarship and by the 1930's was one of the best known teachers in his state and a highly visible, deeply respected member of the community. Just prior to his death in 1971, Carl Wittke discussed this man based on an acquaintance of nearly half a century. "I have a great respect . . . even love. Give him an 'A' on all counts." 53

Larry Hill joined Ohio's faculty in 1922 with a Berkeley Ph.D. in the burgeoning Latin American field. A pioneer scholar in Brazilian history, Hill was always somewhat of an enigma. At informal gatherings he enthralled colleagues with accounts of his own cloak and dagger escapades during South American revolutions. Yet in the
classroom students heard nothing of these dramas and very little concerning Hill's research. In one course, perhaps not typical, lectures were simply extracted from a standard text with no elaboration. Hill was highly sociable with a wide circle of friends and the historian who most frequently visited the faculty club. A good bridge player, an excellent bowler and starting pitcher on the history baseball team who had previously played semi pro-ball, Hill was exceedingly active in these and other social activities.

Hill's effectiveness with students is difficult to assess. A number of personal problems compounded by dissatisfaction with his salary contributed to an acid temper, apparently neither selective nor controllable which ignited with atomic-like fury whenever Hill's internal pressures reached a critical mass. There were, however, students who overlooked this aspect of his personality and benefitted greatly from working with him. Even shortly before Hill's death in 1974, former students inquire of Hill's welfare at conventions he long ago stopped attending. Stories still circulate of instances where he showed extraordinary kindness towards students.

Henry H. Simms, a Virginia gentleman of great charm, arrived at Ohio State in 1929 as instructor of European history despite training in American under Dixon Ryan Fox. Fortunately, Alexander Blair had exactly the opposite situation, having been hired as instructor of American history despite a European emphasis in his coursework, and the two simply traded schedules. Simms taught Southern history following Coles' resignation, a specialty he would retain for the remainder of his long career. Professor Simms, known as "the admiral"
during the 1930's, was extremely precise, seeking order and stability in nearly everything he said and did. Even in informal situations his comments seemed as carefully phrased as the wording of his lectures. Students found him courteous, cooperative and extremely fair. To his colleagues he was reliable and ever willing to undertake responsibilities outside the classroom. By the late 1930's Simms' brand of Southern conservatism was becoming obsolete, and his lectures paid little attention to contemporary emphases in historical writings. Also at this time he began applying research skills towards stock market investments. He proved very astute and by 1940 possessed the beginnings of his future fortune.

Huntley Dupre joined the faculty in 1930 as junior dean of arts and sciences after completing an Ohio State Ph.D. As a student he had been greatly interested in Y.M.C.A. work and after earning a law degree in 1916 went to Czechoslovakia to help establish the Prague "Y" prior to enlisting in T. R. Junior's first division of the American army. Dupre first instructed in a gas school but later decided to serve in the trenches. He was a flaming idealist who viewed the conflict as necessary for democracy's survival and shared the hope of millions that this war would indeed be the last. After the war Dupre turned 180° to become a militant pacifist. He earned a university-wide reputation as a stimulating teacher with fine student rapport. Consequently Rightmire made him a junior dean as part of an effort to improve teaching quality and make the university more responsive to student needs. In 1937 during the uncertainty surrounding Wittke's resignation, Dupre accepted a professorship at Kentucky.
William McDonald joined Ohio's faculty in 1930 as a classical specialist replacing J. A. O. Larsen who had accepted an associate professorship at Chicago. An electric and inspiring teacher whose lectures were veritable dramas, he was famous for leaving his story at a climax at the stroke of the classbell in a manner similar to serialized radio thrillers then in vogue. Due to a zealous enforcement of high standards, McDonald's courses were geared to better than average students who during the 1930's visited his home regularly for cocoa and conversation. McDonald's week-ends were an ever intriguing mystery. Colleagues observed that he traveled considerable distances pursuing a sideline he never discussed but which obviously was quite profitable.

The tumultuous year 1937 witnessed the hiring of three faculty members beginning long careers at Ohio State. First, Harold Grimm, formerly of Capital University, joined the staff as assistant professor in European history and soon gained considerable fame as a Reformation scholar. Second, Sydney N. Fisher, an Illinois Ph.D. who soon specialized in Middle Eastern history, later authoring the field's first authoritative text. Third, Warner Woodring, a Chicago Ph.D. and former Allegheny College Chairman was hired as a full professor specializing in English history. Other Ohio State historians during this period were Paul Clyde, Far Eastern specialist who spent most of his distinguished career at Duke; John Hare, an Ohio Ph.D. with twenty years of high school experience who took charge of American survey courses; Richard H. Shryock who taught at Ohio State from 1921 to 1924 and later became the leading authority in the history of medicine, and
William T. Utter, instructor for three years prior to a long career at Denison.

Harvard enjoyed a top flight reputation, perhaps even hegemony in the American field stemming from Channing and Hart's pioneer efforts, beginning in the 1880's, to create a literature for the discipline. Turner's joining the staff in 1910 underscored Harvard's status and made possible the Guide to the Study and Reading of American History (1912). To the end of his career Turner continued working hard with students. When Eugene Roseboom wrote him from Columbus about a possible dissertation on Ohio politics, Turner's exhaustive reply included sources to consult, suggested chapter headings and even a ringing challenge. "At the end of the academic year I retire, ... But I am relying on you younger men to 'carry on' and carry farther!" Arthur Schlesinger was the "younger man" Harvard chose as Turner's replacement. In addition to his prominence as a scholar, Schlesinger brought outstanding qualities as a teacher while continuing his History of American Life series.

Wisconsin reflected Turner's image despite his absence from that campus. Good teaching was still emphasized, and top scholars like Merle Curti, John Hicks and William Hesseltine were among those joining the department. Depression financial problems caused larger classes, but failed to stop new programs like Alexander Meiklejohn's Experimental College or enrichment courses for better students. One enduring innovation, launched at the School of Education's founding in 1930, required all liberal arts professors teaching advanced courses to be members of the School of Education as well as their subject
matter faculties—thus eliminating much of the friction often characterizing relationships between these two schools.

Columbia continued pioneering in new fields such as Jewish and Scandinavian history. Besides being encouraged to develop their own courses, professors enjoyed light teaching loads and an atmosphere where scholarly productivity was paramount. A feeling that students specialized too early inspired the contemporary civilization course taught by professors of economics, history, philosophy and government presenting literature, paintings and music simultaneously within a chronological framework. In addition cooperation between the history and English departments produced Historical Bases of English Literature which first appeared in 1922. Columbia's tendency to minimize the importance of good teaching precipitated a number of undergraduate riots during the depression. Radicalism was also popular despite the expulsion of student ringleaders including James Wechsler.

In 1934 Pennsylvania's history department lost its elder statesman by retiring Edward Potts Cheyney whose "Last Will and Testament (Academic)"

55 struck a responsive chord during a most difficult era. Lamenting that his distinguished university, and by implication the teaching profession, contained few scholars of real ability, Cheyney suggested raising standards so that only exceptional teachers and researchers might become full professors. He also pressed for better libraries, contending that, "The circulation of books is like the circulation of blood," and sought to stem the flood tide of mediocre students inundating the universities. In an era characterized by paralyzing inactivity, such advice was particularly timely.
By 1917 the nation faced a critical shortage of teachers and other professionals. Consequently universities were under heavy pressure to expand teacher training and graduate programs although generally they had to do this with limited increases in funds. As a result many schools depersonalized and systematized the granting of M.A. and often Ph.D. degrees in order to expand graduate programs without significant staff and budget increases. This forced the attainment of such degrees to be more quantitative than qualitative with clearly stipulated language and course requirements, arbitrary deadlines and standardized curricula. Such doctoral programs often penalized creativity, deadened the imagination and eliminated the most sensitive, inquisitive and intelligent individuals.

In 1917 Ohio's graduate offerings were embryonic, and Dean Denney identified problems existing in other institutions he hoped to avoid in his own:

The most important question that confronts the university authorities is the supply of properly qualified teachers. . . . No one would be so rash as to assert that the most gifted youth of the land are to be found in the Graduate School or the College of Education. . . .

For this situation the higher institutions of learning. . . . are responsible in part. They have failed to make the conditions of educational work and teaching apprenticeship sufficiently attractive to young people of the best caliber. . . .

Recruitment for the profession of teaching has been undertaken. . . . with little enthusiasm and success. 56

Denney and others felt that unless reasonable standards were maintained, producing more graduates would be counterproductive. Administrators, however, had to balance budgetary realities against
demands for increased production of advanced degrees. Consequently Ohio State, like many universities, expanded graduate enrollment more than tenfold between 1917 and 1940 despite numerous objections to this growth throughout the depression:

The rapid increase in the number of graduate students is naturally a source of satisfaction, ... Unfortunately not all the persons who apply for admission to the Graduate School are actuated wholly by a desire for learning. Some of them, ... have an eye not so much of the training as on the degree itself, and they wish to obtain it in the shortest possible time. ... Without exception, however, the graduate student is a seriously minded individual. ... He may not have the ability to carry on graduate work in a very satisfactory way, but at least he has a definite goal in view and summons all his energy to reach that goal.57

The dramatic upsurge in graduate enrollments tended to formalize entrance requirements. The process was gradual and resisted by many faculties who questioned the wisdom of identifying future scholars via paperwork. As late as 1919 graduate entrance requirements were almost unheard of, and Roy Nichols enrolled for a Ph.D. under Dunning at Columbia simply by registering and presenting proof of his M.A. "I did not have to apply for admission nor submit transcripts of grades or letters of recommendation--I did not have to wait in a state of suspense as to whether I would be accepted."58

Although training a scholar is difficult to quantify in terms of course, point hour and residency requirements, graduate professors often imposed such regulations to accommodate large increases in enrollment. What had previously been an individualized and even mystical process was often reduced to a series of clear-cut requirements, or hurdles, which each student had to overcome. First, the ubiquitous
language requirement mandated doctoral candidates be proficient in French and German. This situation was burdensome to many and redundant to those having to learn other languages to carry on their research. At Berkeley, for example, Latin American majors faced French and German exams plus the necessity of mastering Spanish. All universities, however, failed to enforce this requirement with equal rigor, and at Ohio State, for example, it was largely pro forma.

Since graduate students were frequently enrolled in courses with undergraduates, regulations often required the former to do work in addition to that assigned the undergraduates:

That all graduate students registered in 600 courses shall be required to complete a certain amount of work in addition to that required of Undergraduates. This may consist of the reading of additional books on the subject, the presentation of reports, or of such work as the instructor in charge of the course may deem wise.59

Such regulations were designed to encourage graduate students to pursue special interests. Frequently, however, swollen class sizes rendered individualized projects impractical, reducing such requirements to mere busywork.

Even general examinations, previously custom designed for each candidate, tended to become more and more standardized in terms of readings assigned and questions asked. Most master's programs required oral or written examinations after the thesis while Ph.D. applicants usually encountered oral and written tests following coursework in addition to defending the dissertation. Possible fields of concentration typically expanded from two, European and American, to as many as a dozen including non Western specialities such as Asia,
the Middle East and Africa. Ph.D. applicants frequently were examined in from four to six of these areas one of which usually was outside of history. As these examinations became ever more standardized only dissertations remained unique though the consideration each student received varied greatly depending on the school, the professor and the topic.

During the well publicized teaching shortage of the teens and twenties, departments frequently concentrated on producing graduates rather than revising existing programs with the result that requirements tended to accumulate as new ones were added and few if any were re-assessed or deleted. Consequently most American Ph.D.'s took twice as long as their European counterparts, four or five years being far from unusual.

During the depression there was some interest in reform generally from younger faculty members lacking effective power. While smoke was considerable, the flame was too small to endanger the existing structure. For example despite a collapsing job market, these reformers were powerless to stem the rising production of historians which abetted the job shortage and tended to depress salaries. Though inflexible language requirements were criticized repeatedly, little was done to alter this situation either. Another instance where reform attempts proved conspicuously ineffective dealt with projected courses in college teaching and/or a teaching doctorate stemming from the realization that most Ph.D.'s never published and that many proved totally ineffective in the classroom. Despite widespread acknowledgment of the situation, no school altered its requirements for
candidates interested solely in teaching, and only a handful offered even one college methods course. In fact the only fundamental change in many graduate programs involved ending a requirement that all dissertations be published in their entirety, and by 1940 only Pennsylvania, among the major schools, proved an exception to this rule. Steps were also taken in most schools to stop full-time faculty members from earning doctorates in the institution where they taught.

As stated previously, graduate school enrollments expanded dramatically between 1917 and 1940 though there was a temporary decline during World War One when students abandoned their studies to join the military. Acting Dean Siebert's 1917-1918 annual report observed that the coming of war had cut graduate classes in half. Graduate school enrollments quickly recovered, however, and by 1920 were setting new records at schools like Wisconsin and Ohio State where graduate registration more than doubled in three years to exceed 500 and 400 respectively. Vigorous expansion continued in the twenties with California's increase from 862 in 1917 to 2186 in 1927 being typical. While the depression slowed this soaring growth, public universities continued expanding despite predictions to the contrary. Consequently Ohio experienced a budget crisis in 1932 stemming from the matriculation of 127 more graduate students than the previous year despite a cut in assistantships. This trend continued throughout the depression as enrollments climbed from 1233 in 1929 to exceed 2000 by the late 1930's. Though most Ohio graduate students majored in science, agriculture and education and the history doctoral program was one of the school's newest, 45 Ph.D.'s were awarded in this discipline between
1930 and 1940, more than at Hopkins, Michigan or Virginia. Public universities producing even more history Ph.D.'s during this period include Wisconsin (75), California (87) and Illinois (47). Upon adding to these figures the output of private giants such as Harvard (150), Columbia (114) and Chicago (88) when the number of history jobs was declining, one gains some appreciation of a situation many found unfathomable:

The number of doctorates at private institutions fluctuated during the period. . . At the public institutions the number of Ph.D. degrees mounted almost steadily, and it is these degrees that account for the gains as a whole; . . .

. . . it is from one point of view almost ironic that the teaching profession should continue pouring forth holders of advanced degrees who are in a real sense competitors of those whose positions were terminated because of depression circumstances, and whose presence in the "market" inevitably serves to hold down salary levels and to create competitive attitudes and fear for security. The data on Ph.D. degrees are indicative of the unplanned basis of higher education.

Universities with doctoral programs enabled many professors to teach seminars in their special areas of expertise. At Ohio State, for example, year long offerings were first taught in the early 1920's by Homer Hockett (Special Problems in the Constitutional History of the United States and Special Problems in the History of the Westward Advance), Arthur Cole (Special Problems in Recent History of the South), and George Wells Knight (Special Problems in Recent American History and Special Problems in American Diplomacy). Such departments invariably had at least one specialist in historiography and research techniques, and by the end of the thirties, larger departments split these offerings into American and European sections. Such courses
occasionally were taught by several professors with each commenting on his own speciality. The team-teaching of other seminars was practically unknown except at Columbia which pioneered in interdisciplinary offerings like the very popular slavery seminar presented by Frank Tannenbaum, John Krout and Gerold T. Robinson.

Increases in graduate enrollments were absorbed by staffs which generally grew little during the twenties and declined throughout the depression. Most schools seemed hypnotized by numbers and professors seemed willing to overwork themselves accommodating all who applied. Teaching loads and class sizes usually increased, as a consequence, and continental professors expressed amazement any research took place under such conditions. As Utrecht Professor Ernest J. Cohen observed while visiting Ohio, "The teachers are so busy teaching that they have no time for investigation and study—no time to learn new things." 63

Pleas to reduce teaching loads were generally futile since staff increases were rare, and no one wished to curtail his own offerings. In this instance the merits of hard work appear questionable because once administrators noted graduate programs expanding without staff increases, they concluded that teachers previously had been underworked. However even if professors had refused to assume more responsibility, it is doubtful if many schools could have assigned graduate studies a higher priority given popular enthusiasm for physical facilities and undergraduate education. Consequently twelve to fifteen hour teaching loads were common for graduate professors often carrying a host of advisees and serving on several committees. Leading private institutions, however, including Harvard, Chicago, Hopkins and Columbia had
weekly loads of six to nine hours and far less non teaching duties than typically found in public universities. Wisconsin and Michigan proved exceptions to this rule with teaching loads, outside duties and salaries comparable to major private schools.

A few dynamic, concerned scholars set the tone of most quality programs. Despite the growing tendency towards standardization and even mass production of advanced degrees, personal interaction between teacher and apprentice remained vital. At Harvard, for instance, Chairman Schlesinger influenced by quiet example. In addition to opening his house to graduate students on Sunday afternoons, he lavished considerable time on advisees and worked hard trying to place them in good jobs. He also presented American historiography as a seminar separate from European, using this course as a seminar to impart a love of scholarship to selected doctoral candidates. Later Schlesinger recalled:

After discussing past conceptions and directions of American historiography I focused on the main aims of the course. These were to expound historical method, direct attention to the wealth of bibliographical and other tools of the trade, impart the approved ways of scholarly citation and—the crowning feature—instruct the student into original investigation on their own.64

Ohio's history reputation reflected the personality and efforts of Carl Wittke. His concern for student welfare was transparent, and his fierce determination to find everyone a position made Ohio famous for successful placement throughout the depression. Legends abound how Wittke hounded universities, libraries, historical societies and public schools at the mere rumor of an opening. Occasionally he went even further. After succeeding in placing someone at the University
of Pittsburgh, Wittke discovered that a Columbus dry cleaning firm had lost the student's suit. After the company proved obstinate, Wittke launched a crusade of harassment which forced the firm to capitulate. Consequently the student began a new job in a new suit and owed them both to Carl Wittke.

Wittke's interest in Ohio State transcended the boundaries of his own department. The university's growing reputation for quality graduate programs reflected close cooperation between a handful of powerful, dedicated men including Wittke, George Arps of education, Alpheus Smith of physics, George Havens of Romance languages and Henry Spencer of political science all working in harmony to change the institution's image, and the passage of time has but intensified an appreciation of what they accomplished.

The University of Wisconsin fostered communication between faculty and graduate students via inexpensive housing at the University Club. Here existed a true community of scholars where energetic younger teachers compared notes, formed life-long friendships and interacted daily with advanced graduate students.

Older professors often maintain that for employed intellectuals the depression was the century's most pleasant era. Raucous materialism characteristic of the twenties had subsided; the dearth of material goods affected professors but little as they had not shared in the previous bounty, and the hectic pace of a former era relaxed allowing time for simpler pleasures like good conversation in the company of friends. Throughout this era a "watermelon feed," a "roller skating frolic" or a hayride for graduate students would be well
attended and cherished as a memorable occasion. Professors frequently invited colleagues and students to their homes for an evening of bridge or musical entertainment. Faculty-student baseball teams and bowling leagues abounded, and even Columbia's professors were known to indulge in a set or two of tennis with graduate students. Such interactions proved invaluable. Students surrounded with books during their working hours and friends of like temperament during their leisure were far more apt to gain an affection for and dedication towards their chosen profession. And equally important is the fact that married graduate students generally brought their spouses to these social functions where they met individuals of similar temperament and gained a richer understanding of a life they hoped to lead and dreams they came to share.

Also larger departments sponsored lectures and/or discussion meetings several times a month. In addition to inviting outside speakers, professors often used this opportunity to discuss recent developments in scholarship, to share their latest findings or suggest a topic ripe for research. One of Ohio's activities in this area occurred in the summer of 1922 featuring Noyes' discussion of "Recent Tendencies in the Writing of European History," Hockett's "Recent Tendencies in the Writing of American History" and Spencer's "Recent Tendencies in the Writing of Political Science." While large turnouts may have reflected a dearth of available activities rather than professional dedication, an interchange of ideas took place, and a ready made platform was available for anyone wishing to be heard.
By the twenties and thirties many graduate schools had funds available for hiring outside experts to address students and faculty. Luminaries like J. Franklin Jameson, Ferdinand Schevill, Guy Stanton Ford, James Westfall Thompson and Dixon Ryan Fox proved tireless lecturers and accomplished much in breaking down the isolationism and provincialism of individual departments. Though one might assert that what they said could be read in most libraries, the physical presence of great scholars should not be underestimated especially when many enjoyed "talking shop" informally or debating the merits of their writings. The latter occurred at Ohio in 1927 when Professor Schevill chose to berate Robinson and Barnes by stating, "It isn't the job of the historian to save the world." Howls of disapproval followed by a volley of retorts prompted Wittke to announce, "We had better draw to a close before the audience forces Professor Schevill to take back everything he has said." This historian proved his resilience by returning to Columbus several times including the spring of 1932 when he remained the entire quarter. Perhaps remembrance of such events contributed to the fondness for the era shared by many older scholars.

As was previously stated, it is difficult to estimate the funds available for graduate work during the early days of departments. By the thirties, however, more precision is possible since graduate education became an increasingly distinct expenditure rather than an unknown buried in the general budget. The first funds specifically earmarked for research involved scientific and agricultural projects such as those at Wisconsin starting in 1914. As time went on, however, graduate schools generally increased their support of history programs
such as took place at Illinois, Ohio, Virginia, Michigan and California where graduate schools had assumed control over all advanced studies by the mid 1930's. Exceptions to this rule include Harvard, Chicago, Hopkins, Columbia and Pennsylvania where departments received a lump sum for all education. At such institutions, graduate schools tended to concentrate more on procedural details and did not require large budgets. Consequently even as late as 1940 the relationship between the size of graduate school budgets and funds available for history remained imperfect. For example, the University of Illinois' astronomical graduate school budget might lead to the conclusion that its history program had more money than Harvard or Chicago and ten times as much as Ohio State. Such was certainly not the case, though Ohio State deans at least inferred they were ten times more impoverished than their Illinois counterparts.

During the depression, expanding graduate programs faced considerable opposition from those wishing to improve the job shortage and from elements fearful that funds might be drained from existing programs. Throughout the decade, for example, a well documented struggle raged between friends and foes of graduate education at Ohio State. Starting in the mid 1920's Rightmire and others questioned some research projects supported by the university which they felt duplicated previous studies or were exercises of minimal scholarly value. In addition Rightmire admonished prophetically that continuing to promote a larger percentage of teachers to be full professors than was customary in most schools, would precipitate an administrative crackdown.
In 1930 Ohio trustees protested soaring graduate enrollments by refusing to fund an assistant for Dean McPherson staggering under a workload generated by teaching, administration and his recent election to the presidency of the 18,000 member American Chemical Society. Anyone receiving such an honor would normally have obtained some relief, but in this instance the board refused to make any concession, despite McPherson's long and distinguished service. To avert total collapse, Carl Wittke volunteered to assist McPherson without decreasing his own teaching or administrative duties and at no additional salary. The board further emphasized its position by refusing Wittke the title of Assistant Dean and instead designated him "Assistant to the Dean."

The handwriting on the wall became reality in 1932. Despite rising graduate enrollments while nearly all other schools declined, an already inadequate budget was slashed 65 percent leaving $12,950 for graduate work despite McPherson's fears this would terminate Ohio's membership in the Association of American Universities.

The financial crisis remained until 1937 when George Arps became graduate dean. For many institutions, 1937 offered the first ray of hope that the depression might end as increased revenues often accompanied the economy's general improvement. While the depression was still present, many had recovered sufficiently to begin planning for the future. The University of Illinois for example appropriated $390,000 for graduate work in the 1937-1939 biennium, a staggering amount ten times the sum previously available to most universities and twenty times the Ohio State graduate budget.
Dean elect Arps vowed to share in this bounty and worked hard to increase his appropriation. A man of proven success in garnering funds first as psychology chairman and later as education dean, Arps enjoyed popularity with the trustees, counting a number as his close friends. Followed an exhaustive study of current needs and after obtaining formal approval of his functional definition of the graduate school, Arps pressed to raise his budget from $21,612 to approximately $250,000. In addition he requested "8 or 10 great scholars at $10,000-$12,000 apiece" to spearhead graduate training. Arps' detailed budget request included publication subsidies for faculty research projects, ample funds for library books, a tenfold increase in scholarship and fellowship monies and provisions for clerical assistance for professors. Since no one before or after Arps even proposed such a budget, the dean's sudden death in 1939 crushed the possibilities for a program second to none.

As one might infer from the budget discussion, funds for research support dropped drastically during the 1931-1937 period. This situation made lighter teaching loads and paid assistants difficult to obtain and also made sabbaticals difficult if not impossible to secure. In general, public institutions endured more hardships than private or even denominational ones. While research logically should have declined during the thirties, professors spurred themselves on to unprecedented production, prompting the conclusion that intellectuals respond better to the stick than the carrot.

Budget figures, however, sometimes obfuscate the truth, and ingenious fiscal juggling was often employed in encouraging research
activities. While it is difficult to document financial sleight of hand, one gains the impression matters must have been better than commonly assumed. Ohio State, for example, dedicated considerable sums to historical research throughout the depression. Wilbur Siebert who during the 1920's had grown accustomed to several graduate assistants plus two full-time secretaries, refused to acknowledge the depression's existence. Realizing the futility of normal channels Siebert billed President Rightmire for these expenses, a novel method which succeeded for years as the president absorbed this in a variety of ways including raiding the fund for building and grounds. Though occasionally Rightmire returned these bills to Siebert, the fact remains that a feisty professor received funds for years which theoretically did not exist.

Other Ohio historians like Arthur Cole and Homer Hockett received regular grants for research assistants prior to Governor Davey's activities in 1935. Considering that Ohio's lean budget continued subsidizing historical research, one is tempted to conclude that other universities used similar devices not readily apparent by studying the budget. Indeed one authority asserts that because of federal monies, the depression was more generous to scholars than any previous era.

Ohio State failed to benefit from improved economic conditions most of the nation experienced after 1935. Starting in 1936, Homer Hockett had to accept 2/3 salary for two quarter's work in order to escape growing responsibilities required of full-time faculty. In
1937 he described this arrangement to a new dean, Bland Stradley, in hopes of recouping a full salary without curtailing his research:

... This plan of course means that I sacrifice income from the university at the same time that I am attempting work which should be of value to the institution. The adjustment in my case is therefore not an ideal one for the promotion of university interests since it throws the burden chiefly upon the faculty member.  

Graduate students have long used ingenious income producing schemes while pursuing advanced work. One Ohio student, later a distinguished professor at a leading university, supported his wife and family by running a speakeasy. Generally, however, students sought more conventional avenues and were attracted to schools with available assistantships and fellowships for during the twenties the practice of subsidising advanced students expanded from a few prestige universities to include nearly all graduate schools. As always such stipends varied greatly from less than $100 to more than $1,000 annually, with the most famous schools typically being less than generous. Universities also discovered that teaching assistants proved extremely economical as instructors. In addition these individuals could free professors from routine tasks like grading papers and taking attendance, thereby increasing time for professional development without reducing teaching loads. Consequently during the twenties most of Ohio's history doctoral applicants received assistantships paid from departmental rather than graduate school funds. Quite regularly a resigning instructor was replaced by two graduate students, neither costing over $1,000. Few could fault this arrangement which affected considerable savings while training future professors for a multiplicity of available jobs.
The depression's lessening employment opportunities tended to restrict assistantships save in public universities where the low cost of graduate instruction proved particularly appealing. Ohio's administration sought to reverse this trend by curtailing financial aid, but Deans McPherson and Arps resisted Rightmire's insistence that, "Subsidies to Graduate Students in the form of Fellowships . . . be substantially reduced or perhaps eliminated," maintaining that Ohio must compete for its share of outstanding students. This argument was questionable since students were becoming more sophisticated, tending to base their selection more on departmental reputation than monetary considerations. In addition aid was not invariably given to the best applicants as political pressures on university officials frequently influenced the awarding of assistantships.

Throughout the depression universities sought to give dignity and hope to the unemployed Ph.D.'s they had spawned since regulations usually prohibited assistantships after the doctorate save for an occasional temporary appointment as instructor. Starting in 1932, Ohio's McPherson awarded honorary fellowships to give these individuals some shred of respectability and sent annual letters concerning them to President Rightmire:

I am attaching recommendations for the appointment of six honorary fellowships; four of these received their Ph.D. degrees from the Ohio State University in 1932, and one in 1931. They have been unable to secure any positions and . . . desire to come back and continue their research work.

It is understood, of course, that the honorary fellows receive no compensation whatever.
And by 1938 the number of honorary fellows had reached eighteen, their presence on campus reflecting the tragedies of an era.

Activities Outside the Classroom

Particularly during the thirties, required non-teaching duties continued to increase in most schools. Consequently morale was often low, and in 1929 Ohio's Rightmire apologized upon announcing these assignments. "... a professor should not be expected indefinitely to carry such a burden; relief should be accorded after reasonable service." Professorial contentment was rarely advanced at faculty meetings where attendance averaged less than 10 percent. Despite regulations requiring the president to preside, Rightmire was rarely present as important matters were seldom discussed; decisions were hampered by the school's economic problems, and professors had very little power. Consider this recommended change in regulations suggested May 11, 1939 by the Committee on Conduct in Examinations:

... Because of economic conditions the Committee has recommended additional hours for graduation instead of suspension for one quarter as a penalty for cheating.

A sampling of committee assignments given Ohio's historians affords insights into the variety and number of these duties during the 1917-1940 period. Knight served on the rules, appointments and George Washington Bicentennial committees while Siebert remained active on the graduate council and publication committee. Professors Hockett and McNeal accepted important, demanding assignments on the schedule committee and graduate council. In addition, McNeal was acting
secretary for the arts college and chairman of the summer school. Homer Hockett, one of three on the investigation charged with visiting and evaluating Ohio colleges, was also chairman of educational statistics and a member of the graduate council and instructional committee.

George Washburne, while ascending from assistant professor to chairman, accepted a wide range of assignments including the University Press the committees on student dramatics and student affairs and secretary of the arts college. Carl Wittke in addition to duties as departmental chairman was active on the graduate council, worked with Knight on the Washington Bicentennial, and co-authored the Klein-Wittke re-organization of the curriculum. Though Arthur Cole vigorously opposed any distractions from his research, he nonetheless served with energy and distinction on the council of instruction, the graduate council and a special committee to investigate the campus R.O.T.C. unit. In addition to standing committees special assignments were not uncommon particularly during the depression when most universities lurched from one emergency to another.

Enrollments tended to decline along with the employment rate, thus precipitating ferocious competition for students not only among universities but also between disciplines and even individual professors within departments. Large schools like Ohio State sought to alter their reputation as sterile, impersonal institutions by introducing "reforms" designed to attract and hold students. Most of these proved time consuming to professors. Freshman Week, one of Rightmire's favorite projects, required that most faculty begin one week early and participate in a six day program. Results were debatable,
one freshman stating, "On the first night they were willing to die for us; one week later they did not care if we died for them." 75

Once students were lured to a given school considerable efforts were made to keep them and encourage academic excellence since many students felt the school needed them more than vice versa. Mid-term grades were commonly required of professors, special honor rolls in addition to the Dean's List were frequently employed, and prefixing degrees with terms like "distinction" or "cum laude" became increasingly widespread. Many schools left no stone unturned in the mad scramble for students. Wilbur Siebert was on a committee formed to consider giving students credit for playing in the university orchestra or taking courses in absentia. It is testimonial to the durability of professors that most survived the twin pressures of imminent unemployment and ever increasing duties.

Just how time-consuming any one committee can be might best be illustrated by example. Mention has already been made of the Klein Committee, a depression project led by Carl Wittke (liberal arts), Arthur J. Klein (education), and Alpheus Smith (science) entailing thousands of man hours. Each of Ohio State's approximately 2,500 courses was studied and assigned a priority in light of depression budget restraints. It was only with great reluctance that such a project was undertaken as it threatened the special empires of powerful professors. Salaries, teaching loads, degree requirements and administrative supervision of professors were but a few concerns of this project which lasted over a year and ordered the cancellation or
curtailment of 20 percent of all course offerings. In addition several previously unwritten procedures were formalized, necessitating considerable paperwork for most professors. For example, annual reports were required of full-time teaching and administrative employees. These reports described scholarly research and publications, educational study, work in and for professional societies and public service. Some objected to this as an encroachment on time and freedom, but most complied in an uncomplaining fashion. Eugene Roseboom tried a different tack, livening up the "public service" section of a 1939 report with his dry wit:

Not very clear what is wanted here. Assisted a little in the education of a governor. Governor Bricker referred to the Roseboom and Weisenburger History of Ohio in his message to the legislature.  

Of course, work was not constant during this period with the human side of professors much in evidence at bowling alleys, volleyball courts and baseball diamonds. Ohio historians proved formidable baseball players and bowlers during the thirties when faculty leagues flourished. Graduate students were "drafted" for teams, and Wittke was famous for insisting that all advisees participate.  

Economic realities restricted most social gatherings to faculty homes rather than theaters or supper clubs. Newcomer parties were a fall custom where new teachers were entertained by veterans and generally met three or four individuals destined to become life-long friends. In 1924 a novice instructor described these activities including a formal reception at the Faculty Club to meet President
Thompson and being hosted by a number of faculty members including Professors Knight and Siebert.77

Faculty clubs were increasingly utilized in larger universities. In 1923 the third floor of Ohio State's new Administration Building became one which was designed to be self supporting. Despite expensive dues, coercion from Knight and Siebert resulted in all historians who were full professors joining and most of them participating in its activities until Wittke became chairman and was less enthusiastic concerning the club. More formal occasions, however, such as lecture-dinners, parties commemorating special events and faculty plays continued being patronized by most historians.

At unofficial gatherings and parties professors often furnished their own entertainment. Ohio State professors formed several musical ensembles including a popular trio consisting of Spencer at piano, Wittke on violin and Stober, botany, on cello. Mrs. Homer Hockett was an accomplished pianist who frequently accompanied such groups.

Faculty recreation was not invariably innocent since a number of professors had stills during prohibition and invited colleagues over for samples. One historian recalls attending such a gathering, billed as purely intellectual, and being introduced to the still during a tour of the house. At another history party professors sought to avoid a physician's fee by inviting a state health department official to administer the Schick test for diphtheria immunization. As a consequence some became partially paralyzed for months due to dosages far greater than the proper strength.
Halloween and Christmas parties were generally lively and frequently included students. A Lantern description of the 1922 History Club Halloween party depicts a simpler, less hectic era:

... Professor Edgar H. McNeal of the department of European history, decorated with a pumpkin headdress, uniquely executed an esthetic dance, and Professor John R. Knipfing played the light artillery with cornstalks at the Halloween party of the History Club. ...

... During the grand march, Professor Arthur C. Cole elaborated local American history by marching with a pumpkin head. The witch's prophesies were accurate in advising the professors as to the real purpose of their existence. One of the scholastic inquirers was seriously informed that his life work was carpentry, considering his activity in blockhead research. ...

Professor George A. Washburne and W. E. Marion starred in a competition for consumption of candy. An unofficial count of glasses of cider disposed of by Professor Carl Wittke was abandoned, ...

Halloween rabbits and hounds took the place of the usual black cat, among whom Professor George W. Knight was the swiftest. ...

Such activities were possible because the faculty of any school considered itself a cohesive unit and planned social activities accordingly. In smaller schools the president's home hosted events such as musical evenings featuring talented professors. Institutions with faculty clubs made extensive use of these facilities for dinners, parties, plays performed by professors and spouses, lectures, women's club functions and other activities. Interdepartmental bonds were strengthened, strong friendships were cemented and a genuine school spirit engendered. The disadvantages of socializing exclusively with like individuals remained as yet undiscovered.
This feeling of cohesion contributed to the civic mindedness many professors demonstrated. In addition to acts of public service previously mentioned, many professors taught special classes catering to laborers or the unemployed for little or no compensation. Such voluntary efforts are not to be confused, however, with overloads some schools imposed on professors at no additional pay during the depression. In addition many schools inaugurated lectures for alumni which typically took place during a spring week-end. Historians were popular at such events where citizens sought insights into a rapidly changing world. Ohio State's Alumni College was particularly successful, George Washburne and Carl Wittke being perennial favorites.

Perhaps the most popular "volunteer" courses ever taught involved World War One while the conflict still raged. Often given at night before packed high school auditoriums, such offerings, though rarely scholarly or impartial, greatly abetted enthusiasm for history. Other courses sponsored by various unions sought to enlighten laborers. Ohio's historians, for example, taught at the Worker's College of the Columbus Federation of Labor. Such courses were widespread and enjoyed several years of national popularity.

Professors partial to Roosevelt often defended the New Deal from the rostrum or taught WPA sponsored offerings in various "emergency schools" for the unemployed. Historians often taught such courses whose enrollments often compared to "war issues" offerings of a previous decade and frequently included a high percentage of college trained students. Columbus Ohio's emergency school, for example,
accepted 1,001 registrants in 1933, all seeking some relief from the morass of unemployment.

The academic tradition of aiding charitable or non-profit organizations continued although most of this work apparently was carried out by senior professors. The First World War witnessed a tremendous outpouring of volunteer activities particularly among faculty women and faculty wives determined to reduce the suffering of this inhumane activity. They knit clothes, made bandages, sent tons of packages and raised money for medical supplies and ambulances. Others continued as Sunday school teachers and Y.M.C.A. advisors, possibly in hopes of averting future conflicts.

Following the war the Y.M.C.A. along with many historians who were members aided European universities via fund-raising drives which netted considerable sums. Ohio State concentrated on Czechoslovakia with Schlesinger, Knight, Siebert, President Thompson and others devoting thousands of hours to this effort. It seems incredible in this era of subsidized travel that Knight and several graduate students paid their own fares so they could view the situation first-hand. A letter from Prague describes the impression Knight created despite his daughter's death less than one month before:

...  

Coming just after the hard days of seeing his daughter suffer and leave them, Dr. Knight carried on so bravely that he won the instant admiration of all. Coming first as a symbol of a great friendly university, he soon won his way on his merit, ... He will always stand out in minds here as the great humanist who has come this way from America. For the first time in the lives of most here they have seen and known a human, sympathetic, and
loving professor, who has brought a new ideal of friendly relations between Professor and student.79

Sadly the bud of international good will expired before flowering despite vigorous fertilization along Christian lines. Faced with empty placebos like the Washington Conference and Kellog-Briand Treaty, professors turned inward to concentrate on the United States. Many sought to promote their college or university via fund raising speeches, defending the institution against critics, or addressing alumni groups. Others abetted the renaissance of essay contests sponsored by rightest organizations seeking to reinforce traditional virtues. As prizes were often substantial, entries were frequently numerous making judging extremely arduous. During the depression, for example, Wittke and Dorn arbitrated an essay contest on George Washington featuring a prize large enough to maintain a family comfortably for over a year.

Faculty speechmaking continued and possibly increased, despite the introduction of the radio. In addition to traditional platitudes uttered during patriotic holidays, funerals and commencements, social scientists spoke out increasingly on controversial issues. They addressed the full range of audience types and sizes, and in so doing continued interacting with and obtaining valuable feedback from the general public. As a rule topics discussed included politics, foreign affairs, current and prospective wars, and the direction America should or would take. Some analysis of these will demonstrate the range of professorial concerns during this era.
Political discussions were often heated during America's great depression, and theories abounded concerning its causes. Many intellectuals believed materialism to be excessive and voiced the conviction that available wealth was concentrating into fewer and fewer hands. Alternate political philosophies were discussed, and faculty members could be found espousing Communism, Socialism or Fascism. In 1933, Carl Wittke arranged a dramatic debate between Norman Thomas (Socialist), Professor Frederick Schumann (Communist) and Colonel George A. Burrell (Burrell-Mase industrialist). One week earlier, interested students had heard the highly controversial Leftist Scott Nearing and the ardent Fascist Dr. Bruno Roselli. Most professors, however, discussed only domestic politics, and a few ran for public office. During the Coolidge-Smith campaign, for example, Arthur Cole viewed Teapot Dome as the death knell of the Republicans while the more conservative Siebert assessed the scandal as merely ephemeral.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was first a president, then a symbol and ultimately an era. Professors observing this transformation were seldom neutral, and a distinct rift developed in most universities between the pro-Roosevelt social scientists and the anti-New Deal engineers and scientists. Ohio State's Lawrence Hill articulated the sentiments of many historians by complaining:

There is a strange thing about engineers. Although they laugh at the idea of layman's advising them on the construction of a bridge, they consider themselves quite capable of solving all the country's political and economic problems.80

The majority of historians spoke out on some aspect of foreign affairs. One great debate concerned whether or not to join Wilson's
League, an organization most historians chose to endorse. George Washburne, new to Ohio's faculty, agreed with most colleagues while uttering his first recorded public statement:

I am heartily in favor of a League of Nations ... The proposed constitution of the league has some defects and the international situation is such that the league will begin to function under adverse circumstances. But I am in favor of its adoption, knowing that its defects will point the way to a more practical working basis if this is needed.81

Other professors stressed areas of special expertise. Ohio's Arthur Noyes, a specialist in British history who frequently visited England, viewed Anglo-American cooperation as essential to world peace and stability. Beginning in the twenties he opposed any drift towards isolationism and endorsed a vigorous foreign policy "... built upon something more substantial than good-will dinners, disarmament conferences and Kellogg Pacts."82 In addition Noyes, Hill and Wittke eschewed selfish nationalism to favor an international point of view. Hill opposed military occupations of Central American nations while Wittke deplored steadily rising tariffs. Such efforts proved futile, however, until a determination to contain Fascism prompted the Good Neighbor Policy and inspired a number of conferences sponsored by the secretary of state. Invitations to these were frequently extended to professors such as Larry Hill who attended the 1940 Conference on Inter-American Relations at the urging of Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

War was one topic discussed more than any other during this era which began with an attempt to "make the world safe for democracy" and ended under the cloud of Fascism. With rare exceptions history
professors supported America's entry into World War One with deep ardor but an incomplete understanding of the ambiguities involved. In addition a number of distinguished scholars willfully subverted the truth to a degree many found embarrassing once the momentary hysteria had passed. Professors in all institutions saw America's involvement as a holy crusade and exhibited considerable ingenuity in transforming bloodshed and destruction into a positive virtue. Our best historical minds, our greatest political and religious leaders and most ordinary citizens shared the burning conviction that Germany threatened democracy's survival and that Allied intentions were entirely honorable. Privileges enjoyed in America were stressed and contrasted with the grinding totalitarianism under the "Huns." One of Knight's war-time lectures illustrates the twin motivations of idealism and fear which goaded most Americans:

... Democracy is on the defensive at this moment. There cannot be room on this earth for both kinds of government--which shall it be? Shall the ideals for which America stands and by which she had lived be abandoned or lost, or shall we fight now to the finish--until the world is made safe for democracy.83

Professors were in heavy demand by citizens seeking assurances that the war was necessary and wishing insights into the unfolding conflict. Citizens were greatly interested in analyses of the war's causes and predictions of the future world following Germany's defeat. Homer Hockett, a thoughtful scholar and a birthright Quaker, rejected verbal pyrotechniques and attempted a balanced approach. He explained that the war was logical given America's aversion to aristocracy, absolutism and totalitarianism wherever it appeared. Of course after
the United States entered the war, any retreat from commitment became
difficult, and there were fewer impartial analyses of the conflict.

The war's conclusion, Wilson's problems at Versailles, America's
rejection of the League and the ensuing chaos in Germany threatened
lasting peace and ushered in an era of disillusionment and isolation­
ism. Almost as soon as "the war to end all wars" had ended, fears
were voiced that another war remained distinctly possible. Almost
overnight professors were in less demand as lecturers than during the
conflict itself. In addition historians seemed less willing to speak
out, being no longer certain they could solve the world's problems.
Furthermore a general restricting of academic freedom, the resurgence
of conservatism and a growing disenchantment with intellectuals
rendered the outspoken liberal an endangered species. Ohio State's
Arthur Cole, as one of a small minority choosing to ignore such haz­
ards, asserted that American participation in World War One was more
indicative of gullibility than idealism:

... Under the last war psychosis came legislative re­
striction of freedom of speech. This meant that American
history could not even be honestly discussed in the
classroom... Yet, President Wilson in his St. Louis
speech after the war said that the war had been for com­
mercial ends... 84

By the onset of the depression many historians considered World
War One a mistake which should not be repeated. While few openly
criticized the war, this sentiment took other forms when professors
espoused isolationism or even pacifism or stressed that Europe and
America were incompatible. It also explains why prior to 1940, so few
intellectuals criticized Hitler or even took him seriously.
Carl Wittke whose own father was German-born, was one historian who not only realized Hitler's intentions, but beginning soon after the war, crusaded for a more lenient treaty and the amelioration of conditions in Germany which were facilitating Hitler's rise to power. In the thirties, Wittke acknowledged the Fuhrer's shrewdness, particularly during events like the Rhineland occupation, but lashed out at Fascism's denial of individual liberties. He saw himself representing "a rapidly dying group who thinks we can still maintain our individual freedoms while enjoying a high standard of living." Wittke's extremely effective Hitler lectures earned him repeated invitations to address local groups.

As previously stated, few professors faulted National Socialism prior to 1940. Since stories of German atrocities during World War One had been largely fabricated, few believed what actually took place following Hitler's rise to power. Also, Germany's progress contrasted markedly with America's economic depression. Hitler's attractiveness was further enhanced by the popularity of the "great man theory" of history.

By the mid thirties some historians began predicting another war with Germany though most believed it impossible to ascertain the truth concerning events in Europe. Though few considered war inevitable, Francis Weisenburger reflected the widespread feeling of helplessness by stating, "If the world just waits, the muddled affairs of Europe will work themselves out." Others including Ohio's William McDonald believed the secret of averting another war lay in avoiding financial dealings with Europe. A group including Harold Grimm advocated
re-examining and rejuvenating democracy as the best insurance for peace. A few individuals even asserted the depression was punishment for entering the First World War and warned that propagandists might lure us into yet another such holocaust.

Between the wars audiences clamored for speakers willing to predict or suggest the course this nation would ultimately take. Powerful voices advocated isolationism and a return to nonentangling alliances. Supporters of this view frequently asserted that all historical instruction should instill patriotism in students. Consequently Chicago's Mayor W. H. Thompson burned Arthur Schlesinger's *New Viewpoints in American History* (1922) because it contained information complimentary to Great Britain. Many public school teachers including New Jersey's Robert Laurence Joyce advocated "sugarcoating" history to render our heritage more attractive, prompting Carl Wittke to explode:

> Bunk! There is no conflict between truth and the only kind of patriotism that is safe for the world. If deliberate false teaching of history is necessary to inculcate patriotism, then the country would be better off without that brand of patriotism.87

Professors themselves reflected deep rifts within the nation. A few espoused pacifism or socialism. Others wished to expand federal powers to improve the general welfare, even at the expense of individual freedom. During a 1936 speech Wittke stated, "Today the demand for political security has become more dominating than desire for political democracy,"88 and predicted that Social Security would soon become a reality. Homer Hockett believed the depression economy allowed few to be free, maintaining that, "The average man is a cog in a wheel, a part of a regimentation system."89 He too believed that
the government must intervene to restore personal freedom. Some thor­
oughly disenchanted Americans began comparing the depression with Rome
prior to its fall and predicting the most dire consequences if pressing
problems remained unsolved. But classical specialists advised against
making such comparisons which William McDonald labeled "pure specula­
tion." 88

Other issues which previously had been almost ignored surfaced
during the depression. A few bold scholars addressed themselves to
race relations, attacking organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan while
calling for an end to discrimination and denying claims of white supe­
riority. While during the twenties most liberals ignored or privately
despaired of this situation, the following decade witnessed concerted
efforts to improve the lot of Blacks. In other words, the boundaries
of liberalism had expanded to encompass minorities. Ohio's historians
reflected this shift. In 1921 Arthur Cole and other liberals addressed
the Kit-Kat Club on "The Negro Problem of Today." After declaring the
situation to be exceedingly grave, the scholars concluded no solution
was possible. The following decade witnessed a dramatic change.
Professor Cole lobbied vigorously for an end to racist theories of
ethnic differences, asserting in a radio address, "There is no one
good, bad or better race; there is no applicable standard to allow us
to say any race is chosen." 92 Chairman Wittke spoke out against the
Klan upon hearing some students were becoming members. Homer Hockett,
after thoroughly researching the San Jose lynchings and subsequent
Scottsboro trial, organized a large group of students determined to
correct injustices towards the defendants. A standing committee was formed, resolutions passed and letters sent to prominent political figures. Hockett's actions reflected deep personal commitment. The nation's foundations seemed threatened, and he vowed to do what he could to shore them up.

Scholars in Controversy

Edward Alsworth Ross drew upon a 46 year career in commenting on the evolution of academic freedom since 1890:

Looking over old letters from Hopkins cronies just launched on their academic careers, I note something significant: they are not afraid. They show no concern as to how their utterances will strike powerful outsiders because in those days outsiders did not presume to dictate to institutions of learning. 

Since then (but too gradually for many to notice it) an elaborate control has been thrown over the American people and one of its measures is to block the channels by which ideas hateful to the business control System reach people's minds.

For the clear-seeing and outspoken scholar in one of the social branches America is far less kindly and tolerant, far more grim and treacherous, than the America we Hopkins' economists met. Until he has won a place from which he can flout and defy the system he always goes in peril of his academic life.93

Indeed it does appear that scholars of the twenties and thirties were confronted by many pressures, few of them new but generally more severe and insistent than previously. Beginning in the 1920's the ascendancy of athletics and a general loosening of academic standards resulted in many professors having to make special concessions towards certain students. One Ohio historian exhibited considerable courage by failing a noted basketball star after he had written "Napoleon was a
nice guy" as his entire final examination. An assistant coach visited the professor's home where he argued the merits of basketball for an afternoon, and finally departed after concluding his mission to be hopeless. Some other schools, however, were far less tolerant of professors who insisted on maintaining academic standards.

Other factors threatened social scientists as a species during this 1917-1940 period. War or its imminent danger, severe economic dislocations and the rise of Communism were but a few of the more potent considerations shaping the intellectual environment. Naturally such trying circumstances prompted many social scientists to comment about and even seek to improve upon society. Such actions engendered some resentment in a nation not only opposed philosophically to social planning and grand designs, but also led by powerful elements determined to avert any change in the status quo. Even known defenders of academic freedom found occasion to alter their convictions. Carl Wittke who had spearheaded an exchange of students and professors between the United States and Germany deemed it prudent to halt this activity despite his passion for the free flow of ideas. Harvard's Lowell, ending a long career initiated by rejecting a ten million dollar donation contingent upon firing a certain professor, felt it prudent to restrain his professors:

The university or college is under certain obligations to its students. It compels them to attend courses of instruction, and... they have a right not to be compelled to listen to remarks offensive or injurious to them on subjects of which the instructor is not a master,... A Professor of Greek, for example, is not at liberty to harangue his pupils on the futility and harmfulness of vaccination; a professor of economics on Bacon's authorship of
As stated before, this entire period was shrouded by war or its immediate prospect. It is entirely possible that World War One produced the most emotionally charged atmosphere in American history, a situation characterized by enthusiastic and sometimes self-righteous idealism. During the height of the wartime exhuberance President William Oxley Thompson greeted incoming students by stating, "The University will be at your service in the interest of preparation for public duty and a life of devotion to the interests of humanity." Meanwhile a youthful instructor described the university's mission as he perceived it:

Ohio State's job is to add to the number that believe in the highest expression of yourself... In other words, the job of Ohio State is to present to you a living prospectus of a Kingdom of God on earth in which the expression of human life sought is seen in the life already lived.

Scholars soon discovered that zealous self-righteousness spawned oppressive intolerance. John Burgess of Columbia learned that a publisher with whom he had contracted to print a book refused to do so after a typesetter judged it filled with "Prussianism." Though the editors detected no such tendency, they voiced the fear, based on the typesetter's opinion, that the public would find Burgess' book offensive. James Harvey Robinson, though fiercely anti-German, deplored any such intolerance even to the point of defending those against the war lest this nation be guilty of hypocrisy:

Here is a new puzzle. We have had little sympathy for similar proceedings in the belligerent countries...
And, now that we are actually in the war, these same things which we deprecated in the policy of European countries have become our policy.\(^97\)

Beard's resignation from Columbia echoed this philosophy. While a staunch Allied supporter, he spurned the administration's contention that the continuation of his employment necessitated endorsing the war effort.

The University of Wisconsin retained its deeply rooted academic freedom partially because most faculty members were enthusiastic about the war and anxious to prove their patriotism. Even the iconoclastic Richard T. Ely pounced on Robert La Follette for opposing war with Germany. By 1918, 186 Wisconsin professors were on leave for defense related work in army, navy and Red Cross units. Those still in the classroom often devised courses to assist the war effort. These included vocational offerings aimed at producing needed gunsmiths, machinists, electricians and blacksmiths. Scientists concentrated on projects like gas mask protection and submarine detection research, while those in liberal arts produced a flood of publications designed to promote patriotism and to foster support for the Allies. In addition many of these same faculty members stumped the state garnering support for the war by addressing countless rallies.

Chicago's historians were equally zealous as patriots. Chairman Andrew McLaughlin hoped to accomplish what Lord Bryce did for England by penning vitriolic tracts such as his "Sixteen Causes of the War" (1917). As a recent president of the American Historical Association, McLaughlin lent intellectual credence to theories that the Allies were totally pure and their enemies the precise opposite. In contrast to
the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois was relatively calm and experienced little war hysteria save chastising several teachers for "deriding Liberty Bond salesmen, the Red Cross and Y.M.C.A. agents." 98

During this war, prestige institutions were surprisingly more apt to launch professorial witch hunts than schools of lesser renown. As an example, the University of Michigan fired seven faculty members, including one tenured professor with twenty years' service. Virginia broke its tradition of academic freedom when Leon Whipple, director of the journalism school, was dismissed with no appeal rights after delivering a speech to Sweetbriar College's Current Events Club.

While Harvard's administration continued defending academic freedom, some intolerant professors pressed for the dismissal of dissidents. William Roscoe Thayer's "Germany Versus Civilization" (1916) documents faculty hysteria definitely out of context with the school's scholarly reputation.

Ohio State was a haven of toleration throughout the war, the only exception involving three foreign born professors who had decided not to become naturalized. Federal authorities barred these aliens from the campus which was a military zone housing a flying school. President Thompson, however, tolerated neither witch hunts nor dismissals of his faculty for ideological reasons. Following the war, however, Ohio and most other states enacted loyalty oaths requiring teachers take a pledge like the following before assuming their duties:

I solemnly swear, or affirm, that I will support the constitution of the United States, the constitution of the State of Ohio, and the laws enacted, thereunder, and
that I will teach by precept and example, respect for
the flag, reverence for law and order and undivided al-
legiance to the government of one country, the United
States of America.99

Ohio faculty members treated this regulation in a fashion no doubt
typical of most professors. Though disappointed at being singled out
as a group particularly prone to disloyalty, few protested publicly
and nearly everyone signed the oath because refusal resulted in dis-
missal with little possibility of finding another position.

Articles appeared protesting these oaths, and some administra-
tors resisted them, especially in Massachusetts where a group of de-
termined presidents averted an oath law until 1935 when Lowell re-
tired. Johns Hopkins' President Isiah Bowman was particularly op-
posed to such restrictions and delivered impassioned speeches on the
subject:

An armed soldier to tell you when to take off your
hat will follow. It is the coercion of a people by
fanatics, the tyranny of "the few" that Jefferson
feared...100

Somewhat different was the attitude of ordinary citizens, one of
whom penned a letter defending oaths that appeared in the Literary
Digest.101 The writer pointed out that since times were hard and money
very scarce, what little remained should be reserved for loyal
teachers.

One complexity in the oath controversy was that regulations were
seldom enforced uniformly, and that some professors refused to sign
and still remained employed. At Ohio State, for example, one historian
who never signed continued teaching there for over 30 years although
the regulation remained in force, and technically he was ineligible to collect a paycheck.

Depression pressures tended to intensify discrimination in hiring, and almost no one championed the underdogs. The percentage of professional females plunged dramatically and failed to recover for over forty years. Being a Catholic presented some difficulties, while Jews, atheists and radicals had practically no chance of employment anywhere. Women were generally hired only by women's colleges and Blacks by Negro institutions. Some schools even attempted to refuse admission to radical students. An Ohio State professor sought to thwart this movement by introducing a resolution that no student be rejected for his opinions, but it failed to pass the faculty.

In addition to discrimination in hiring, a welter of pressure groups which monitored professorial behavior prevented most students from being exposed to divergent philosophies and viewpoints. Consequently the mere discussion of current social and political problems often proved perilous. While students accused teachers of being irrelevant, the latter asserted the impossibility of dealing with controversial issues. Howard K. Beale was less kind:

... Teachers, on their part were likely to be completely indifferent to the author's undertaking. Many care nothing about freedom or a study of freedom and want only to draw their salaries with as little effort as possible. Many do not know they are not free and will be happier never to discover it.102

Professors, already under fire on several fronts, frequently faced trustees who viewed them as they would corporation employees. Such individuals showed little tolerance for scholarly independence or the
right of intellectuals to advocate change. In addition many trustees stressed "pulling with the team" and exhibiting school spirit, concepts which mystified or even infuriated many scholars who increasingly placed professional considerations ahead of university affairs. Professors on their part seldom tried to understand these officials despite their authority. In fact many scholars delighted in belittling their governing boards in seeming confirmation of one proverb defining a professor as "a man who thinks otherwise."

Such actions reflected widespread unhappiness that many trustees were governing far more vigorously than before. These boards echoed the public's belief that scholars espousing controversial causes betrayed a public trust. During the twenties when universities expanded dramatically, their very success signified popular endorsement of higher education's importance and consequent need to be carefully monitored. In fact the zeal with which dissident professors were hunted down is tribute to the influence many citizens felt they exerted.

Columbia trustees were under constant fire from scholars viewing the work of the Board of Trustees as administrative meddling at its worst. Retrospectively one must question whether these charges were entirely accurate given the cantankerous brilliance of scholars who delighted in harassing "... the interlocking directors of the Pujo charts." Columbia's trustees, nearly all representing from birth an economic elite, were doubtlessly unaccustomed to criticism and possibly overreacted when under attack.
Quite predictably the stresses of World War One produced extreme
tension between Columbia professors and trustees, the latter being
zealous Allied supporters determined to eradicate disloyal elements
from the faculty. After two instructors, Henry Dana and James Cattell,
were fired for exhibiting questionable loyalty a trustee-appointed
committee was formed to investigate the entire faculty. Predictably
this group performed quite sluggishly, and ceased functioning alto­
gether after John Dewey resigned from it. Soon thereafter President
Butler took a sudden vacation, leaving his trustees in charge of the
investigation. Scholars summoned before this body included Charles
Beard who presented himself more out of curiosity than anything else.
While the precise dialogue between these men can never be ascertained,
the very fact this event transpired appears to reflect the board's
conviction a professor needed Columbia more than vice versa, an as­
sumption Beard did not share. Consequently he resigned stating that,
"The status of a professor in Columbia is lower than that of a manual
laborer." Others such as James Harvey Robinson followed suit, while
the deposed Cattell sued the university and several years later won a
substantial libel judgment.

Upton Sinclair popularized the notion of trustees as narrow
minded businessmen who crushed dissident professors as thoroughly as
they did the competitors. He reserved special wrath for the Uni­
versity of Pennsylvania being controlled by Philadelphia utility
owners whose special relationships with city politicians and ardor for
protecting the status quo were legendary. When the young Scott Nearing
used his classroom to criticize local business practices, he was
dismissed with little warning and even less explanation. His crusade
to be reinstated failed, but Nearing's experience coalesced liberal
citizens behind university reform.

Trustees in state institutions often faced difficult situations. First, the governor appointing them expected loyalty in return. Second, as conservative businessmen they often mistrusted liberal tendencies found in many schools where an education was free or very inexpensive. Third, these trustees, though seldom as wealthy or influential as their counterparts in the great private schools, were frequently criticized for inactivity by people failing to realize this. Fourth, and for reasons not entirely clear, these individuals were often inundated with minor matters, such as being drawn into faculty feuds, which wore them down and impeded attending to other matters.

Ohio State trustees faced all these difficulties and more. Depression Governor Martin Davey resisted what he deemed excessive expenditures and demonstrated this conviction by repeatedly vetoing the university budget. Labeling Ohio State officials "treasury raiders," Davey expounded his philosophy in a 1935 radio broadcast:

... Tax spenders and privilege seekers clamor for what they want at the expense of the people... I prefer the friendship and respect of the masses of the people. I will be the Defender of the taxpayer.106

Trustees, who were technically responsible to the governor, found it difficult to contradict him prompting educational leaders to criticize them and on more than one occasion suggest the trustees resign in favor of "more qualified" individuals.
In addition, Ohio's trustees faced a barrage of bothersome details. Teachers wishing to attend professional activities required written permission from the board. All salary negotiations and the hiring of new instructors had to be ratified by this group. If several offers were tendered in securing a desired professor, each successive salary figure required the same approval as the initial one. For example, hours of discussion proved necessary to secure an additional $250 to meet one candidate's minimum acceptable figure.

Ohio trustees also felt incessant political pressures to cleanse the university of elements deemed offensive to conservative groups. Red probes and other investigations resulted, and few recognized their true source as criticism of such activities focused on the trustees. Also as teachers became better organized, pressures increased for the board to lobby on their behalf. Professors pinned their hopes on Newton D. Baker when this nationally recognized figure joined the board during the depression's bleakest hour. Yet Baker had lost his former liberalism and set a poor standard by absenting himself from many trustee meetings.

Harold Laski, on the other hand, saw little point in dealing with American trustees whom he considered pawns of the business community. He accused Harvard colleagues of truckling to these conservative pressures and deliberately espousing reactionary views in hopes of securing promotions. After accepting a position in England, Laski asserted that although British manufacturers dominated university boards, they seldom
tampered with internal policy. He compared English with American trustees who employed strategy like the following:

... six 'radical' teachers ... would be forced to teach other subjects than their own as punishment. A teacher of economics was to be transferred to auto mechanics, a sociology teacher to ancient history, a civics teacher to mathematics, and a social science teacher to English and janitorial duties. 107

What percentage of such actions was forced on trustees will never be known as pressure groups often operate secretively. Some cases, however, are exceedingly well documented. California trustees were monitored and even intimidated by the ultra conservative Better America Federation. Similar pressures harrassed the University of Chicago's board to the point that Hutchins was forced to authorize a Red probe. Wisconsin's board received a direct legislative order to investigate "Communistic and atheistic influences in the State's educational institutions." 108

As was certainly true in Illinois and probably the case elsewhere, conservative interests including a particularly well organized publishing lobby led by William Randolph Hearst manipulated state lawmakers. Typically, legislators were prodded by businessmen hearing rumors of indiscretions at the state university. Trustees would then order administrators to take action, resulting in professors being investigated at the end of this chain of cause and effect. Scholars on their part frequently aggravated matters by remaining obstinately aloof. Generally speaking, professors were at least as intolerant of trustees as vice versa, a situation easy to understand but difficult to square with the scholarly ideal.
There were several instances where boards proved more level­headed than most professors. Mention has already been made of Wisconsin trustees' issuing a manifesto of academic freedom following an investigation. Ohio State's counterparts showed real courage in the late thirties when under fire from the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the legislature, and several other groups charging that the state university harbored communists. The Legion's Major Dunkle approached board chairman Carlton Dargusch who reported, "Very serious charges have been made." Consequently school business halted while trustees met repeatedly to investigate charges and hear a long string of witnesses describe the most minute details:

Witness 47 H. Schuyler Foster, Jr. 2093 Iuka Avenue  
... Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science; member A.A.U.P. Witnessed showing "Spain in Flames;" ... admitted urging the passage of the film; said, "We had not had very many opportunities to see what modern war was like and I was interested somewhat from the standpoint of hoping that it would create sentiment for peace to have that realistic picture." 109

Acting President McPherson faced countless inquiries about the investigation and attempted to answer them all. In response to one query he commented, "... so far as I am able to find out, there is nothing illegal in being a communist, provided you don't advocate the overthrow of the government." 110 Simultaneously John Fullen's Ohio State University Monthly launched an offensive against the Legion, asserting the school's innocence and demanding hard evidence to substantiate charges against it. Chairman Dargusch echoed this theme and effectively ended the matter by directly challenging Major Dunkle:

Very serious charges have been made, and the committee expects the Franklin County Council to submit any
evidence it has. We expect to proceed on the assump­
tion they have no evidence unless they lay it before
us.111

Possibly the most difficult situations trustees faced occurred
when pressure groups disagreed and sent conflicting messages on a given
issue. Witness the Bertrand Russell Case at the College of the City of
New York. With high enthusiasm the board ratified unanimously this
philosopher's appointment based on faculty recommendations. An enor­
mous uproar ensued, trapping the board in the crossfire of pro and
anti-Russell forces. Several years before, Ohio's trustees had been
embroiled in problems regarding minority students. On one hand, par­
ents and the alumni were demanding the "Negro invasion" be halted; the
Anti-Negro Guild contained many students, and most faculty members
acquisced in this philosophy. Yet the Citizens' Committee for the Con­
sideration of the Problem of Equality of Opportunity for Negro Stu­
dents at the Ohio State University was a small but articulate radical
group led by two historians. In this instance the two factions can­
celled each other out. While Blacks continued being harassed, dis­
tributing "defamatory literature directed towards colored students"
was halted, and minorities continued enrolling in record numbers. In
this and other instances Ohio's trustees confronted two opposing
forces, neither willing to give an inch. Such pressures inflicted
constant strain and shortened tempers considerably.

Complaints from citizens are a perennial problem, especially in
public institutions. During the depression, schools were particularly
sensitive due to fierce competition for students and the fact that
education had surprisingly few vocal allies. A mere rumor often
launched an investigation of a faculty member who typically was considered guilty until proven otherwise. Tensions were extreme, and the accused often forfeited his paycheck pending completion of the investigation. Naturally a professor's treatment varied according to rank and reputation, a situation shocking to intellectuals but congruent with reality in the larger world.

Investigations of Ohio State's faculty reflected this phenomenon though these individuals generally received far more consideration than their counterparts in most institutions. Historians were in a particularly ticklish situation as aspects of their discipline were highly controversial, and the conservative nature of text-books inspired many teachers to close this gap in the classroom. Two neophyte instructors caused considerable commotion and one was criticized by the governor himself. Wittke defended them consistently and even ferociously, but privately he conceded they were causing far more trouble than they were worth. As the years wore on and complaints continued, these instructors became ever more discouraged and blatantly cynical. Finally Wittke visited their classes. He found the teaching to be totally ineffective and gave these individuals one year's notice. The decision was particularly agonizing for this famous defender of academic freedom, and the memory rankled to the day of Wittke's death.

Other controversies regarding Ohio's historians were resolved less traumatically. 1933 witnessed a gentleman "in the business of advising financial problems" demanding a full professor's dismissal on the basis of a newspaper article describing one of his speeches. After
checking the matter, President Rightmire advised this individual to mind his own business:

I sent your letter of April 19th . . . to the professor and have received from him a reply, a copy of which I beg to enclose. . .

. . .

As a general rule of procedure it seems inadvisable to criticise a speaker from a newspaper report. . .

May I suggest that as a preventative procedure hereafter when you read something said by a University professor which in your judgment is objectionable that you call the Professor and talk the matter over with him? . . . offensive names should be applied to these members of the teaching staff only after clear proof of their negligent or vicious purposes. . . I fail to see any reason for making an attack on the professor without first finding out exactly what he did say, in what connection he said it and what his own understanding of it was. . . .112

Fortunately not all such reports were critical, as witness a Chillicothe attorney's letter praising Professor Washburne:

I am led to wonder whether the Board of Trustees appreciates his strength and value. I do not know what degrees he may happen to hold or what his rank may be from scholastic recognition, but he has great scholarship and great natural ability which would, were he in any field where men are judged by their merits, rather than by degrees, place him in front rank in any field of endeavor.113

In addition a nucleus of dynamic professors proved eminently capable of defending themselves. Columbia's David Muzzey, for example, relished explaining his writings before an audience and did so repeatedly. When in 1936 his text was investigated by Washington, D.C.'s Piney Branch Citizens' Association, Muzzey descended on an open hearing, defending his book with such effectiveness that its retention was assured.
In the last analysis, however, academic freedom is more a state of mind than anything else, and scholars often categorize a university on the basis of a vague impression or isolated incident. Ohio State, for example, despite hard evidence to the contrary, retained its reputation as a school where academic freedom was not secure, prompting many to reject any thought of joining its faculty. For instance in 1937, three promising scholars refused offers to fill Wittke's old position. When asked thirtyfive years later why they had rejected Ohio State, Henry Steele Commager, John Hicks and Merle Curti all reflected similar concerns. A fear that academic freedom was insecure; a belief that athletics were overstressed; uncertainty concerning the quality of administrative leadership; and unhappiness with the school's reputation prompted these men to reject Ohio after giving it but little consideration.

In reality no school escaped the stresses and crises of the depression, and Ohio's situation was doubtlessly better than most. As in any protracted emergency, feelings were intensified as people became more threatened by opposing views and differences distinguishing one group from another became more obvious. Yet even without a depression, educators increasingly believed reforms were necessary if teachers were to function as effective professionals:

... The governing bodies of not a few American universities have a heavy burden of moral guilt to bear for the treatment accorded to professors whose conduct has been called in question...

Perhaps the day will come when every professor will be left free to teach what he pleases, as he pleases, and to whom he pleases, with no accountability save to his own intelligence and conscience; when the influence of the alumnus will diminish as his age increases; when the public
that questions what the university has to offer or how professors conduct themselves will be invited to stand aside; and the only practical function of a governing board will be to account for the funds which the professors expend; but it will be only when the American university shall have lost its present corporate character and responsibility of a trust under a law, and when the professoriate itself shall have been spiritually transformed.115

Another author "defended" administrators by asserting that spinelessness was a prerequisite for their survival:

... he who sets out with his eye on an administrative chair must know that a long wearisome stretch of bootlicking is before him. ... He has also discovered that there are many rights a man must surrender to get anywhere in the educational structure. Among these, first and foremost, is the prerogative to think, and act, for himself.116

Consequently, administrators were often less secure than teachers, for without a strong power base, a president's high visibility rendered him even more vulnerable than most professors. Especially during the depression presidents led exceedingly precarious existences attempting to satisfy pressures from many directions particularly the alumni, trustees and faculty. Also as jobs became scarcer, some of the most prominent advocates of rugged individualism and laissez faire capitalism pulled every string imaginable attempting to secure employment or even an assistantship for a friend or relative. Bombarded by numerous pressures, and confronted with needs exceeding financial realities, a chief executive's lot was seldom enviable. Trustees seldom tolerated those who questioned or defied them, and occasionally took it for granted that a president must be obsequious:

... There are three serious mistakes that boards may be tempted to make in appointing a president... Thirdly-- and this is the most deadly of all sins against an
institution of higher learning—a board in its efforts to control the faculty may appoint as president a man who will be subservient to its will, with little regard to qualifications of leadership or of scholarship.  

Trustees' preference for good news over bad frequently led to the suppression of vital information. Thus President Rightmire, despite a keen interest in curricular reform, prevented disseminating a Ph.D. thesis pinpointing weaknesses in the courses of study. His letter to Dean McPherson stated:  

A view of the nature of the material and the fact that it intimately brings to the surface our own weaknesses lead me to believe that there is no purpose in printing and distributing this study.  

This graduate dean, though a man of unquestionable integrity, agreed it was inadvisable to air soiled linen:  

In reference to your letter of December 16th, . . . I would say that this thesis has been deposited in our vault and will not be accessible to anyone; . . . I have no desire to print this thesis.  

Though university presidents faced similar problems, their responses were quite different. Harvard's Lowell threatened to resign when he felt academic freedom was being imperiled. He was, nonetheless, blindly partial to England and prevented pro Germans from speaking on the campus while extending invitations to British sympathizers. Depression pressures and advancing old age caused a certain tarnishing of Lowell's image though few judged him second rate or the pawn of anyone. While financial problems were minimal, he encountered many difficulties stating on one occasion, "Sometimes I wish I were the head of a penitentiary. Then I should have little trouble with parents and none with the alumni."
Lowell was particularly incensed at American Ph.D. programs which he felt reduced the degree to a college teaching certificate bearing little relationship to the intelligence of the recipient or the caliber of his work. Lowell also detected a mad scramble for students, and charged universities took greater pride in statistics than quality. In 1933 after failing to reform his own graduate faculty, Lowell donated $1,500,000 to establish Eliot House. Fellows were to have three years of "room, board, and a generous allowance" free of any regulations related to degree candidacy. Schlesinger endorsed the program by sending Arthur Jr. to Eliot house where he established his scholarly reputation instead of fretting over requirements. Not all professors supported this program, however, and some charged Lowell with exceeding his rightful authority in initiating it.

Mention was previously made of Nicholas Murray Butler who greatly improved Columbia's physical and financial resources during a twenty year tenure while purportedly dismissing over 40 faculty members plus uncounted legions of students. He endorsed teaching freedom but admonished his faculty "... that the adventure ceases once the class is over." During World War I, Butler shared the failings of many administrators by dismissing teachers on the basis of limited evidence. For example, he dismissed Leon Fraser for being pro-German after Fraser had already enlisted in the American army.

Evidence indicates that Wisconsin's presidents did little to preserve academic freedom during this period. George Sellery, long-time dean of arts and sciences, defended his faculty repeatedly from accusations by President Frank who tried and failed to force Sellery's
resignation. Glenn Frank's conviction that "powerful forces" monitored his actions and contemplated his dismissal emasculated his effectiveness. Despite this fact machinery previously set in motion continued to protect the faculty and to fend off assaults on "radicals." Professors continued to dominate policy making, particularly in areas of the budget and the selection of administrators:

Deans and other high administrative officers were usually chosen as the result of faculty consensus ... and their tenure of office depended primarily upon their success in representing accurately faculty opinion.122 Consequently John Hicks' description of Wisconsin's presidents as "constitutional monarchs" appears accurate.

Illinois' President Kinley was known as an ultra conservative who quashed liberal tendencies wherever they appeared. Many teachers fled the institution, despite generous salaries, and Ohio State was enriched by the addition of Arthur Cole, George Arps and several others.

The final years of President Thompson's administration were not as fruitful as those prior to 1920. Tired and in poor health, only the strenuous insistence that he remain kept Thompson from resigning. That George Wells Knight understood this is reflected in a congratulatory letter he wrote when Thompson finally did retire in 1925:

This letter is by way of being the carrier of greetings to you from all three of us on your coming birthday anniversary in November—the day that marks another mile post for you, and the release from the presidential prison in which you have served so long a term ... 123

Yet despite these limitations, Ohio's academic freedom remained secure while Thompson was in office. He rebuffed community efforts to
influence university policy by insisting that no citizen, regardless of pedigree or position could criticize a professor's teaching. Students were also protected by this kindly man who defended their right of free expression to the point of loaning them the auditorium.

Though several professors like Homer Hockett attempted to hire an assistant to share the president's duties and postpone his retirement, the inevitable took place in 1925 with Thompson's resignation. While a president was being located, George W. Rightmire took over on an interim basis. A man of modest pretensions who initially believed the board had played a joke on him by announcing his appointment, Rightmire nonetheless entered a roaring controversy centering on Governor Victor Donahey's determination to investigate alleged liquor violations and communistic activities on campus. The new president proved sufficiently adroit to win high praise from both the faculty and the governor who conceded that the university was not guilty as charged. Such leadership convinced the trustees that Rightmire should be president, and early in 1926 the term "acting" was deleted from his title.

Rightmire faced an awesome task. Senior faculty members so revered Thompson that in their opinion no one could ever replace him. In addition presidential powers were severely limited, a situation which even Thompson was unable to alter officially. Since Rightmire had initially been installed on an acting basis, no clarification of his authority was ever made, and because the board had suddenly and unilaterally appointed him, the implications were clear concerning
who held the power. Faculty members proved unsympathetic of Rightmire's plight, and their criticism of him thrust the president deeper into the board's embrace.

The depression accentuated the problem of weak executive leadership as Ohio State lurched from crisis to crisis. Rightmire, a gentle­man with real love for his university, never understood that not everyone else was passionately interested in seeing the school prosper. Consequently if a need existed, he believed that carefully explaining the situation was all that was required. For example, when one applicant proved the outstanding candidate for a deanship, Rightmire was utterly undone when the board rejected this individual for political reasons. And typically, during depression economizing, Ohio State's president was its only employee requesting a pay cut larger than that assigned him.

Rightmire's most famous activity was the reading of works authored by faculty members, and over the years he sent hundreds of letters urging professors to continue their research. Scholars sending him materials often received detailed replies such as the following suggestion to expand an article into a book:

I have read with great interest your article "German Contributions to America" appearing in the March, 1929 issue of The World Tomorrow. . . . Such a complete discussion as you would give this subject if you had ample space would be of the greatest interest to me. I do not know whether you have undertaken this matter in a larger way or not but if you have I should be pleased indeed to have the opportunity of looking over it.124

Over a dozen professors corresponded regularly with Rightmire on issues of the day. Homer Hockett was one such professor as the
president admired his scholarship and welcomed his suggestions. The following, sent in the troubled spring of 1933, is typical:

Appropos of your recent circular letter to the faculty concerning the Student Book Exchange. . . Since reduced sales and smaller editions will mean higher prices on new books, it seems to me not unlikely that what the student saves today by using secondhand books, he will spend tomorrow in the form of higher prices for the new texts which will have to be bought. Besides, there is a disadvantage of using, in many cases, out of date books, and the inhibition of the desirable habit of keeping one's books as one cherishes friends.125

Rightmire was criticized for failing to take a firm stand on issues, one professor asserting that dealing with the president was "like pushing a feather pillow." While appearing to agree with whomever he was speaking, Rightmire seldom committed himself or promised any action. He gave little evidence of having a central plan, and generally operated in response to specific prodding. Rightmire did, however, press vigorously to improve teaching quality and reduce class sizes and achieved some success prior to depression budget cuts. His respect for research caused the conviction that anyone promoted to professor, "... be an acknowledged scholar in his field who is constantly advancing the outposts of his science."126 Since Ohio's salaries, library facilities and teaching loads could not compete with prestige schools, many teachers protested this tightening of standards. Wittke supported Rightmire, however, and by enforcing promotion standards comparable to Harvard's, this historian gained several determined enemies.

Faculty-trustee difficulties were exacerbated by Rightmire's inability to assume decisive leadership. Consequently influential
professors approached the board directly, thus dragging trustees into faculty feuds. One example of this took place following Wittke's recruitment of an established scholar to join his department, a move Rightmire immediately applauded:

I shall have great pleasure in presenting to the Board of Trustees . . . the nomination of . . . It is highly pleasing that Professor Wittke and yourself (Dean Walter Shepard) have been able to add this man of highest quality . . . to the University staff. He will receive a warm welcome here. 127

At this point a historian aborted the man's routine approval by informing the board that the candidate was a known Communist. This revelation shocked the trustees who to their credit requested more information rather than rejecting him outright. Rightmire transmitted this request to Wittke who, not knowing otherwise, charged the board with usurping his authority and offered to resign:

... My conclusion must be that for some reason, not as yet clear to me, the Board and the administration are not willing to accept my recommendations . . . in the light of my conduct as an administrator in the past . . . If I am correct in this assumption, I shall be most happy to be relieved of all administrative duties at the earliest possible moment. 128

Meanwhile, trustee Newton D. Baker found these developments puzzling since his position on another board made him aware that Western Reserve was bidding for the same man and that several other schools including Columbia were also exhibiting considerable interest. Baker deemed it unlikely that several major schools would be courting a known Communist and wrote Rightmire to this effect. Baker's curiosity infected other trustees who devoted many hours
researching this rumor and found it completely groundless. Consequently the man did come to Ohio State, and Rightmire informed Baker of what had actually transpired:

* * *

Off the record, let me say that ten years ago we had a Department of American History and a Department of European History, but these were merged and a younger professor of American history was made the chairman of the single department. This action... aroused certain adverse feeling on the part of several of the men who had been in the Department of European History... Information about the present situation... doubtless went to a member of the Board from one of the dissatisfied professors.129

Quite obviously, professors often fail to act in their own or their institution's best interest. Though schools became larger and more impersonal, teachers remained stubbornly independent, a trait Upton Sinclair feared endangered the professorial species:

The average professor in an American college will look on an act of injustice done to a brother professor by their college president with the same unconcern as the rabbit who is not attacked watches the ferret pursue his brother up and down through the warren to a predestinate and horrible death.130

Edward Alsworth Ross identified a new breed of professor, the "university sneak," who advanced his own fortunes by spying on colleagues and reporting his findings to university officials. Such people, he asserted, were not invariably truthful in what they said. Ross felt trustees accepted such behavior in keeping with normal business practices, but could not understand why professors themselves failed to halt it. "Were we scholars roused and bold how quickly we would freeze these reptiles out of the faculty."131 Other teachers were sufficiently tactless to publicize their disagreements though
some were quite humorous. At Ohio State, for example, an engineering professor's dog visited a historian's lecture and vomited on the floor. The scholar became enraged, halted his lecture and burst into an engineering class taught by the dog's owner. Shouting from the back of the room, the historian described what had just occurred. The engineer's retort, "If your lectures have that effect on dogs, think what they must do to students," quickly became a campus classic.

Other situations were far less defensible. Some Ohio State historians traded insults across the hall during class changes. A Big Ten history chairman who resigned in anger spent the rest of his life avenging a perceived injustice. For over thirty years, nearly every speech he uttered disparaged his former institution, and he always told those considering teaching there to "avoid it like the plague." After two decades had failed to dim this hatred, the school's vice president visited him attempting to gain his cooperation in hiring another history chairman. Though the man agreed to cooperate, he remained the same and endorsed an unsuitable candidate already past his prime.

Interdepartmental rivalries often intensified during this era. Just as prior to 1900 Hopkins professors accused H.B. Adams of teaching "snap" courses, liberal arts teachers increasingly charged that education schools employed the same device. As early as 1919, Ohio's Thompson sought to end such rivalries by remarking, "As far as I know there has never been an increase in salary recommended in this university because of the number of students in a department."
In fact, antagonism toward education professors came to be expected in most schools. G. W. Knight advocated placing education teachers in academic departments, a plan not dissimilar to one later adopted at Wisconsin. Though the initiator and teacher of Ohio's first social studies education course, Knight like many old timers was contemptuous of professional educators. It is therefore surprising that Knight was Dean of the college of education for six years prior to 1920, and it appears likely his appointment was engineered by those seeking to minimize the influence of this college.

In 1962, Carl Wittke received the following praise while accepting an honorary degree from Ohio State:

Inspiring teacher, distinguished historian, able administrator, wise counselor of youth, true exemplar of the liberal arts tradition, whose efforts have enriched the life of the commonwealth and the community of scholars.133

This recalled for some in the audience the day in 1937 when he had suddenly resigned as history chairman. Wittke's exit had constituted an important event in a feud of long standing. In fact Wittke's Ohio State career with its challenges, victories and defeats mirrors a troubled period in higher education and compares with numerous situations in other universities.

In 1925 Knight stepped down as chairman of American history, a post he had held forty years, though often in conjunction with other positions. Though two history departments had long existed as the result of the rivalry between Knight and Siebert, plans were made to unite these factions under a single administrator. Siebert, chief of European history since 1901, enjoyed twin reputations first as a
scholar and second as a gentleman of high community standing who entertained elegantly, moved in the best of circles, and embodied respectable conservatism. Knight failed to esteem Siebert for a number of reasons. First, he envied Siebert's reputation as a scholar and resented being almost unknown outside Ohio's borders. Also, despite Knight's best efforts, he never became as much as Siebert a part of the community's ruling establishment and was jealous of Siebert's place in its ranks. In addition, Knight considered himself more liberal than his arch rival.

As both men neared retirement, each sought to groom an heir apparent to chair a united department. All Ohio historians had been hired by one of these men, so that European scholars tended to favor Siebert more than Knight while the reverse was true of American specialists. Dean Walter Shepard understood this problem in seeking to select the best possible chairman and recommended a man he believed was not associated with either senior historian. Shepard apparently miscalculated as Wittke's appointment was hailed as a great victory for Professor Knight, and it is true that the new chairman respected Knight whose picture was one of two remaining in Wittke's study when the latter died in 1971. Consequently a new administrator fell heir to an old feud and realized it immediately. He explained:

In accepting the appointment as chairman of the American History Department I am yielding to a situation which seems to make such action inevitable. . . . Professor Hockett . . . feels that my selection as Chairman further illustrates the administration's disposition to underestimate his ability, and the selection of a younger man will probably continue to be a source of irritation to him for a long time to come.
Secondly I am wondering seriously what may be the outcome of your plans to coalesce the two history departments. These difficulties may be aggravated by the disposition of some to carry their cases high up, possibly to the Board of Trustees.

Finally, the position of chairman will carry no honor with it off the campus, and I doubt very much whether it will carry any on the campus. As you know, I am much disappointed because the administration could not find it possible to give me at least the minimum salary for the professorial rank.

Complete candor compels me to say, however, that in view of these conditions, I am disposed to consider any offers I may receive. including the recent one from Lafayette College.

Wittke's fears were soon realized as Knight's rapidly declining health rendered him incapable of countering Siebert's efforts to erode the new chairman's authority. As an example, Siebert used his office as acting dean of arts and sciences to promote George Washburne from assistant to full professor during a summer that Wittke was teaching at the University of Chicago. Washburne, who became as thoroughly linked to Siebert as Wittke was with Knight, could hardly refuse this promotion which reflected his patron's status far more than his own. The chairman was enraged to learn of this in a second-handed fashion and sent his resignation in to Ohio's president. Rightmire, who had majored in history under Knight and admired him deeply, was equally fond of Wittke and simply ignored his resignation, a drama which repeated itself on a number of occasions.

Consequently the chairman returned from Chicago to participate in an old feud being relived in new bodies. Washburne, who had been assailed by Wittke as unworthy of advancement, had little to lose in
embracing a patron capable of overriding the chairman and securing the only promotion received by an Ohio State historian in 1927. Washburne, like his mentor Siebert, was socially active, a gracious host and an ardent conservative. Though not a wealthy man, he had some means and identified with the social elite. Wittke on the other hand was contemptuous of the community establishment and unpopular with Ohio's trustees who considered him a reckless liberal. Both men accumulated a following thus continuing the old rift between Knight and Siebert.

Wittke's department soon became two hostile camps with a greater reputation for in-fighting than for scholarship. Many innocent actions fell victim to this conflict. Washburne dated Knight's daughter and was charged with trying to rise by devious means. Actually, Mrs. Knight instigated this courtship in hopes of a society wedding for her daughter, and neither member of the pair was seriously interested in the other. Another professor named his son Washburne after a favorite relative and was ever thereafter charged with dramatizing his preference for departmental leadership. One could go on for pages discussing such squabbles, but suffice it to say that Walter Shephard's death in 1936 exploded this controversy into a nationally known conflict.

This dean's departure created a void no one was able to fill. As Ohio State's best known administrator, he had enjoyed a national reputation for leadership and counted some of America's most famous intellectuals among his personal friends. A preliminary search for Shepherd's successor quickly established two facts. First, the reality of Ohio's finances made it highly unlikely that an eminent
outsider would accept this deanship when Rightmire himself earned less than some chairmen in prestige institutions. Second, people queried generally felt that Carl Wittke was the best person available who would accept the position, for over the years he had grown steadily in stature as a scholar of national prominence and an administrator of tested effectiveness. Some older individuals, however, held his relative youth against him and faulted his liberal tendencies.

President Rightmire then met the trustees, explained the problems of recruiting a dean and suggested Wittke be appointed. Simultaneously, the faculty voiced its preference for Wittke in a rare display of unity and for a complicated set of reasons. Wittke was a rarity being a proven scholar and administrator while still young and energetic and contrasted markedly with the aging Siebert once again serving as acting dean. Wittke was also, however, a strident opponent of community and trustee interference who had repeatedly resisted these elements and succeeded to a surprising degree in blunting their efforts. He was not particularly tactful, however, and over the years his blunt words had drawn much blood. Just as the late Adam Clayton Powell's supporters admired his "telling off" the establishment, pro Wittke forces perceived this historian as a symbol of ringing defiance.

The trustees concurred in this assessment, rejected Wittke and established a faculty committee to prepare a slate of candidates. Once again only Wittke was nominated, prompting the board to dissolve the committee and form another which did precisely the same thing. To emphasize faculty resolve, a "secret" meeting was called which endorsed
Wittke 84-4 while Henry Spencer coordinated a drive to force the historian's appointment:

... The Trustees must not be allowed to suppose that the faculty has lost interest or will supinely accept the situation... In such case they will come to think they can count on our passivity and appoint any person without regard to faculty opinion, appoint perhaps a mediocre or merely acquiescent person... 

Hiring a distinguished outsider seemed the only way out, and the trustees vowed to locate this individual. By this time, however, Ohio's difficulties were so well known one doubts if such a person could have been lured at any price. In addition, Graduate Dean McPherson was scheduled to retire in September of 1936, and Wittke was a viable candidate for this position as well. Failing to find one eminent outsider, the board despaired of locating two. Nonetheless inquiries were made concerning McPherson's replacement, and men such as Arthur Schlesinger and Guy Stanton Ford again proclaimed Wittke the best man available.

By this time, however, and for reasons not entirely clear, Wittke was visibly losing faculty support. Reports of opposition began to surface, and one of his staunchest supporters alerted Spencer of a shift taking place:

... While I am personally disposed to join in the renomination of Wittke, I know as you do that all chairmen will not be willing to participate.

Acting Dean Siebert informed the board that the faculty's endorsement of Wittke only signified that militant professors were forcing colleagues to support him. Soon thereafter, the usually
submissive Hockett, who over the years had become ever more impressed with his chairman, urged all historians counter such rumors by informing Rightmire of their preference for Wittke. Letters the president received, however, were penned only by American historians, indicating a split in Wittke's own department and lending credence to Siebert's assertion.

Then in March of 1937, the tenor of Ohio's board changed considerably following Julius Stone's resignation after twenty years' service. Though a great conservative power and certainly no friend of Wittke's, he had remained neutral and almost silent during the deanship controversy thus greatly abetting the board's impasse. When Larry Laybourne became chairman, pro Wittke forces received a mortal blow as Laybourne knew Siebert through his son who had enjoyed his classes and formed a friendship with the professor. Then in a lightning move which amazed everyone, the board appointed Bland Stradley, a man heretofore unmentioned as a candidate, to be Dean of Arts and Sciences. Then just as suddenly and probably after even less contemplation, Wittke accepted an Oberlin deanship and resigned his position.

Bland Stradley proved a colorful individualist who delighted in shattering stereotypes. A former university examiner known especially for arbitrating disputes, he held a Harvard M.A. in education and never taught a liberal arts course except in country schools. He sought to stress practicality in hopes of improving student placement, feeling that intellectual development meant little to those with empty stomachs. Professors tended to resist this philosophy and were
not reassured when Stradley tried to put "think" at the front of every classroom or invited teachers to his farm to participate in milking contests. At one such event Stradley boasted that he recognized each of his 100 sheep and vowed soon to know his teachers equally well. While one scholar assailed him as, "The poorest, most uneducated dean the U.S. has ever seen," another contended his colleagues opposed Stradley blindly with no thought of trying to work with him.

In reality Ohio's situation had become so untenable that anyone chosen dean immediately became the sworn enemy of one faction or another. Consequently, a major university became paralyzed by dissen­sion at the very time it could least afford it. Yet even with the benefit of hindsight, it is difficult to assign blame for the situation or to see how both sides could have been reconciled. It also appears evident that similar feuding repeated itself in institutions of all sizes and was the rule rather than the exception.

Bitter controversies plagued Ohio State throughout the thirties, and the search for Wittke's replacement proved no exception. Promising younger candidates were approached and invited to fill the position, but few agreed even to be interviewed. Doubtlessly, numerous history resignations including those of Carl Wittke, Huntley Dupre and W. P. Hotchkiss compounded the department's recruitment problems. Complic­ating matters was a financial situation so grave that any position remaining unfilled generally lost its funding. Also, the person
selected needed Stradley's approval. On one occasion, for example, he vetoed the author of a Chester Arthur biography by stating:

... He has written one book on a man who did not rise much above an ordinary politician and who was known by all intelligent people to belong to the tribe of mediocrity.\(^\text{140}\)

In the absence of a chairman, Robinson, Washburne and Hockett ran the department as a triumvirate. Robinson, who had left Miami to escape administrative duties hardly welcomed them at Ohio State and resigned to accept another position. Hockett, busy at his research and uninterested in new responsibilities, nonetheless cooperated with Washburne who proved an energetic and conscientious executive committee chairman. Both hoped an outsider would soon lead the department, and as the month's dragged on, Washburne became less than subtle:

We have... completed today the Annual Report... With its transmission to you my work as chairman of the Executive Committee comes to a final conclusion... I should, therefore, like to ask to be excused from further service on the Executive Committee.\(^\text{141}\)

Once again a familiar problem plagued the university. Wittke's precipitous departure compounded by the school's known difficulties made securing a "name" chairman as unlikely as recruiting an outstanding dean. In addition, Ohio's best known historians were totally disinterested in the post, and not wishing to be "drafted," proved increasingly anxious to endorse anyone willing to accept it. Consequently Washburne came to realize that yesterday's improbability might be tomorrow's reality, as he was the sole executive committee member willing to be chairman. Although little known as a scholar he could count on the board's endorsement, the support of Siebert and other
community leaders, the acquiescence of colleagues unwilling to volunteer and unable to find anyone better, and the approval of Bland Stradley who admired Washburne's popularity as a teacher.

Consequently in the spring of 1938 the trustees, Stradley and the historians agreed to make Washburne chairman; not out of special enthusiasm for him, but rather in hopes of picking up and continuing long neglected business. From the outset he proved highly controversial and capable of inspiring deep affection as well as genuine hatred. Even more than Wittke represented Knight's leadership, Washburne was considered Siebert's creature, immediately triggering powerful forces both for and against him. In a letter to the author, Francis P. Weisenburger describes the Washburne era as he recalled it:

The Department missed the aggressive leadership of Wittke and labored under much unhappy dissension. But intra department rivalry and factionalism were not uncommon in many institutions where some professors (and their wives) were not always on speaking terms with other families of the Department. In those days Departments were often not highly regimented, and full professors in particular, frequently followed a rather independent academic life. When Washburne became chairman at Ohio State in 1938, his ability to change the Department was severely limited by other factors than those relating to him personally. The country was just recovering from a severe Depression so money for expansion was limited indeed. Then, for many years the Department faced a concern for the nation's defense and a devastating war, taxing the financial resources of the country. For years while Washburne was chairman enrollment declined, as able-bodied men entered the country's service. But, despite deep differences of opinion, members of the Department carried on their work, often with a deep sense of dedication. The fundamental courses as well as the more advanced ones in history continued to draw many students, and much attention was given by professors to the work of individuals seeking a Master's or Doctor's degree. The Department had various members who were nationally known for their scholarship and publication record. Henry Simms, for example, had published The Rise of the Whigs in
Virginia (Richmond, 1929): The Life of John Taylor (Richmond, 1932); and The Life of Robert M.T. Hunter, a Study in Sectionalism and Secession (Richmond, 1935). Early during Washburne's chairmanship, he was to publish A Decade of Sectional Controversy, 1851-1861 (Chapel Hill, 1942), a book widely used in courses on Southern history.

Lawrence Hill had published Jose de Escandon and the Founding of Nuevo Santander (Columbus, 1926); The Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Brazil (Durham, 1932); and The Confederate Exodus to Latin America (Austin, 1936).

Hockett had cooperated with Arthur M. Schlesinger in producing the most widely used undergraduate text in the field of American history and had published a scholarly work on Western Influences on Political Parties to 1825, as well as Introduction to Research in American History (New York, 1931) and, beginning in 1939 a two-volume Constitutional History of the United States. Eugene H. Roseboom and Francis P. Weisenburger were widely known for their work in the field of Ohio History.

If the Department after 1938 seemed "stagnant" to some, not only the aftermath of the depression and (but also) a bitter war made the introduction of new blood into the Department as replacements well nigh impossible. Indeed, of the assistant, associate, and full professors in the Department in 1938 every one remained on and continued at Ohio State until his retirement. (Walter Dorn after his retirement from Ohio State spent some years on the Columbia University faculty, and Harold Grimm spent a few years at Indiana University before returning to Ohio State where he retired in 1972. Sydney Fisher who joined the Department as an instructor in 1937 and Harold Grimm who came as an assistant professor in 1937 did later add to the offerings in Near Eastern and Reformation History respectively.)

Eventually a replacement was to be found for Wittke as Foster Rhea Dulles joined the Department in 1941. Dulles was a very popular lecturer and a prodigious writer, as he authored many historical books with a distinctly journalistic approach.142

As stated previously, academic freedom was accepted in all major universities, but its implementation varied widely. One dispute of particular notoriety involved Ohio State's Herbert A. Miller who although a professor of sociology, found historians his most ardent allies during the bitter struggle following his dismissal in 1931.
What precipitated this action is difficult to ascertain, but the lone surviving board member\textsuperscript{143} substantiates Ely's contention that scholars are their own worst enemies by recalling that faculty members themselves first alerted the trustees to Miller's activities.

As a teacher, Miller apparently was colorful, controversial, superbly interesting and so unforgettable that to this day former students remember him vividly and recall his exact words. One such individual claims a single phrase changed his life when the professor burst into class stating, "The D.A.R. is dedicated to the preservation of dead radicals."\textsuperscript{144} Others recall his contention that Ohio embodied the Klan's philosophy during this era when Jesse Owens was denied election to the school's athletic honorary society. Among other activities, Miller conducted a strident, lonely crusade on behalf of Blacks, and on at least one occasion escorted students to Wilberforce where they ate, socialized and even danced with Negroes. Besides denying white superiority this professor proved an ardent internationalist in an isolationist era, and even asserted the "American way" was not necessarily the best. A globe trotter of sufficient diversity to be Gandhi's friend and a drafter of Czechoslovakia's constitution, Miller was an anomaly in Columbus, Ohio where clergymen judged him injurious to the faith and morals of youth.

Though Shepard and others mobilized the faculty on Miller's behalf, they did so only to protect academic freedom since this controversial figure had drawbacks conceded by everyone. A man proud to be blatantly controversial, he went out of his way to bait the establishment and was more intolerant in his liberalism than any conservative
imaginable. Carl Wittke, who returned early from Europe to aid Miller, admitted he did so despite the fact this professor "did some very foolish things." Because Wittke chaired the American Association of University Professor's Committee "A" concerning itself with academic freedom, he initiated the investigation which censured Ohio State, exonerated Miller, and gave the school bad publicity not entirely deserved.

When this episode was finally completed and Miller had departed, the trustees instituted a formalized procedure for dismissing professors which greatly strengthened the teacher's position and made it nearly impossible for anyone else to suffer Miller's fate. Acting from a position of strength, the board effectively conceded the faculty lacked basic rights and moved on its own to correct the situation. Wisconsin, Harvard and other schools had similar experiences whereby a dismissed professor precipitated reform though he himself failed to benefit from this or win reinstatement. Arthur Schlesinger, for example, was unsuccessful in averting the dismissal of two Harvard economists. Nonetheless reforms soon followed greatly strengthening the faculty's position:

Suffice it to say that they completely revolutionized the system of faculty recruitment, advancement and tenure, including the introduction of a new and more logical salary schedule.146

The controversy concerning R.O.T.C. intensified to the point that some militants insisted it not be permitted to exist on university campuses. The sympathy for this training articulated by conservative, "patriotic" organizations tended to irritate liberals and
led to the abolishment of R.O.T.C. requirements at several schools including Wisconsin and Michigan while some universities like Chicago and Virginia never even instituted military training. Schools at the other end of the spectrum included Indiana and to some extent Ohio State where opposition to R.O.T.C. could result in the possibility of dismissal.

Tempers flared in Columbus when during the depression, a coalition of liberal professors sought to end compulsory military training. One historian whose experience in the recent war converted him to pacifism proved sufficiently outspoken for the authorities to demand and accept his resignation. Students claiming exemption from R.O.T.C. on religious grounds were invited to change their minds or be expelled by President Rightmire who apparently forgot that as a student he had avoided military training on a similar technicality. Ohio State officials approved these dismissals at the same time they condemned the curtailment of liberties in Germany.

During the previous decade, a committee had been assembled to investigate military training from an "educational point of view," and the majority report, endorsed by faculty vote, lauded compulsory R.O.T.C.:

Aside from its value as a defensive measure, the committee feels that military science has merit from the standpoint of both physical education and discipline. Being required to do a specific thing in a specific way at a specific time, without discussion, is perhaps as helpful as anything an average boy gets from his college course.
The committee believes that to make the military work optional would greatly decrease the number taking part for real military work can not be made popular any more than can other forms of work. From this it appears safe to forecast that optional military science would result in a weakening of the defensive plans of the Nation. 148

Historian Arthur Cole was one committee member who challenged the majority viewpoint and authored his own report encapsulating anti-R.O.T.C. sentiment:

It should first be pointed out that the Morrill Act. assigned no place in the curriculum to military training. [Actually the Act provided for "including military training" in the instruction.]

... military training in American colleges has largely come since the passage of the National Defense Act of 1920. ... It should be noted that the compulsory feature was generally rejected.

... During the World War, the University of Michigan, in which there had never been any provision for military drill, had 29% of its graduates holding army commissions, nearly one-half as many more than the Ohio State average of 20.7%.

... The discipline in which an educational institution is primarily interested is not that of "being required to do a specific thing in a specific way at a specific time without discussion."

It should be borne in mind that the military department is not under the jurisdiction of the University Faculty. ... It reflects ... a specifically privileged position. 149

The period between the wars saw a vigilant monitoring of teachers' private lives. Immorality was everywhere condemned, but its definition varied greatly. In retrospect it seems all professors should have checked the do's and don'ts of any school prior to accepting employment. Being a pacifist, for example, could be exceedingly dangerous or hardly noticed. One institution while intolerant of pacifists might pay slight attention to other behavior. Ohio
State, for example, considered pacifism a cardinal sin, but tended to overlook moral indiscretions by faculty members. Even when a prominent businessman charged an untenured historian with "ruining" his wife, nothing was done about it. Yet an English teacher found drinking in his home was immediately dismissed with little opportunity to defend himself.

In prestigious Eastern schools, accepting a philosophy like atheism, socialism or even communism might not be particularly dangerous so long as the professor dressed and acted like a gentleman and eschewed heresy in the lecture hall. In the Midwest such people often led suspenseful existances while in the South, they were nearly non-existant. On the other hand, conservatives could be hounded mercifully and even fired from liberal institutions. While almost any professor could find acceptance and some recognition were he free to choose from a wide range of schools, anyone, no matter how honorable or industrious, might face misery and possible dismissal in some institutions. One depression tragedy was that almost everyone had to accept any position he could find. Consequently, many schools contained some very unhappy professors who became less and less effective. Yet, when such people were dismissed, they often fought bitterly to retain jobs they loathed and in normal times would never have accepted. Thus even the employed could be very unhappy during the depression.

A perennial controversy centered on student quality particularly in one's own university. Midwestern teachers often considered their students inferior to Eastern undergraduates. Ohio's Arthur Cole
endorsed this theory, crusading for tighter standards and for incentives rewarding academic excellence. He once estimated that a third of his students could not do creditable work:

Standards are too low. . . . It would be best to take the highest two-thirds or three-quarters of high school graduates with the right given to others to take entrance examinations.150

Others disagreed, took great pride in their students and considered them second to none. William Oxley Thompson was one such administrator who devoted his last annual report to countering rumors he believed untrue:

So much has been said and written about the modern college student in a critical tone and in a spirit of pessimism that it would seem worth while to review the experience of a quarter of a century with Ohio boys and girls. . . . They represent the best youth of the State. . . .

The common assumption so current in the past decade that students are not up to standard, intellectually, morally, or socially, is more chargeable to a poor memory than to an accurate comparison of two generations.151

Thompson had distinguished allies. Arthur Schlesinger admired his Midwestern students and kept in touch with Ohio throughout his career. Pennsylvania's Edward P. Cheyney denied his students were superior to those elsewhere, asserting that one-third were incapable of satisfactory work. In fact, some Eastern professors preferred institutions further west and felt their schools were stagnating:

In the middle and far west the spirit is very different. . . . The chasm between ideals and practice is greatly narrowed. . . . One meets everywhere those who have new and original ideas who have often been allowed to carry them into effect. . . . The female element is everywhere more recognizable and potent. . . . The chief
academic influence is from the newer state institutions... The future weighs relatively more than the past, the precedents of which are less firmly in the saddle. The life of the community flows more richly through institutions of every grade.152

Therefore, as is true today, student quality was a moot controversy with professors tending to criticize their own situation while minimizing problems afar.

Thus it seems evident that most controversies of the twenties and thirties have not been wholly solved even today. Though ideological warfare raged throughout the thirties, it inspired few reforms and failed to alter the educational landscape. Today, in the seventies, grim necessity forces many over the same blood-stained ground.

Salaries, University Finances and Physical Facilities

During the late teens, a fierce demand for goods and services inflated costs at a rate unparalleled since the Revolutionary War. From 1916 to 1920 essentials were doubling in price while university pay raises averaged 11 percent. By the mid 1920's matters had improved considerably as the cost of living index dropped from 216.5 in June of 1920 to 175.6 by December of 1926 while efforts to raise teachers' pay succeeded in elevating average real salaries to their 1913 level. Nonetheless, Homer Hockett, a full professor earning double that of the average American college teacher, claimed financial discomfiture in an open letter to President Thompson presented as a "Bulletin of Information and Advice" to newly hired professors. By painting a bleak picture for those of the highest rank, Hockett left unsaid the obvious assumption that no hope remained for lesser mortals.
Using the average full professor's salary of $4,250, he detailed how to spend the entire amount right down to $36 for medical expenses and $54 for miscellaneous needs. Some words of caution were also included:

... (Son's education) The son will have to be taught to rustle for himself. A few years spent in knocking about while the son of a rich man is going ahead will not handicap him in the race.

... (Concerning wife) Advice to the professor at this point comes a trifle late, but... the professor's wife must be prepared to wash, iron, cook, scrub, nurse, and be her own modiste, seamstress, and milliner. As a voting citizen and Christian she must be a leader in women's civic, religious, and philanthropic work. As a woman of high talent she should be as willing as she is capable of helping out with the family budget by teaching or playing an organ in the movies. Of course, this should be done ostensibly for love of the work.

... (Travel) This subject is also somewhat delicate. Even attendance at the annual gathering of one's professional associates, the expenses of which some old-fashioned institutions still defray, is now known for the "junketing" trip it is.

... (Books) In these happy, philanthropic modern times the professor has great liberty in the use of the riches of the University library, limited only by the like liberty of six hundred other teachers and ten thousand students.

... (Hospitality)... There are some faculty families of independent means who entertain. You will in the course of time become indebted to them, but can be content with the knowledge that they probably understand exactly why you give no parties or receptions yourself; let us hope for the time when the President of a University will be recognized as official entertainer for the entire faculty. In a sense it will put him on a par with the library.

Looking at the matter in a large way, it may safely be concluded that you will find your salary to be quite an aid in meeting the expense of living among us.
Fortunately for Professor Hockett, book royalties ultimately afforded him a large second income. He and his mentor Frederick Jackson Turner were nonetheless concerned that low salaries coupled with difficulties in gaining scholarly recognition kept talented youth from entering the profession, and available evidence does show that new teachers were struggling to make ends meet:

... Mr. ..., the new instructor ..., is a very pleasant fellow. His wife ..., insists on working at the University Library, and spends her evenings teaching dancing of the interpretative type, at a studio downtown.\footnote{154}

While today it is routine for a wife to work, the above situation proved humiliating in a society where an employed spouse signified an impecunious breadwinner. Consequently, many historians sought second incomes in fields unrelated to their professional training, a situation which damaged the prestige of teaching.

During the twenties the rapid expansion of higher education created a demand for teachers, particularly experienced specialists to train advanced students. During this decade and to a surprising extent the thirties, such individuals were often hired at salaries equalling or exceeding those of senior department members\footnote{154}. This situation engendered great bitterness because pay often reflected the availability of outside offers rather than teaching or scholarly competence. This situation forced many historians to be itinerants who lavished considerable time politicking and soliciting job offers. Consequently, like ambitious businessmen, "successful" professors figuratively wrapped themselves in cellophane and marketed their
talents. Those who concentrated on good teaching and/or the betterment of their university, hopefully found virtue to be its own reward.

Unlike most businessmen, however, professors seeking to improve their salaries were doing so out of necessity. Despite a legendary individualism, some teachers were banding together in hopes of increasing their earnings. The Teachers' League of the Ohio State University was such an organization which in 1920 suggested all salaries be raised 50 percent to halt wholesale faculty resignations. Particularly vulnerable was the 19 member department of economics and sociology, 12 of whom quit in 1920 to accept offers from 20 percent to 100 percent more remunerative. Meanwhile, Governor Cox expressed his concern by declaring a special teachers' week and calling for an end to the instructor shortage which for a time prevented some students from enrolling in required courses.

In 1921, Ohio State teachers received the pay hikes they requested, particularly at the full professor level where resignations had been most numerous. Ten men without administrative duties now earned $6,000 while the average full professor advanced to $4,139, causing the Lantern to exult:

... The average salary to professors for next year will be exceeded in the Central West, ... only by Chicago and Michigan. The average paid to assistant professors and instructors ranks among the highest in the country.155

Despite this news, 46 more teachers resigned, but Ohio now was capable of plundering other faculties to gain needed personnel.

A problem plaguing larger schools was a general ignorance of effective bookkeeping and budgeting procedures. Departments used
funds freed by resignations to raise salaries of remaining members, only to create budgetary havoc when attempting to refill these vacancies. On the other hand, as already pointed out, it often proved impossible to retain these monies until new personnel could be hired. Mistakes also resulted from slipshod accounting methods. One Ohio professor received checks for a year after resigning because his chairman neglected to fill out a form, and the university felt powerless to recover the money.

The late 1920's witnessed a general easing of financial problems because budgets tended to increase faster than enrollments. Ohio's 1929-1930 appropriation was a third higher than the previous one, a situation typical throughout the nation, and one permitting administrators to look beyond survival and ponder matters like faculty fringe benefits. After a period of uncertainty, Americans seemed pleased with higher education and willing to support it with dollars as well as rhetoric. Full professors frequently earned $5,000 to $6,000, a very comfortable wage for that time. In addition, openings were plentiful so that new Ph.D.'s entered the profession with little difficulty. The situation was not perfect, but real progress could be cited which was anticipated to continue.

The bane of many historians was earning less while teaching heavier loads than many professors in other fields. Harvard, for example, placed an $8,000 ceiling for salaries in arts and sciences while law professors typically earned far more--occasionally twice as much. Again, this situation reflected the philosophy that job possibilities outside the university dictated one's compensation within
its walls, and like the majority of businesses most universities paid the "market price."

Attempts to remedy this situation achieved very little. Ohio's Rightmire attributed these discrepancies to poor central planning and for a time sought to eliminate them. He asked specifically why most psychologists had lighter teaching loads and double the salary of most historians. He discovered a certain psychology instructor earning nearly as much as an unnamed full professor of history. Also exposed, was one professor in educational research earning twice as much as the Dean of Arts and Sciences and considerably more than the president. While wide salary ranges continued at Ohio, Rightmire was most unusual in stating that historians should earn as much as anyone else. A number of scholars benefitted from this including Homer Hockett whose 1928 raise resulted from Rightmire's direct appeal to the trustees:

I experienced one of the great surprises of my life this morning when I received notice that at the Monday meeting of the Board of Trustees my salary was advanced. . . . Never before in the course of nineteen years at the University have I received a promotion of which I had no intimation in advance.

. . . Confidence that an administration is really capable of discriminating judgments in dealing with a numerous faculty is really worth as much to me as the money. 156

Matters changed for the worse at Ohio and elsewhere with the onset of the depression. The public hardened visibly towards educators as if blaming the academic community for the nation's woes. Professors' unpopularity and growing reputation as overpaid, unproductive parasites prompted several administrators to attribute public pressure
more than financial necessity to the pay slashes their teachers received. Several states including Ohio reduced teachers' compensation more often and more extensively than other public employees. In addition, professors were often last in having their salaries restored once matters returned to normal. This cognizance of public disenchantment tended to erode faculty morale more than any pay cut. The State of Ohio, for instance, funded an expensive roadbuilding program as originally planned while slashing university appropriations so extensively that for a time funds were unavailable to replace light bulbs in Ohio's library stacks.

The human cost of such financial strangulation can be illustrated by excerpting one of many letters Rightmire received. A teacher's wife explained that she and her daughters started a beauty shop to offset her husband's pay cuts, only to become destitute when he was dismissed for economy reasons.

... You may not know through actual experience what it means to have a large family and insufficient funds to cover the actual needs. To scheme, plan and budget--to get along, then have all support taken away. You may never experience this but you are human. This alone gives me courage to write to you.

Another letter which a recently dismissed English instructor sent to Rightmire, the trustees and the legislature charged that administrators protected themselves at faculty expense by making certain almost none of the former were dismissed. Several trustees and legislators were so incensed by this letter they demanded that a man who had already been dismissed be investigated and punished. Rightmire's vigorous intervention prevented this during 1933 when so many tempers
were frayed beyond repair and the American dream appeared smashed beyond recognition.

In relative terms, college teachers suffered minor pay reductions when contrasted with other professionals. One estimate states professors' cuts averaged 15 percent compared to 62 percent for consulting engineers; 47 percent for dentists, 42 percent for medical doctors, 30 percent for lawyers and 26 percent for ministers. Averages mask individual situations, however, and a teacher receiving a 40 percent pay slash took little comfort in learning that the average was 15 percent. Another factor to consider is that excepting the ministry, those occupations cited were more remunerative than teaching so that pay cuts often affected these individuals less. In addition, such people could often draw on savings while most professors could not accumulate substantial amounts.

One also must mention that behind any statistics was a widespread belief, carefully nurtured by administrators, that in exchange for unattractive salaries, teachers enjoyed security of tenure and income stability regardless of general economic conditions. In addition, since, for example, "demoting" a teacher from say an associate to an assistant professor was virtually unheard of, members of the profession expected their salaries would never decline and tailored living standards accordingly. Certainly this belief facilitated scholarly productivity while luring many into teaching who otherwise would have followed more lucrative careers. Consequently, professors felt duped
when, after failing to share adequately in the bounty of good times, they also suffered during the depression:

... Faculty members and their families... were brought face to face with the fact that their assumed security was no longer a reality. They had not shared the advantages of prosperous days; they were now experiencing the hazards of depression. Theirs was a double loss. Enhancing all the immediate worries was this more basic and disconcerting factor.159

Evidence also indicates that as a whole, professors identified with and sought to emulate those in more lucrative occupations. Frequently history Ph.D.'s were from comfortable upper middle class backgrounds and continued a living style unsuited to their incomes. Being well educated, they sought homes in expensive neighborhoods with good school systems. Being sensitive and intelligent, they loved books, works of art, fine furniture and other expensive items. They often enjoyed travel and were known to endure real hardships to afford this luxury. Practically speaking, most teachers should have emulated the tastes and habits of laborers with comparable incomes. In fact many people pointed this out when professorial budgets, already strained to the limit, proved inoperable after salary cuts and decreased opportunities for moonlighting.

Pay cuts for individual professors varied widely depending on the employing institution and one's original salary. In addition, most schools extended preferential treatment to a few with established reputations or proper connections. Since professors seldom negotiated in unison, pay cuts were often decided individually with each teacher seeking the best "deal" with little regard for colleagues. Nearly everyone faced the probability of decreased pay, and very few managed...
to avoid it. Lowell's Harvard was a singular exception. Though the untenured were often dismissed, the remainder suffered no inconvenience, and many received raises during the thirties. Lowell was possibly the only depression president to insist that teachers be exempted from bad times since they had failed to share fully in the good. Many presidents embraced this theory in the twenties and forgot it the following decade.

A few professors crusaded to rectify perceived injustices. Some including Ohio's Harvey Walker and Harvard's A. Lawrence Lowell questioned paying full interest on bonds considering that the dollar was worth far more than when they were sold. They felt something amiss in a society where wealthy bondholders reaped great windfalls at taxpayer's expense. Some rebels sought to ascertain their school's income to see if cuts were justified. This proved a precarious undertaking since "troublemakers" could be replaced and the facts were difficult to uncover. Work actually carried out, however, showed matters to be better than assumed, particularly because of price decreases, and indicated that pay cuts were often greater than necessary:

The experience of the past six years leads to the conclusion that when depressions come, administrative officials in charge of budgets and budget policy do resort to salary cutting, in part at least because of the effect they believe it will produce.160

Declining salaries and public hostility were not the only problems professors faced. Enrollment decreases rarely corresponded to the number of faculty being dismissed, with the result that class sizes and teaching loads tended to increase. This was especially true of state schools, many of which actually gained students while
trimming their faculties. In addition, some professors took temporary federal or state positions leaving their own classes to be absorbed by colleagues until they returned. Consequently, many depression professors, victimized by a buyer's market, assumed heavier schedules while their wages were being reduced, a fact Dean Shepard noted in his 1934 annual report:

Particularly during 1934-35, with a heavy increase in student enrollment, it has been necessary to call upon many of our staff to add several hours to their teaching load. The first and immediate effect of this has been to substantially slow down research programs throughout the college. A second and very noticeable effect has been to place a severe strain and tension upon many of our teachers which has definitely affected their health. In spite of increased teaching schedules, class enrollments have in some instances been unduly large.161

Another disheartening phenomenon was a widespread granting of "dry promotions" which brought an increase in rank with no improvement in salary. This practice tended to lower average salaries in the higher ranks and to render it ever more difficult for incumbents to obtain raises or escape pay cuts. Particularly in state schools, this practice partially explains why full restoration of salaries sometimes did not occur until after 1945.

A teacher's overall effectiveness often relates to resources at his disposal. In addition to pay cuts, professors frequently encountered obstacles when requiring desks, filing cabinets, teaching aids and bluebooks. Even basic utilities could not be taken for granted. During Ohio's severe winter of 1935, only an emergency appropriation prevented the school from losing its water, electricity and telephone service. During this same period, students furnished
their own bluebooks and money was not available for new faculty. Such
difficulties fostered numerous rumors including speculation that some
schools would close. Therefore, Illinois' President Emeritus David
Kinley asked George Rightmire whether Ohio State would remain open,
and James L. Morrill responded:

• • •

There has been no responsible talk in Ohio about "closing the doors" of the Ohio State University. Some
wild statements of this kind may have been made in the
last two or three years of officers of tax payers as-
sociations.

In the legislative session two years ago a proposal
was made and rather seriously considered by one section
of the House Finance Committee to change one of the
state colleges (Kent State College. . .) into a welfare
institution; possibly a state hospital for mental
cases.162

Yet despite these rumors some professors were skeptical of the
school's poverty, citing the extensive remodeling of university
buildings and making pointed suggestions that these funds be used for
faculty salaries.

To view the depression's impact on a single department, Ohio's
case is readily discernible because of Wittke's efforts to publicize
his situation. He concentrated on raising salaries of those in the
upper ranks whose pay cuts were proportionally greater and whose mar-
ketability was generally higher. Young Ph.D.'s, on the other hand,
were a glut on the market and rarely promoted in rank, salary or re-
sponsibility. Being readily available from the finest graduate
schools at under $2,000 a year, they were treated as the expendable
commodity they were.
Though Wittke worked especially hard at raising the salaries of those who received "dry" promotions, he had little success. He also made some efforts to reward those whose services had been longest in contrast to the widespread practice of shortchanging those considered too old to relocate. Again, Wittke experienced little success because available resources were exhausted in matching offers his professors received and in paying what was necessary to hire experienced personnel. Though beginners came cheap, those with any reputation tended to exact a high price when exchanging a secure position for employment in an institution of questionable standing.

The result was a two-tiered pay system discriminating against both the youngest and most senior teachers. In 1935, for example, a man of assumed promise but not one publication was hired as an associate professor for $360 less than that received by Homer Hockett whose works were a household word in the profession. A few years earlier, a full professor of almost no demonstrable productivity, joined the staff for a higher salary than that earned by either Hockett or Chairman Wittke. At the same time, two productive and popular assistant professors had remained at that rank for a decade with little increase in pay while carrying heavy teaching loads, publishing regularly and cheerfully assuming a wide variety of duties. Another assistant professor in the course of seven years had come to offer all the advanced work in a major field, to author three books and to supervise the American survey courses. In 1935 he earned $2,388 for these services, $112 less than he had received when hired to teach only introductory courses seven years before. Consequently, many
teachers became embittered at seeing less established, often younger individuals being hired at higher salaries than their own.

Fringe benefits such as retirement programs gained some headway during the twenties, but seldom advanced during the following decade. Though most teachers experienced little success in saving for their old age, pension programs remained the exception until after World War Two. One study conducted in the mid thirties revealed:

... 413 of the 583 institutions in the sample made no provision of any kind for retirement of the staff members, ... The conclusion is that protection for old age is an individual matter for large numbers of college and university teachers.163

George Wells Knight, for example, retired in 1926 following 43 years as a full professor. He was awarded a pension, but only because of long, distinguished service and Rightmire's success in proving that this indeed was the case. His daughter's appreciative note indicates pensions were not automatic even in schools which granted them:

My Dear President Rightmire:

I cannot refrain from writing you a brief word of appreciation for what you are doing for father in connection with his retirement. ...

May I say, too, that I am glad the compensation is what you suggest. I would not have wanted him to have a large sum, there is too much criticism regarding unearned salaries. What you are recommending to the trustees is quite enough to show your appreciation and at the same time gives him a little more financial lee-way than he might have had.164

Death benefits for professors' immediate families were much rarer than pensions, and almost unknown. Typical was an Ohio law forbidding compensating any public employee beyond the actual month of death. Though sympathy was extended to victims of this policy, the
law remained in force as one widow discovered after pleading futilely for herself and eight children following the husband’s death in 1936.

Professors in larger, more prosperous institutions obtained a number of benefits during the twenties which often were curtailed the following decade. The use of teaching assistants for grading papers, aid for research and clerical assistance became widespread in major universities. With the depression, this benefit became rarer, particularly in public schools, despite a general expansion of class sizes and teaching loads. Offsetting this to some extent was an increasing availability of travel and research grants awarded throughout the depression by organizations like the Council of Learned Societies and the American Philosophical Society. In addition, federal funds were made available for employing students, a number of whom aided professors in their research.

Sabbaticals were awarded in the thirties by most schools previously granting them, though some were denied due to depression exigencies. Instances did exist of highly paid professors being forced on sabbatical so schools could save money by the individuals concerned being on half pay. On the other hand, some universities took pains arranging long leaves at full pay in addition to sabbaticals in order to encourage research. A professor, for instance, could elect to take leave summer and fall and in return contract to teach three successive semesters or four consecutive quarters. This practice, heretofore quite rare, came into its own during the depression to give teachers large blocks of time with no loss in income. Paycuts, however, could cause a professor to owe money after making up
the quarter he had "borrowed." Homer Hockett, for instance, protested vigorously when billed the difference between his former quarterly compensation and his new lower pay rate.

The practice of reimbursing professors' convention expenses continued during the thirties in wealthier schools, but became rare in public institutions because of popular opposition to "junketing." Teachers requesting this benefit were often considered on an individual basis with first priority given to those appearing on the program. Some schools like Ohio State would not spend any money for this purpose, while other institutions such as Michigan made considerable sacrifices to assure that funds were made available.

Prior to World War I, most university libraries relied on haphazard donations for expanding their collections. By the twenties, however, their importance was widely accepted, and on a national basis the percentage increase for library expenditures was exceeded only by the proliferation of athletic budgets. Johns Hopkins alumni formed Friends of the Johns Hopkins Library and pledged to give at least $100 per member annually plus books and private collections. The organization proved its worth by furnishing over $13,000 its first year and served as a veritable life saver throughout the depression.

The definition of "library" expanded as clients came to expect services beyond the storage and retrieval of books as Homer Hockett discovered while at Michigan in 1924:

... I find the library the most convenient one to work in I have yet encountered and I am quite envious, not
only of the large collection, but of the little stalls in the stacks where one has such excellent opportunities for work. 165

In addition to study carrels, many libraries added features like reading and seminar rooms plus specialized collections for advanced work in various disciplines. The impetus for expanding and improving libraries continued throughout the depression, and leading universities spent great sums on this activity. Two public mid-western schools, Michigan and Illinois, expended record amounts during the thirties with library budgets among the top six of all American universities. Taking advantage of depression construction costs, Illinois erected an enormous, elegant building with seating for 1800 undergraduates, 40 seminar rooms, 12 study rooms and 112 research carrels. Schools with comparable facilities included Minnesota, Michigan, Chicago and Columbia. Harvard and Yale continued in a class by themselves in terms of both the size and quality of their collections.

Professors in second rank schools realized a good library was necessary for their university to join the inner circle of top flight institutions. Typical was Ohio State which during the twenties and thirties suffered from being sixth in enrollment among American universities while averaging eighteenth in library appropriations. The neglect was of long standing. Though the school had opened in 1913, a library building was not completed until 1913 and was woefully inadequate by 1920. Considerable pressure was exerted to halt a crisis resulting from library appropriations decreasing between 1913 and 1920 while inflation raised costs about 50 percent. The resulting squeeze dried up funds for ordering and repairing books while reducing the
staff to half the size of Michigan's and a third that of Chicago's. Matters soon worsened and in 1922 the *Lantern* announced the library was "broke" and predicted its hours of operation would be severely curtailed. 166

1923, however, saw considerable improvement as the legislature accepted Thompson's request for $100,000 to purchase books during the coming biennium. Professor George Havens deserves credit for achieving this and visited Thompson on several occasions armed with facts, figures, statistics and one particular chart depicting the school in a most unflattering fashion. Upon presenting this evidence, Havens asked Thompson if he understood the chart, and his reply, "Yes George, even a college president can understand that," 167 signaled victory for the library lobby.

Thompson's retirement soon thereafter meant that another president needed convincing of the library's worth in order to maintain appropriations and provide the needed increase in a staff which groaned under a backlog of over 10,000 uncatalogued books. Also, few funds were earmarked for specific departments creating special problems for historians assigning supplementary readings in large survey sections. In addition, departmental accounts were not funded logically. In 1926, for example, the fusing of American and European history resulted in a new appropriation being half of what had formerly been received, and this despite constantly rising enrollments. Consequently, the new president George Rightmire, in order to continue the high level of book purchases, needed to hire more staff,
construct a substantial addition to the building and carefully refine the library's budget.

Rightmire proved unequal to the challenge. During the early years of his administration before the depression, he exhibited little interest in the library beyond a concern that multiple copies of required readings be available to undergraduates. Such indifference during prosperity proved disastrous in the thirties when library appropriations so plummeted that the entire budget was less than the cost of subscribing to the current collection of periodicals. Money was once again unavailable for binding or repair work; book purchases ceased, and the building began to deteriorate. Writing in the February, 1936 Ohio State Monthly, Professor Havens described how matters had worsened in the course of a decade:

…

Seventy students in one class endeavoring to get access to a single copy of a reserve book, ... no appropriations for any new books at all, ... no funds for continuing technical journals, books wearing out, valuable sets disintegrating for lack of binding, no money available even to buy a constantly demanded copy of the World Almanac.168

As was everywhere the case, Ohio's library experienced especially hard use during the thirties when students and teachers were financially hard pressed. Consequently, with almost no money for replacing or preserving books, the existing collection was literally pounded to pieces, thus further eroding the university's reputation and effectiveness. This situation failed to improve before 1940 despite concerted faculty efforts to remedy it. A university committee reported:

The spectacular, persistent, and dominant need of the University is the library. Opened in 1913 it was built to care for a student body of 3500, a faculty of
200, and a graduate student body of 150. Now, 25 years later, the same stunted building still attempts to serve a student body of 16,000, a faculty of 900, and a graduate enrollment of 3200 students. . . . Only one student in twenty can find a place to sit in the library. 169

Increasingly, professors tended to denigrate any university lacking the means to publish their research. For a number of reasons, twelve schools founded presses in the twenties and several more the following decade. First, commercial houses would not publish books judged unprofitable. Second, scholars generally believed businessmen would not publish liberal works or books criticizing the conservative viewpoint. Upton Sinclair substantiated this belief with an array of evidence documenting a twenty year campaign against him. 170 Third, the volume of scholarly works increased so markedly that commercial printers could not handle this without slighting other types of materials. Fourth, the prestige value of a university press was unquestionable, and schools without them experienced considerable pressure to establish such a facility. Wilbur Siebert, for example, spearheaded the drive culminating in the founding of Ohio's press in 1926. Since the nineteenth century, he had advocated university sponsorship of scholarly publications and had guided several ventures including a "Contributions in History and Political Science" series, the Ohio History Teachers' Journal, and a number of university studies modeled after similar projects at Wisconsin and Minnesota.

Siebert then discovered that having a press was no guarantee anything would be published. The University of Pennsylvania, for example, produced but three books between 1920 and 1927, the first seven years its press was operating, and received only token budgets
until after 1940. Ohio's tale was nearly as bleak due to pressures exerted by private Columbus printers. Fearing a loss of their livelihood, they insisted the press be abandoned and succeeded in hamstringing its activities and eventually closing it down.

Siebert's volume IV of the History of Ohio State University featuring alumni in World War One became a battleground between those advocating university publication and people wishing to use commercial facilities. The manuscript's completion in 1929 precipitated swift trustee authorization for Ohio's press to publish the work. Despite this action absolutely nothing happened, and in July of 1931 Siebert informed President Rightmire of his disappointment:

... This is the third summer that I have been prepared to read the proof of that work. ... if the state of our finances will not permit I see no other way than to get it printed privately by raising a fund for that purpose.171

Siebert continued pressing Rightmire who denied him permission to raise money for the project despite assurances Ralph Mershon and others were willing to contribute. The author then brought all of his considerable influence to bear on the matter and finally achieved success late in 1935.

Works published by Ohio's press were few and far between. A Wittke manuscript was rejected in 1926 for fear criticism would result from its portrayal of Germany in a favorable light. Later, a Syracuse professor found his manuscript unpublished despite its acceptance and the signing of a contract. Soon thereafter, he received an announcement there were no funds for carrying out any services. Even books
selling well were not reprinted, prompting several authors to obtain releases and take their business elsewhere. Copyrights were then returned to all non Ohio State authors coupled with an announcement nothing further would be published unless written by an Ohio State employee. It was further stipulated that, "It is the policy of the Board of Trustees, therefore, to undertake printing only where the cash to cover the quoted cost of printing is in hand." By 1933, the strangulation of Ohio's press was complete as evidenced by Rightmire's letter to Professor Osman C. Hooper concerning his "History of Ohio Journalism from 1793 to the Present:"

Sympathetically I have studied the conditions here and find that it will not be possible to undertake the printing of the book although you state a method of financing this work. The University could not escape attack and criticism from the printing trade outside if it should undertake to do a piece of contract printing or any other printing not in the ordinary course of the University's business. We have had several experiences of this kind with the printing trade and some time ago had to reach the conclusion that such criticism must be avoided.

Ohio's press remained dormant the next two decades despite its proven worth from works like Paul Clyde's International Rivalries in Manchuria (1928), John LaMonte's Kingship in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem (1932), and William Hesseltine's Prisoners of War and Military Prisons in the War (1930), all of which established scholarly reputations. Unrecorded, however, are the worthy manuscripts rejected by Ohio and other presses which thwarted careers prior to their inception. One such Ohioan wrote a dissertation deemed outstanding only to find no one willing to publish it without a $1,000 advance to underwrite the first edition. In an era when many breadwinners received
between $30 and $60 per month, this sum loomed well beyond his reach. Consequently, university presses failed to provide an outlet for all worthwhile scholarly works.

**Conclusions**

The period 1917-1940 began in confusion and ended in uncertainty, Ohio's Thompson reflecting the former in a 1917 address:

... We are beginning to realize that the world is thoroughly stirred and disorganized and can never return to the old and established methods. ... We shall not return to the old order. We must go on to the new world that is in the making and that will emerge when the fury of the contest is past.174

Professors of history, gripped in the vortex of change, often suffered its unpleasant consequences. Some thought it best to embrace the newly dominant business ethic and become practical, efficient and profit oriented. Even this "new breed" of scholar, however, often was scorned and ridiculed--for increasingly, intellectuals of all types were branded freaks or at best caged canaries who would perish in the more relevant larger world. George Bernard Shaw's "Those who can do; those who can't teach" became a popular and widely believed quotation. In addition, teachers were castigated by conservatives perceiving changes they thought were undesirable fruits of faulty education. They held that given proper stimuli the good old days would return, provided educators were screened and the rotten apples eliminated. This philosophy's dominance spawned an epidemic of loyalty oaths, investigations and mass dismissals; all of which showed
widespread ignorance of education's influence. In 1936, Howard K. 
Beale described the situation as he perceived it:

... Until Americans learn that other factors in
a child's life—for example, parents and the social
environment society provides—are as important as what
he is "taught" in school, they will not cease restrict­
ing the teacher's freedom by trying to hold him re­
sponsible for all that child becomes. . .175

Many professors were confused by these developments since most
were genuinely conservative and opposed to substantive changes in
society or the educational process. The depression failed to dislodge
this conviction, and was viewed as a storm to be weathered, not proof
of a need for change. Such attitudes strained student respect for
educators, many of whom seemed to be more contemptuous than concerned.
While recruiting a colleague, an Ohio political scientist wrote:

Our students are of the sort that is rather usual
in state universities. There is no wealth represented
here and no great culture, but unlimited docility.176

Perhaps educators resembled elements of society seeking to avoid the
depression by dime novels, lavish movies and soap operas which for
scholars became foreign travel, worshipping the past, and clinging
fieroce to traditional education:

... In some respects the adverse economic cir­
cumstances could be regarded as an opportunity, ... to re-evaluate programs and practices...

Yet these above efforts did not change the basic
character, purpose, or function of institutions gen­
erally. The depression seems to have been no great
watershed.177

As 1940 dawned, few signs indicated a new decade would be better
than the old. The economy remained sluggish; the threat of war plunged
real estate values to new lows, and teaching jobs remained incredibly
difficult to locate. Furthermore, economists predicted that recovery would bring inflation which traditionally penalized teachers. A new era was on the horizon, but neither its shape nor the future role of history were as yet discernible.
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